



Consultation Statement

Published: 22/01/2021

Prepared by the Copthorne
Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
2	Consultation Activities up to Reg.14	5
	Copthorne Magazine Survey & Early Engagement (March 2012).....	5
	Establishment of the Steering Group (April 2012).....	5
	Copthorne Carnival Display & Questionnaire (June 2012).....	5
	Early Engagement Feedback (August 2012)	6
	Call for Sites & Sites Consultation (from February 2013).....	6
	St. Modwens Plc Consultation (July 2013)	6
	Hurst House landowners Consultation (November 2013)	6
	Consultation on Draft Plan (23 November 2013)	7
	Steering Group Restructuring (28 November 2013).....	7
	Housing Needs Survey (February 2014)	7
	Preparation of SA / SEA & First Reg.14 Plan (2014 – 2017)	7
	First Regulation 14 Consultation (6 March - 28 April 2017).....	8
	Copthorne Village Survey (July/August 2019)	8
	Policy Options Consultation (9 March - 16 April 2020).....	8
3	Regulation 14 Consultation.....	10
	Who was consulted?	10
	How the consultation was conducted	11
	Main issues raised and how they have been addressed.....	12
	CNP1 – General Development Requirements	13
	CNP2 – Infill Development	13
	CNP3 – Homes for older people	13
	CNP4 – Important Community Facilities	14
	CNP5 – Conversion of public houses	14
	CNP6 – Assets of Community Value	14
	CNP7 – Local Green Space.....	14
	CNP8 – Parish Heritage Assets	14
	SECTION 7: Character Areas (Policies CNP9, CNP10, CNP11, CNP13)	15
	CNP14 – Our Economy.....	15
	CNP15 – Sustainable Transport	15
	CNP16 – Car Parking.....	16
	CNP17 – New Parking Areas.....	16
4	Post Regulation 14 Consultation	17
	CNP2 – Infill Development	17
	CNP3 – Homes for older people	18

CNP14 – Our Economy.....	18
CNP15 – Sustainable Transport	18
CNP16 – Car Parking.....	19
Other comments.....	19

Appendices

APPENDIX 1	Copthorne Magazine Survey (2012).....	20
APPENDIX 2	Initial list of stakeholders & letter to them	21
APPENDIX 3	Responses from the Copthorne Magazine Survey 2012	25
APPENDIX 4	Copthorne Carnival Display	27
APPENDIX 5	Copthorne Carnival Questionnaire	29
APPENDIX 6	Sites Consultation Documentation (April 2012).....	32
APPENDIX 7	Results & Analysis of November 2013 Consultation.....	37
APPENDIX 8	Housing Needs Survey 2014	72
APPENDIX 9	First Regulation 14 Consultation Material.....	111
APPENDIX 10	Copthorne Village Survey Report	117
APPENDIX 11	Policy Options Consultation Report.....	140
APPENDIX 12	Regulation 14 Online Notices and Advertising	157
APPENDIX 13	Example Regulation 14 notification email	161
APPENDIX 14	Example Regulation 14 reminder emails.....	162
APPENDIX 15	Notices in Copthorne Village Magazine.....	164
APPENDIX 16	Regulation 14 notification to Local Green Space owners	169
APPENDIX 17	Regulation 14 Response Form (front page)	171
APPENDIX 18	Verbatim Regulation 14 representations.....	172
APPENDIX 19	MSDC Meeting Notes	195

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Consultation Statement sets out how the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have engaged with the local community whilst preparing the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan.
- 1.2 Throughout the preparation of this plan the Steering Group and Parish Council have sought to include all parts of the community including, but not limited to:
 - Residents
 - Local businesses
 - Schools
 - West Sussex County Council
 - Horsham District Council
 - Neighbouring Parish Councils
 - Environment Agency
 - Infrastructure Providers
 - Churches
 - Historic England
 - Landowners
- 1.3 We have also sought to engage with the community via a variety of means, more recently the options available to us have been restricted due to COVID-19 but we are confident that the plan presented is firmly based and resulting from the community engagement undertaken to date.
- 1.4 **Section 2** of this document details the consultation and engagement activities undertaken prior to the Regulation 14 consultation undertaken in 2020. It documents what the Steering Group did, how it was done, what was learnt and was done with what we learnt at each stage.
- 1.5 **Section 3** of this document fulfils the legal obligations of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 Regulation 15(1) which requires a Consultation Statement to accompany the submission of a plan. Regulation 12(2) of the above-mentioned regulations confirm that a 'Consultation Statement' is a document which:
 - a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - b) explains how they were consulted;
 - c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
 - d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
- 1.6 A number of Appendices are attached to this document which evidence the engagement that has taken place. It should be noted that these appendices are meant to provide a fuller picture of the activities taken place and should not be considered the definitive collection of all relevant material.

2 Consultation Activities up to Reg.14

- 2.1 The Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan has been in development since 2012 and since its inception there has been much engagement with the local community encompassing numerous events, consultation activities.
- 2.2 This section provides an overview of the consultation activities and engagement undertaken with the local community up to the Reg.14 Consultation help in 2020.

Copthorne Magazine Survey & Early Engagement (March 2012)

- 2.3 In March 2012, a questionnaire (included at APPENDIX 1) was circulated to all households in the Copthorne ward via the village magazine to get initial indications of villagers' view on matters effecting the future of the village and surrounding area.
- 2.4 During this consultation, on 22nd March 2012, a meeting of businesses, sports organisations and surrounding councils was held at the Jubilee Pavilion, Copthorne. 22 local groups attended and had group and whole meeting discussions on how they visualised the Plan area developing. Attendees were encouraged to indicate positive aspects of the village, negative aspects, and improvements they would like to see over the coming years. On 11th April 2012, a second meeting of different businesses, organisations and surrounding councils was held at the Jubilee Pavilion, Copthorne to ensure a wider group of organisations had an opportunity to influence the direction of the Neighbourhood Plan. A list confirming some of the stakeholders invited, and the letter sent, is included at APPENDIX 2.
- 2.5 The responses received to the magazine survey (summary at APPENDIX 3) and the feedback received from stakeholders were used in the formulation of the plans vision and objectives and the direction of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Establishment of the Steering Group (April 2012)

- 2.6 On 11th April 2012, the Parish Council established a Steering Group of local residents and Parish councillors to work on and prepare the Neighbourhood Plan. To attract people to join, the Parish Council sought volunteers through the Parish Council magazine and from contacts we thought might be interested. This attracted a range of people who came forward to take part.

Copthorne Carnival Display & Questionnaire (June 2012)

- 2.7 A gazebo was set up at the Copthorne Carnival with some pictures of key places around the plan area alongside some words on the neighbourhood plan and what it was setting out to achieve.
- 2.8 The display used at the Copthorne Carnival is included at APPENDIX 4 and the associated questionnaire is at APPENDIX 5.
- 2.9 The exercise was very informative and helped the Steering Group further understand aspirations for the local area.

Early Engagement Feedback (August 2012)

- 2.10 During August 2012, Worth Parish Council published a guide to the Neighbourhood Plan. This took account of the views expressed by consultation groups and residents to the extent that these could be accommodated within the law and remit of Neighbourhood Plans at this time. They were used by those working on the neighbourhood plan to inform work moving forward.

Call for Sites & Sites Consultation (from February 2013)

- 2.11 In February 2013 developers and householders were invited to submit sites which might be suitable for future development. This was to identify sites of all sizes which might be suitable for development over the lifetime of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.12 Criteria were drawn up against which the sites were considered for suitability for development. These criteria included whether they were in the existing built up area, whether they would impact on the countryside and their sustainability with reference to their location and the existing facilities available in the village.
- 2.13 It was agreed to hold a public exhibition and consultation on the sites that were submitted, and this was held at the Delmar Morgan Institute in Copthorne in April 2013. A detailed map and plan of each proposed development was displayed and where the proposer chose, additional information was provided to support the sites. The advert and consultation site map and response form used at this event can be found in APPENDIX 6. 75 people attended the exhibition and 57 responses were received.
- 2.14 Although the sites were then assessed for suitability, no decision was made as to whether proposed sites would be included in the Plan or whether the suitability of sites would be measured against the objectives laid out in the Plan.

St. Modwens Plc Consultation (July 2013)

- 2.15 On 12th & 13th July 2013, St. Modwens Plc. held their own public consultations at the Delmar Morgan Institute on their plans for 500 plus houses at a site at Copthorne West.
- 2.16 Whilst this was not part of the neighbourhood plan process (it was part of their preparation for the submission of a formal planning application to Mid Sussex District Council), members of the steering group attended to see the presentation, observe and try and gauge resident's views on the proposals.

Hurst House landowners Consultation (November 2013)

- 2.17 On 4th November 2013, members of the steering group met with Hurst House landowners following a request from the landowners to have their sites included for housing and industrial development in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.18 Members of the Steering Group agreed to assess the site in the same way as other sites submitted as a result of the 'Call for sites' process.

Consultation on Draft Plan (23 November 2013)

- 2.19 On 23rd November 2013, a public consultation on draft Neighbourhood Plan proposals at Delmar Morgan Institute. Boards displaying the various sections of the Plan were on display setting out the objectives and proposed criteria.
- 2.20 70 residents attended and 30 questionnaires were completed. Further questionnaires were completed subsequent to the open day. The responses received and analysis report is included at APPENDIX 7.
- 2.21 The feedback received from this consultation was taken into account and the plan was updated in the following weeks.

Steering Group Restructuring (28 November 2013)

- 2.22 On 28th November 2013, Worth Parish Council decided that the steering groups for the 2 Neighbourhood Plans in Copthorne and Crawley Down should become formal sub committees reporting on to a Neighbourhood Plan Committee which would coordinate the work of the 2 plans.

Housing Needs Survey (February 2014)

- 2.23 During February 2014, all residents within the built area of Copthorne received a questionnaire to be completed anonymously. This was undertaken to better understand the local housing stock and deficiencies in it. 562 useable responses were received and used to inform the plan moving forward.
- 2.24 A report detailing the consultation and analysis of the results is included at APPENDIX 8 for reference.
- 2.25 Alongside information previously gathered, the results used to inform the preparation of the draft plan.

Preparation of SA / SEA & First Reg.14 Plan (2014 – 2017)

- 2.26 Over the following three years, the plan was developed by the Steering Group in consultation with the public through a number of informal events such as the Copthorne Carnival and others as considered appropriate. Much work and time was invested in the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment required at the time due to the scope of the plan. Alongside this, there was uncertainty in the planning system as Mid Sussex District Council progressed a new District Plan for the area.

First Regulation 14 Consultation (6 March - 28 April 2017)

- 2.27 The draft Plan was circulated to statutory bodies for Regulation 14 consultation during the period 6th March to 28th April 2017. It was advertised in a range of places in accordance with the regulations – some of the relevant material is included in APPENDIX 9.
- 2.28 A number of responses were received to this consultation including a lengthy response from Mid Sussex District Council which raised concerns with the document and the policies within it.
- 2.29 Following an initial review of the responses, a planning consultant was appointed to review the responses and assist with the necessary revisions. Unfortunately, after an initial review the consultant advised the Sub-Committee that the changes required were significant and additional evidence was required to support the proposed policies.
- 2.30 Accordingly, the Sub-Committee set about preparing the necessary evidence and updating the plan.

Copthorne Village Survey (July/August 2019)

- 2.31 In a bid to update the local evidence being relied upon (being some 7 years after the original survey) a new village survey was prepared which covered a range of topics. 2079 surveys were delivered to every house in Copthorne.
- 2.32 Of the 2079 surveys distributed, 614 surveys were returned representing approximately 30% return rate. The survey requested details of each residence as follows:-
- The number of rooms and availability of parking.
 - The number of people residing in each house.
 - The working arrangements for residents of working age.
 - Details of schools that children attended.
 - Details of doctor's surgeries attended.
 - Additional requirements for additional dwellings in the coming years.
 - An indication of residents likely to be looking to upsize or downsize in the coming years.
 - Details of facilities used and suggestions for additional facilities that would be used if they were available.
- 2.33 The results received were analysed by the Sub-Committee. A report which sets out how the consultation was conducted; the resulting analysis and copies of the consultation documentation is included at APPENDIX 10.
- 2.34 The responses received were used to refine the policies and their requirements in the plan. This was very helpful as it ensured that requirements being set reflected the needs and aspirations of the local community.

Policy Options Consultation (9 March - 16 April 2020)

- 2.35 Whilst the above Housing Survey was being prepared, the Steering Group were also preparing evidence to inform and support the neighbourhood plan. The findings from the survey and this updated evidence resulted in the Sub-Committee having several areas where they were not sure on the best way to address the matter in the plan.

- 2.36 Accordingly, a Policy Options Consultation was held to try and refine their thinking. This consultation consisted of a questionnaire being put out alongside the draft evidence base including the Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019), 2019 Copthorne Village Survey Results & Analysis (February 2020), Draft Local Heritage Assets (February 2020) and Draft Local Green Space (February 2020).
- 2.37 The consultation was advertised widely, and drop-in sessions were held in the Parish Hub on Monday 16th March between 10-12am or Thursday 2nd April between 6-8pm so that interested parties could discuss the plan and the policy options put forward.
- 2.38 A report regarding this consultation is included in APPENDIX 11 which provides further detail on the consultation, how it was conducted and analysis of the results. This report also highlights the recommendations that came out of the consultation which the Sub-Committee considered as they worded to finalise the new Regulation 14 plan.

3 Regulation 14 Consultation

- 3.1 This section provides the information required to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. It specifies:
- (a) details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
 - (b) explains how they were consulted;
 - (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
 - (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.
- 3.2 The first Regulation 14 consultation took place between 14 March 2017 and 28 April 2017. The second Regulation 14 consultation, and the one which is relevant in accordance with the regulations was undertaken between 18 Sept 2020 to 13 Nov 2020 and is the one referred to in this section.
- 3.3 The consultation commenced during the COVID-19 pandemic and great consideration was given as to the best way for the consultation to proceed whilst complying with the government restrictions. Consultees were encouraged to respond online but if this were not possible a hard copy could be accessed (whilst meeting COVID-19 rules and guidance) by contacting the Parish Council.

Who was consulted?

- 3.4 Efforts were made to consult as many people that may have a stake in the parish as possible. The following bodies were sent emails (example at APPENDIX 13) notifying them of the consultation:
- Adur and Worthing Councils
 - Albourne Parish Council
 - Ansty and Staplefield Parish Council
 - Ardingly Parish Council
 - Arun District Council
 - Ashurst Wood Village Council
 - Balcombe Parish Council
 - Brighton and Hove City Council
 - BT Plc c/o RPS Planning
 - Burgess Hill Town Council
 - Burstow Parish Council
 - Chailey Parish Council
 - Colgate Parish Council
 - Cowfold Parish Council
 - Crawley Borough Council
 - Cuckfield Parish Council
 - Danehill Parish Council
 - Horsted Keynes Parish Council
 - Hurstpierpoint & Sayers Common Parish Council
 - Lewes District Council
 - Lindfield Parish Council
 - Lindfield Rural Parish Council
 - Mid Sussex District Council
 - Mobile Operators Association
 - National Grid
 - Natural England
 - Network Rail (Kent, Sussex, Wessex)
 - Newtimber Parish Council
 - NHS West Sussex Clinical Commissioning Group
 - Pyecombe Parish Council
 - Shermanbury Parish Council
 - Slaugham Parish Council

- Ditchling Parish Council
- Dormansland Parish Council
- East Grinstead Town Council
- East Sussex County Council
- EMF Enquiries - Vodafone and O2
- Environment Agency
- Felbridge Parish Council
- Fletching Parish Council
- Forest Row Parish Council
- Fulking Parish Council
- Hassocks Parish Council
- Haywards Heath Town Council
- High Weald AONB Unit
- Highways England
- Historic England
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Horsham District Council
- South Downs National Park Authority
- Southern Gas Network
- Southern Water
- Surrey County Council
- Sussex Police
- Sutton and East Surrey Water
- Tandridge District Council
- Thames Water
- Twineham Parish Council
- UK Power Networks
- Upper Beeding Parish Council
- Wealden District Council
- West Hoathly Parish Council
- West Sussex County Council
- Wivelsfield Parish Council
- Woodmancote Parish Council
- Worth Parish Council

- 3.5 In addition, 225 others were consulted. This included local developers and agents and those who had previously responded to the consultation were notified by email. Specific details of these cannot be published here for GDPR reasons.
- 3.6 It should be noted that landowners of proposed Local Green Space designations were also specifically notified of the consultation and included details of the proposed designation on their land (see APPENDIX 16 for a copy of the notification they received).

How the consultation was conducted

- 3.7 The Parish Council published the following documents for scrutiny and comment:
- Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (August 2020)
 - Draft Consultation Statement (August 2020)
 - Copthorne SEA Screening (July 2020)
 - Assessment of Local Heritage Assets (August 2020)
 - Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)
 - Local Green Space Assessment (August 2020)
- 3.8 These were available online on the Parish Council's dedicated website <http://www.worth-pc.gov.uk/>
- 3.9 Efforts were made to consult with as many people as possible over the 8-week consultation period. Unfortunately, due to the ongoing restrictions relating to the Covid-19 pandemic, meetings, exhibitions, drop-in sessions, and letter drops were not possible. The main methods adopted to raise awareness of the consultation were therefore online and via email and are set out below:
- 3.10 Updates & posts on social media relating to the start of the consultation and follow up reminders to respond to the consultation (APPENDIX 12). Posts were published to the following locations:

- Facebook Group – Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (*200 followers on 26/11/20*)
 - Facebook Group – Copthorne Village Association (*934 followers on 26/11/20*)
- 3.11 Direct emails were sent to everyone on the Parish Council's database, the Mid Sussex District Council consultee database and those that have previously been involved with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan (who have asked to be notified and email details kept on file). Emails were sent at the start of the consultation on 23 October (APPENDIX 13), and 11 November, 2 days before the end of the consultation (APPENDIX 14).
- 3.12 Landowners of proposed Local Green Space designations were specifically notified of the consultation and included details of the proposed designation on their land (see APPENDIX 16 for a copy of the notification they received).
- 3.13 Details of the consultation were also published in the Oct/Nov 2020 edition of the Copthorne Village Magazine, and an article included in the Parish Council's newsletter within it as well. This was published in late September and distributed to all households (APPENDIX 15).
- 3.14 Those interested were able to inspect the consultation documents and access the response form in the following ways:
- Online on the Parish Council website. All consultation documents were available to view, download and/or print 24/7 for the duration of the consultation period.
 - For those unable to view documents/forms online, hard copies were available to be read by phoning the Parish Council who would ensure access to a hard copy, whilst meeting Covid-19 restrictions.
- 3.15 Responses were invited in writing within the consultation period and respondents were notified that all responses would be published verbatim in the Consultation Statement when the plan is submitted to Mid Sussex District Council.
- 3.16 Consultees were also notified that anonymous responses, responses that contain inappropriate language, defamation or are deemed to be offensive would not be accepted.
- 3.17 To assist with gathering responses to the consultation, we asked that responses were provided on the forms provided via the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan [webpage](#). This not only made it easier for members of the Steering Group, saving valuable data input time, but also for people and organisations to submit their comments. Two versions of the 'form' were provided:
- **Digital Form.** This was a word document which people could open and complete on a pc/laptop/phone etc and then email.
 - **Paper Form.** A PDF copy of the form which could be printed and sent by post (APPENDIX 17).
- 3.18 Whilst efforts were made to ensure representations were submitted to us using the forms above, any response received in writing was accepted and subsequently considered by the steering group.

Main issues raised and how they have been addressed.

- 3.19 This section considers the main issues and concerns raised in the responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation. It sets out how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the submission version of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan.

- 3.20 For transparency, we include anonymised verbatim Regulation 14 Consultation representations in APPENDIX 18 of this document. Against each comment is a brief response from the Steering Group setting out how that comment has been taken into account.
- 3.21 The comments received covered a range of matters with the majority seeking clarifications of text of policy, correction of typographical errors or factual information or other small amendments. Following consideration of the comments received during the Regulation 14 Consultation, the main issues/concerns raised, and how they have been addressed, are set out below:

CNP1 – General Development Requirements

- 3.22 The issues raised in relation to this policy included:
- That CNP1.2 is too restrictive compared to MSDC Policy DP26.
 - That not every development can provide enhancements in line with CNP1.3 and that it may not be necessary, appropriate, or desirable to do so.
 - That the requirement for enhancement in CNP1.4 goes beyond the MSDC Local Plan policy DP22 and the requirement of such infrastructure is subject to the assessment of the relevant highway authority, and may not therefore be appropriate.
 - That CNP1.6a is too prescriptive and would prevent people from carrying out works that would normally be considered standard.
- 3.23 The wording of CNP1.2 has been amended to clarify the purpose of the policy. CNP1.3 and CNP1.4 have been amended to require enhancements where possible to reflect that it may not always be feasible to provide enhancement. Other minor amendments have been made to provide clarity and address the issues raised.

CNP2 – Infill Development

- 3.24 The issues raised in relation to this policy included:
- Two responses took issue with the term “vacant parcel of land” and that this would undermine the aim of the policy to allow infill within the built-up area.
 - Three responses felt the policy should also apply to the redevelopment of sites to achieve the objectives of the Plan.
- 3.25 Amendments to the policy include adding “redevelopment” and removing the term “vacant parcels of land” to better reflect the overall aim of the plan in allowing infill subject to criteria preventing harmful impacts to the character of the streetscene, parking provision, and neighbours’ amenity.

CNP3 – Homes for older people

- 3.26 The issues raised in relation to this policy included:
- That specific protection of bungalows could have the unintended consequence of retaining poor bungalows and could prevent the optimization of a site to provide more housing.
 - The policy should not exclude apartments/maisonettes which can also be accessible for older people.
 - The requirement for development to meet M4(2) criteria is likely to affect development viability.

- 3.27 The policy (CNP3.1) has been amended to widen the possible accommodation that could be suitable for older people by removing specific reference to bungalows. This would allow, for example, ground floor apartments or maisonettes.
- 3.28 The requirement to meet M4(2) is minor and would not materially affect viability. This objective is supported by the recent MHCLG consultation "*Raising accessibility standards for new homes*" which suggests that all new homes should meet M4(2) as a minimum requirement. The estimated cost per dwelling would be approx. £1,400 for units that do not already meet the M4(2) standard. The benefits of this may potentially reduce the need for social care.

CNP4 – Important Community Facilities

- 3.29 The issues raised in relation to this policy included:

- That the wording "*no more difficult*" is unclear
- Including a list of community facilities would be useful.
- That CNP4.3 should reflect wider infrastructure requirements.

- 3.30 To provide greater clarity CNP4.3 has been amended to require that the location of relocated facilities be easily and safely accessible by foot or cycle. The list of community facilities has been added to the policy. It is not felt wording of wider infrastructure requirements is necessary as they are covered elsewhere in the development plan.

CNP5 – Conversion of public houses

- 3.31 There were no issues raised regarding this policy.

CNP6 – Assets of Community Value

- 3.32 One comment was received asking for clarification on what "*affecting assets of community value*" means. The wording of this policy (CNP6.1) has been amended to provide greater clarity.

CNP7 – Local Green Space

- 3.33 One response nominated a small pocket of land in Lashmere Crescent for designation as a Local Green Space.
- 3.34 This open space provides a link from the residential area to the south to footpaths out into the countryside to the north of Copthorne. It is felt that the space does not meet the criteria for consideration by the Local Green Space Assessment. The criteria which guides the area to be looked at is set out within the evidence document. On top of this, Policy CNP1.4 protects footpaths, cycle paths, bridleways and Rights of Way and it is felt this provides protection for this link.

CNP8 – Parish Heritage Assets

- 3.35 One response queried whether referring to them as non-designated heritage assets may be more appropriate and in line with the NPPF.
- 3.36 It is felt that it is appropriate to give the designations a name such as "Parish Heritage Assets" as the policy does not intent to identify all non-designated heritage assets. If the neighbourhood plan sought to designate, non-designated heritage assets, not only would be it an oxymoron but also risks the designation being considered an exclusive list of the non-designated assets in the

Parish (which they are not). However, to provide clarity, the supporting text has been amended to state that they are non-designated assets.

SECTION 7: Character Areas (Policies CNP9, CNP10, CNP11, CNP13)

3.37 There were several comments on this section generally and on each specific policy. The main issues raised were:

- That the policies are descriptive. The response suggests focusing on design guidance rather than the characteristics of an area which would normally be in supporting text of background documents.
- That the words “*preserve and enhance*” introduce a level of protection equivalent of, if not higher than that applied to AONB and is therefore not proportionate.
- Request to include High Weald AONB Management Plan in the policy and require that proposals have regard to it.
- The policy should acknowledge suitable locations for residential development or new housing in the area.
- The policy should acknowledge the existence of the outline permission (St Modwens development) that will change the landscape character.

3.38 The wording has been amended to provide more proportionate protection of positive aspects that make up the character and distinctiveness of each character area.

3.39 The policy now includes a requirement to have regard to the High Weald AONB Management Plan.

3.40 The purpose of the policy is to protect and reinforce the character of the areas and does not cover the suitability of housing. The plan does not allocate housing sites which is not a requirement of Neighbourhood Plans. Assessment of new housing is covered by policy CNP1 and CNP2 and the wider development plan.

3.41 The development to the west of Copthorne between the built-up area and the M23 motorway is yet to be completed. It is therefore appropriate to assess the character of the area as it stands now and review when neighbourhood plan is reviewed.

CNP14 – Our Economy

3.42 One response requested a definition of “exceptional circumstances”. In response to this a footnote has been inserted which provides examples of what may constitute exceptional circumstances.

CNP15 – Sustainable Transport

3.43 The issues raised in relation to this policy included:

- There were a number of responses requesting a cycle track/path/lane from Copthorne to Worth Way or Three Bridges. There is no safe way to make this journey now by bicycle, forcing people to use their cars.
- Highlighting that development can only address its own impacts.
- Highlighting that certain sizes of development may not require an assessment of traffic congestion making this criterion challenging to implement.
- A request to clarify on what types of development CNP15.3 applies to.
- Request to consider impacts of northern runway at Gatwick on the area, specifically regarding off airport parking.

- 3.44 A cycle route between Copthorne and Worth Way is supported by Policy CNP15.2 and is now provided as an example including Crawley and East Grinstead which would benefit from improved cycle/walking links.
- 3.45 Policy CNP15.1(b) has been amended to clarify that the development should address its own impacts.
- 3.46 Policy CNP15.1(c) has been amended to require that only major development include a detailed assessment of its impacts on the highway network.
- 3.47 Policy CNP15.3 applies to new development which includes off road parking spaces. It is not felt that the policy needs to set out all the different types of development that policy applies to.
- 3.48 MSDC do not have a policy addressing the issue of new off airport parking sites whereas other authorities do such as Crawley, Horsham, and Tandridge. New or additional off airport parking within the plan area would impact the character of the area and increase traffic/reduce air quality undermining the vision and objectives of the plan. An additional paragraph has therefore been added to CNP15 to prevent off airport parking as the airport is the most sustainable location for it.

CNP16 – Car Parking

- 3.49 The issues raised in relation to this policy included:
- That households which already have provision over the standard will be required to maintain it which is considered unreasonable.
 - That 16.3(b) is too prescriptive, and the higher level of provision required (compared with WSCC guidance) is not based on evidence.
 - Suggestion to allow a lower parking provision where justified, for example, being in a sustainable location.
 - Suggestion to reference WSCC parking guidance which also outlines guidance for electric charging points as well as cycle storage provision.
- 3.50 Changes have been made to CNP16.1 to ensure that sufficient off-road parking is provided in line with the proposed standards which are set out in Policy CNP16.3.
- 3.51 The evidence to support the parking standards proposed is contained within the Copthorne Village Survey 2019. To provide greater clarity a note has been prepared that clearly sets out the justification for this policy requirement. This is included as part of the suite of submission documents.
- 3.52 The requirements of this policy are justified by the evidence supporting the Plan. Lower provision due to a sustainable location can be argued by other material considerations and justified as a departure from policy which can be considered by the decision maker.
- 3.53 A reference to the West Sussex County Council, Guidance on Parking at New Developments (September 2020) has been included.

CNP17 – New Parking Areas

- 3.54 One response requested that the policy included a reference to WSCC parking standards. A reference to the West Sussex County Council, Guidance on Parking at New Developments (September 2020) has been included.

4 Post Regulation 14 Consultation

- 4.1 Following the Regulation 14 consultation the Neighbourhood Plan was updated to reflect the changes made in light of the consultation responses received. It was felt that prior to Regulation 15 where the plan is sent to the local planning authority, it would be beneficial for the local planning authority to be consulted on the amended Neighbourhood Plan and associated Reg15 documents prior to this including a meeting to discuss any outstanding concerns that the council may have.
- 4.2 A copy of the amended Neighbourhood Plan, Consultation Statement, Basic Conditions Statement and the evidence underpinning Plan were sent to Mid Sussex District Council. This included two new documents post reg 14, a report identifying the Important Community Facilities (Policy CNP4) and a note on Parking Requirements, setting out the justification for the parking standards within Policy CNP16.
- 4.3 A meeting took place on 17 December between members of the NP Steering Group and Mid Sussex District Council. At this meeting, the council raised outstanding concerns and a discussion took place between the steering group members and the council as to how these concerns could be resolved. A copy of the council's outstanding concerns was received after this meeting on 6 January and is included in (APPENDIX 19). The meeting was constructive and resulted in a number of changes to the plan which were subsequently agreed at the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meetings on 6 January and 20 January. A summary of the changes made to the Neighbourhood Plan are set out below:

CNP2 – Infill Development

- 4.4 MSDC felt that this policy conflicted with MSDP Policy DP6 Settlement Hierarchy and could impact the delivery of windfall sites as the policy solely allows for redevelopment/infill within the built-up area.
- 4.5 It was confirmed at the meeting that this is not the intention of the policy and it was agreed that the wording needed to be amended to clarify that the policy relates spatially to the built-up area and does not deal with development outside. Outside the BUAB other development plan policies apply such as Local plan Policy DP6 and proposed Neighbourhood Plan policies CNP9 and CNP10.
- 4.6 Whilst MSDC recommended deletion of the policy in the follow up note, the policy has been retained as it is specific to infill/redevelopment and sufficiently different in its requirements than MSDP Policy DP26 which covers general design and character:
 - Paragraph a) adds more detail to the development policies and related specifically to infill/redevelopment.
 - Paragraph b) provides slightly stronger protection of all pedestrian/cycle routes than DP22 which applies to recreational routes/rights of way and DP26 which asks for a pedestrian friendly layout.
 - Paragraph c) is considered a more appropriate policy approach than DP26, requiring that development does not cause unreasonable harm rather than DP26 which is not to cause significant harm. DP26 is considered too low a standard to meet in order to achieve Neighbourhood Plan Objectives or the strong focus on high standard of amenity as set out in NPPF paragraphs 127(f) *'create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users'*.

- 4.7 In summary, the policy has been amended to clarify its intention to support sensitive infill and redevelopment with the built-up area of Copthorne.

CNP3 – Homes for older people

- 4.8 MSDC raised a concern that CNP3.3 could impact viability and therefore housing delivery. MSDC recommend preparing a viability report to justify this policy.
- 4.9 The estimated cost per dwelling would be approx. £1,400¹ for units that do not already meet the M4(2) standard. It is considered that viability is unlikely to be impacted but the policy wording has been amended to allow exceptions if the applicants can demonstrate that to meet the requirement would render the proposal unviable.
- 4.10 Additional wording has been added to the supporting text to confirm that permitted development rights exist that undermine the objective of retaining single storey residential floorspace.
- 4.11 In response to MSDC comments and following a review of the Housing Needs Survey, the Steering Group agreed to change the policy wording of CNP3.2 from 'single storey' to 'smaller accessible homes' as per the housing survey results which showed a significant demand for smaller homes for older people to downsize to as well as single storey dwellings which is addressed in CNP3.1.
- 4.12 The Village Survey showed that there is a significant demand for moving to a smaller home within the next 20 years (Q9). Only a handful gave moving to a bungalow as reason for moving in the next 20 years. A number of comments mentioned the need for smaller dwellings for older generations to downsize to but remain in the village.

CNP14 – Our Economy

- 4.13 As requested by MSDC additional wording has been included to clarify that permitted development rights that allow changes of use from shops to offices for example without the need for planning permission undermine the policy.

CNP15 – Sustainable Transport

- 4.14 MSDC recommended clarifying the type of supporting document be required under CNP15(c).
- 4.15 This policy has been amended to clarify that a Transport Assessment (as defined in the NPPF) is not required but than an assessment of highways impacts is required for major developments. It is considered that this addresses a gap in the MSDC requirements whereby no assessment of highway impacts is required for development under 50 residential units or under 1500m² commercial floorspace. In Copthorne where there is an identified issue with traffic congestion it is considered that, for example, a residential proposal for 45 dwellings should provide an assessment of its impact on the highway due to its likely reliance on the car.
- 4.16 It is also noted that the Highways England response to the Reg 14 consultation states.

“Due to the congestion issues identified in 9. Traffic and Travel, further developments in this area would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, or Assessment, and thus it is recommended that this is included under CNP1 – General Development Requirements”.

¹ 2020 MHCLG consultation “Raising accessibility standards for new homes”

- 4.17 Whilst duplication of the requirement by including it in CNP1 has not been accepted, the response from Highways England does support the requirement for an assessment of transport impacts as stated in Policy CNP15.1(c).
- 4.18 It is also noted that WSCC as the Highway Authority do not raise any concerns or objections to Policy CNP15.
- 4.19 The policy has also been amended to replace 'negative' with 'harmful' as the former would not be in general conformity with the development plan.
- 4.20 MSDC also noted that the insertion of a new paragraph in policy CNP15 post reg 14 consultation relating to airport related parking could trigger the requirement for a new Regulation 14 consultation as it has not previously been consulted upon.
- 4.21 The reason for including this additional paragraph is covered in the previous section. Whilst the issue has been raised late on in the process, this is not a valid reason for ignoring the issue when the additional paragraph is fully in line with the Plan objectives and consultation responses received. Regulation 16 provides a minimum 6-week period for comments which allows all interested parties to put forward their view prior to consideration of the Plan by the appointed Examiner.

CNP16 – Car Parking

- 4.22 MSDC view is that provision of additional spaces for new dwellings will not make up an existing shortfall. MSDC recommends further evidence to justify the introduction of local parking standards.
- 4.23 It should be noted that the purpose of the policy is not to make up existing shortfalls. Further evidence has been provided in the '*Review of Parking Requirements*' note that pulls together existing evidence. This justifies a parking standard for the Plan area to help avoid new development exacerbating the existing parking problems or creating additional areas with parking problems.

Other comments

- 4.24 Amendments have been made to the Plan addressing MSDC comments that 'a good standard of amenity is vague' this been amended to '...do not cause unreasonable harm' which achieves the policy objective of maintaining amenity. This is no less open to interpretation than MSDP policy or the NPPF with regard to amenity.

Copthorne Magazine March 2012

Worth Parish Council – Neighbourhood Plans

Name:		Address:		
		Post code:		
The Neighbourhood Plan to which my answers below refer is for:				
Copthorne / Crawley Down (delete which is inapplicable)				
<i>Please tick the relevant answer box</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Do not Agree	No opinion
It is important that the Plan undertakes to protect the village's distinctive characteristics and separation from adjacent communities.				
The Plan needs to identify what improved and/or new services and facilities are needed in the village.				
To provide those new services and facilities, I am willing to accept new homes built in suitable locations in the neighbourhood to fund them.				
The Plan must ensure any new developments do not reduce the amount of green spaces / common land in the village.				
All new developments must integrate well into the village to prevent the creation of separate communities.				
The Plan should support the development of local businesses to provide more local employment.				
The most important issue which I would like to see reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan is:				

Return to: The Parish Clerk, Worth Parish Council Offices, Village Hall Bungalow, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down, West Sussex, RH10 4HE, by March 8th.

APPENDIX 2 Initial list of stakeholders & letter to them

COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

STAKEHOLDERS / CONSULTEES REGISTER

Statutory Consultees:

1. Mid Sussex District Council – Claire Tester, Head of Economic Promotion and Planning
claire.testers@midsussex.gov.uk
2. Crawley Borough Council – 01293 43800
3. Tandridge District Council – Piers Mason, Chief Planning Officer – TDC, Station Road East, Oxted, Surrey RH8 0BT
4. Burstow Parish Council – Mrs J Crosby, Clerk, burstowpc@btconnect.com
5. Turners Hill Parish Council – Mrs Christine Marsh, Clerk, turnershillpc@btconnect.com
6. West Sussex County Council Highways Dept – Diane Ashby, Director of Service Operations, highways@westsussex.gov.uk 01243 642105
7. Surrey County Council Highways Dept – Highways Service – Jason Russell, Asst Director
8. Highways Agency – Mr Garry Frostrick, Network Planning Manager
garry.frostrick@highways.gsi.gov.uk
9. Environment Agency – Ms Laura Bourke, Principal Planning Advisor
laura.bourke@environment-agency.gov.uk
10. Natural England – Lead Advisor consultation@naturalengland.org.uk
11. Utilities Companies (BT, British Gas, Electricity Suppliers)
12. Thames Water (sewerage) – Thames Water Utilities Limited, PO Box 286, Swindon, SN38 2RA Tel: 0845 9200 888
13. South East Water (water) – communications@southeastwater.co.uk
Lee Dance, Head of Water Resources lee.dance@southeastwater.co.uk
14. Primary Care Trust

Stakeholders:

Copthorne Junior School – Head, Mrs Ann MacGregor 01342 712372

Fairway School – Head, Mrs B Davison 01342 713691

Sussex Police – Local Policing Team, PC Nicki Follett, PCSO Tim Wainwright
nicki.follett@sussex.pnn.police.uk

Pound Hill Medical Group – Perry Anderson, Practice Manager

Local Businesses



WORTH Parish Council

Clerk to the Council Keith L. Wall

**Village Hall Bungalow
Turners Hill Road
Crawley Down
West Sussex
RH10 4HE**

**Phone and Fax. 01342 713407
E-mail. Worthparish@btconnect.com**

January 31, 2012

Dear Stakeholder,

Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan

Under the Government's Localism legislation, if we wish to have a say in how we want our Neighbourhood to be shaped over the next 25 years, we need to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. A Neighbourhood may be the same as a Parish or Town area but Worth Parish Council has decided it is more equitable for a Plan to be produced for each of the wards in the Parish, so that there will be one for Copthorne and one for Crawley Down.

As an organisation / business being a key stakeholder in Copthorne, you are invited to send a representative to the initial stakeholder meeting for the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan, to be held on Thursday, March 22nd at 7:30 p.m. at the new Copthorne Pavilion, King George's field, Copthorne Bank (opposite the Hunters Moon allotments).

The meeting will provide a brief introduction as to what can, and cannot, be included in Neighbourhood Plans and then, by working in groups, hopefully produce as comprehensive a list as possible of wants, needs and objectives for the future development of the village. The meeting will end at 9:45 p.m.

Please ensure your representative is briefed to reflect the views of your organisation so that we can gather as wide a range of inputs as possible. This will enable us to draft a vision and form objectives. In order to assist you in providing your representative with relevant information, we enclose a copy of the Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire which is in the Council's Newsletter in the February / March edition of the Copthorne Magazine. Also enclosed is an indication of what a vision statement and objectives should try to achieve.

In order to help us organise the meeting, please let us know by March 8th if you will be sending a representative and, if so, their name. It is vital you do this by letter or e-mail so we have written confirmation. Regretfully, nominations received after that date cannot be accommodated.

We look forward to meeting our key stakeholder representatives and getting their ideas for the future of Copthorne.

Kind regards,

Mike Livesey
Worth Parish Council, Neighbourhood Plan Co-ordinator

Stakeholder	Contact	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3	Postcode	Invite to Mar22 sent	Response date	Rep name
Parish Church				Copthorne		26 Jan 12	24/12	
Scouts and Guides				Copthorne		26 Jan 12	23.3.12	
Guideline				Copthorne		26 Jan 12		
Copthorne Afternoon WI				Copthorne		30 Jan 12	23.2.12	
Copthorne Evening WI				Copthorne		31 Jan 12	7.2.12	
Copthorne Junior School				Copthorne		31 Jan 12		
Fairway Infant School				Copthorne		31 Jan 12		
Copthorne Village Ass'n				Copthorne		31 Jan 12	23.3.12	
Local Action Team				Copthorne		31 Jan 12		
Mothers' Union				Copthorne		31 Jan 12		
Copthorne Ladies Club				Copthorne		31 Jan 12	7.2.12	
Avensys Ltd				Copthorne				
Budgens				Copthorne				
Connells				Copthorne				
Copthorne Hotel				Copthorne				
Copthorne Post Office				Copthorne				
Copthorne Social Club				Copthorne		31 Jan 12		
Copthorne Sports & Comm'y Ass'n				Copthorne		31 Jan 12		
Copthorne Surgery				Copthorne		31 Jan 12		
Police				Copthorne				
Sunshine Pre-School								
Rowfant Society								

Stakeholder	Contact	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3	Postcode	Invite to Apr 11 sent	Response date	Rep name
Avensys Ltd	Owner / Manager			Copthorne		16/3		
A H Budgen (Cop) Ltd	Managing Director		E	Copthorne		16/3		
Connells Plc			S	Copthorne		16/3		
Copthorne Hotel	General Manager			Copthorne		16/3		
Guideline Building Ser	Managing Director		E	Copthorne		16/3		
Harbour Holdings Ltd	Managing Director		E	Copthorne		16/3		
T Smart & Sons Ltd	Managing Director		E	Copthorne		16/3		
Londis Stores	General Manager			Copthorne		16/3		
Copthorne Village Stores	General Manager			Copthorne		16/3		
Stracken & Hawkridge	Owners		C	Copthorne		16/3		
Pestareast	Managing Director			Worth		16/3		
Cherry Tree Public House	General Manager			Copthorne		16/3		
Prince Albert Public Hse	General Manager			Copthorne		16/3		
Gatwick Worth Hotel	General Manager			Worth		16/3		
Dragons Health Club	General Manager			Copthorne		16/3		
Rowfant House	General Manager			Rowfant		16/3		
Wyvale Garden Centre	General Manager			Copthorne		16/3		
Mad World Fancy Dress	Managing Director			Crawley D		16/3		
Colas Ltd	Managing Director			Rowfant		16/3		
Police	F					16/3		

Worth Parish Council – Neighbourhood Plans

Name:		Address:		
		Post code:		
The Neighbourhood Plan to which my answers below refer is for:				
Copthorne (delete which is inapplicable)				
<i>Please tick the relevant answer box</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Do not Agree	No opinion
It is important that the Plan undertakes to protect the village's distinctive characteristics and separation from adjacent communities.	23	2	1	
The Plan needs to identify what improved and/or new services and facilities are needed in the village.	15	8	3	
To provide those new services and facilities, I am willing to accept new homes built in suitable locations in the neighbourhood to fund them.	1	7	16	2
The Plan must ensure any new developments do not reduce the amount of green spaces / common land in the village.	26			
All new developments must integrate well into the village to prevent the creation of separate communities.	14	7		5
The Plan should support the development of local businesses to provide more local employment.	8	6	8	4
The most important issue which I would like to see reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan is:				
Protect gap / surrounding countryside 10 Traffic management in the village 8; Adequate parking to reduce on-street parking 3 Wallage lane too industrial and too many signs 1 More rubbish bins 1; more policing 1 Develop only on brownfield sites 1; affordable housing for young people 1				



**Copthorne Village Millennium Group
Copthorne Village Association**

COPTHORNE-

it's YOUR VILLAGE so be sure that you've had your say!

The Copthorne Village Millennium Group and the Copthorne Village Association have simple aims; to support the community and protect its heritage. During the next twelve to eighteen months some of the most important decisions to affect our village will be made. These decisions will affect the shape and size of Copthorne and, if this is a village you feel part of and care about, they will affect you. They hinge around the term 'NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN'

What's a NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN?

A NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN is a document to be agreed by the community; that sets out the level of development - residential, commercial or leisure - that the community needs or can sustain in the next 20 years. It has to be a positive document that identifies what can happen and it has to comply with the Mid Sussex District Council's Local Development Plan. Once produced it will be vetted to ensure compliance and will be subject to a community referendum which must achieve 50% agreement to be approved. If approved it will be an effective planning control document for the next 20 years.

So what if we don't produce a NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN or the plan is not agreed?

We must, and we must agree. If the Copthorne community cannot produce an effective NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN on which the majority of residents who vote agree there will be no control and the community will have no say in the level of development that could be, and probably will be, forced upon us. We live in an area sought after by developers and changes to planning policy will enable their plans to be enacted much more easily than we have ever known before.

Can we just say "No" to development?

No. If we do this they will build the houses anyway.

The Government has decreed that there must be more development in the South East. Mid Sussex District Council has identified the number of houses it can sustain in the District. The District requires that Worth Parish provides a proportion of this development and Copthorne must take its share.

Is it just more houses?

No. More housing affects our schools, our infrastructure, our community facilities and our roads. All of these issues must be considered in deciding what the community can sustain. Due consideration in the production of the NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN is the only way each these can be fully appraised.

How can the whole community of Copthorne agree a plan?

It won't, and for this reason it is essential that the whole community is aware of the implications of failure to produce and agree the NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN. The Worth Parish Council has taken the first important step of separating the Parish (Copthorne and Crawley Down) and identifying Copthorne as a community which should shape its own destiny and has sought the support of the community in producing the NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN.

It will be essential for those working on the plan to be objective, to listen and give fair consideration to all views. They must be open and honest with the community throughout its production and communicate the progress in clear understandable terms. They must consider all options open to them and only then will the residents be able to vote on the plan in the knowledge that it is the very best that the community can achieve. In this way it has a chance of success.

If we just agree to let the developers take the lead and build won't the community benefit financially?

Probably. However it is vitally important, and the Copthorne Village Millennium Group hopes you will concur, that due consideration should be given to the longer term and social implications of accepting short term cash rewards. The village has a strong community atmosphere and a heritage measured more by its people than its buildings. This could all be lost if the development is wrong, no matter how big the reward. The Copthorne Village Millennium Group accepts that change is probably inevitable but seeks that it is formulated on the basis of careful consideration of the long term effect on the community.

What do the residents need to do?

- Get involved.
- Offer help to the Parish Council maybe as part of the NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Group
- Communicate with your ward councillors.
- Express your views either direct to the PARISH COUNCIL or use the COPTHORNE VILLAGE ASSOCIATION as a vehicle to represent your views.
- Nominate people to the Steering Group who you feel can be objective, and have both your trust and perhaps the skills to make this work.
- At the very least watch how the NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN evolves, think how it will affect your children, the schools, your clubs or organisations and the people around you and state your support or otherwise.
- Please speak up now; it will be too late afterwards.

We live on the edge of nearly every possible boundary and over the years have been pushed from one authority to another. The village has often been so far from the controlling body that it seems its voice has hardly been heard. The NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN can, and should, traverse all boundaries and encompass the whole community. We can either look at this as a disaster for the village or turn it into an opportunity. An opportunity to take every morsel of power that the NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN offers to shape the destiny of the future of the village and make it our own decision.

Copthorne must have an effective NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN that safeguards the whole community for the future. No plan is not an option.

The Copthorne Village Millennium Group and the Copthorne Village Association supports the production of a NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN that has given due consideration to all the views expressed.

Gwyn Cheesmur (Chairman)
On behalf of the Copthorne Village Millennium Group

Joy Day (Vice Chairman)
On behalf of the Copthorne Village Association

Have your say, leave your comments at www.copthornevillage.org

COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN RESIDENTS VIEWS

It is important in the preparation of our Cophorne Neighbourhood Plan to gather views and information from residents, on local matters, which will directly influence the future of our village over the next 20 years. This is your opportunity to give us your views.

The Government's localism Bill has allowed local people to produce their own Plans for the future of their villages or towns through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. These Plans will make provisions for your village over the next 20 years. We (your Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) would like to ask you for your views on some general subjects to help prepare our Plan. Once completed our Village Plan will be submitted to Mid-Sussex DC for approval and consideration for inclusion in the overall District Plan for Mid-Sussex.

Housing for the future

TOPIC	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Other suggestions or comments
How many houses do you feel will be needed over next 20 years Up to max 100 Between 100 – 300 Between 300 - 500						
Is the need for:- Small family houses Houses/ flats for older folk Affordable/low cost housing						
New dwellings should be within the present village boundaries						
Should there be a limited number of dwellings outside the boundaries						
Maintain the gap between M23 & Crawley - avoid coalescence						

Transport and Roads

TOPIC	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Other suggestions or comments
The present village roads should be upgraded and made safe before any further development						
Copthorne has adequate public transport provision						
Improve A264 to avoid congestion and reduce traffic on the village roads for the future.						
Encourage & improve safer facilities for walking and cycling in the village						
Parking in the village is a major issue & should be addressed						

General topics

Topic	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Other suggestions and comments
Copthorne has a need for outdoor leisure and recreational facilities						
Copthorne schools and medical facilities cannot sustain a major increase in population						
Copthorne is served by a wide range of businesses/employment						

Tpoic	Strongly agree	Agree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Suggestions or comments
The environment and green areas in and around the village must be protected						
The identity of Copthorne could be lost with any expansion of Gatwick Airport						
Utilities need urgent update prior to any development – sewage etc						
Copthorne is adequately served with shops and services						

About you and your family

- 1 I/we have lived in Copthorne for years. 2 There are persons in our household. 3 I/we live in a house/flat/rented accommodation/other.
- 4 Please indicate your age bracket. under 16 / 16-24 / 25-34 / 35-54 / 55-64 / 65-74 / over 75.
- 5 Are you. Retired / Employed part-time / Employed full-time / Self employed / Unemployed.
- 6 Is your employment in the locality. In and around Copthorne / Gatwick / Crawley / Other (please state)

Please return your response to:-

Thank you for helping us with this survey.

YOUR VILLAGE YOUR PLAN YOUR VOICE

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

APRIL 21st from 2p.m.-5p.m.

at the


DELMAR-MORGAN CENTRE

YOUR CHANCE

to see possible sites and tell us which
you prefer for new housing, employment
and facilities development over the next
20 years

To include in the Copthorne
Neighbourhood Plan

Published by the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group for Worth Parish Council 2013



**Proposed Sites in Worth Parish for Alternative Sites Comparison
June 2014**

Re No	Description
1	Crawley Down Garage, Snow Hill
2.	West of West Way, Copthorne
4.	Opposite old Post Office, Copthorne
7.	Burleigh Lane, Crawley Down
8.	Palmers Autos Site, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down
11.	South of Hazel Way, Crawley Down
15.	On Site of old Crawley Down Florists
16.	Old rail track next to Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down
17.	Next to Golf Course Copthorne
18.	Old Sewerage Works, Copthorne
22.	West of Erica Way, Copthorne
23,	Pasture Wood, Crawley Down
24.	Hophurst Lane, Crawley Down
25.	West of Turners Hill Road, opposite Hazelwood Close
26.	Courthouse Farm, Copthorne Common Road (120 dwellings, 60 affordable)
27.	Bramble Close, Copthorne (20 dwellings, all affordable)
28.	Firs Farm, Copthorne Common Road
29.	Barns Court, Turners Hill Road

30.	Friday Farm, Turners Hill Road
31.	Woodmans Farm, Copthorne Common Road (90 dwellings, 27 affordable)
32.	Glencree, Copthorne Bank, Copthorne
33.	Border Oak, Shipley Bridge Road, Copthorne
34.	West of Copthorne, (450 dwellings, 135 affordable)
35.	Hurst House & South Place, Copthorne Common Rd (60 dwellings, 18 affordable)
36.	Florans Farm, Hophurst Lane, Crawley Down
37.	Redcourt Barn, Cuttinglye Lane, Crawley Down
38.	Land North of Shepherds Farm, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down
39.	Winch Well, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down
40,	Wychwood, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down
41.	Land South East of Shepherds Farm, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down
42.	Southern Tree Surgeons/Shepherds Lea, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down
43.	Crawley Down Group, Woodpeckers, Snow Hill
44.	Crawley Down Garage, Snow Hill

Worth Parish Council – Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan
Public Consultation on possible development sites – April 21st 2013

Please complete after viewing the presentations, to give us your feedback. Thank you.

This information is optional Name:		This information is optional Address:
e-mail:		Post code:
Your choices will help to determine what is included in the Neighbourhood Plan. Without a Plan, our village will be open to uncontrolled development. With a Plan, which must include proposals for new housing, we can gain control and obtain significant infrastructure and financial benefits for the village.		
Please tick the relevant answer box. Site numbers do NOT indicate any preference	Very accept -able	Accept -able
No opinion	Unaccept -able	Very unaccept -able
If you find unacceptable, how many dwellings do you suggest for this site		
Site 1 – Courthouse Farm – could provide up to 200 dwellings, of which 60 would be affordable		
Site 2 – Bramble Close – could provide 20 maisonette type dwellings – all affordable		
Site 3 – Barns Court, Friday Farm and Firs Farm, Turners Hill Road – could provide up to 150 dwellings, of which 45 affordable, plus business units		
Site 4 – St John's Church Hall – could provide 1 - 3 dwellings		
Site 5 – West of Newtown – could provide up to 50 Housing Association dwellings		
Site 6 – East of Copthorne Hotel – could provide up to 90 dwellings, of which 27 would be affordable		
Site 7 – Land at end of Westway – could provide up to 10 dwellings		
Site 8 – "Glencree", Copthorne Bank – could provide up to 14 dwellings		
Site 9 – Shipley Bridge Lane – could provide up to 14 dwellings		
Site 10 – Shipley Bridge Lane – could provide 10-14 dwellings		
Site 11 – Oak Close – could provide 4 dwellings		
Site 12 – West of village – could provide up to 450 dwellings, of which 135 affordable, plus allotments, leisure space, new school site & business units		
Site 13 – Hurst House & South Place, Copthorne Common Road – could provide up to 60 dwellings, of which 18 would be affordable		

Please record any comments or observations you may have on the reverse of this feedback form

Copthorne Neighbourhood Planning Group Analysis of data from the Public Consultation 23rd November 2013

Introduction

Data about the respondents

66 responses were received. No data was recorded as to gender. 4 responses were submitted anonymously with no corroborative data to confirm their entitlement to contribute to the discussion. However these anonymous replies declared themselves to be residents of Copthorne, and the forms are included in the statistics below.

Occupation

Accountant	2%
Administrator	5%
Aviation Technician	2%
Business Consultant	2%
Carer	3%
Company Director	5%
Driver	2%
Educator	5%
Electrical Contractor	2%
Electrical Engineer	2%
G A Specialist, Tokyo Electron Europe Ltd	2%
Housewife	3%
Housing Manager	2%
Independent Distributer	2%
Marketing	2%
Office Manager	2%
Pharmacist	2%
Planning Consultant & Property Manager	2%
Podiatrist	2%
Project Manager	2%
Purchasing Manager	2%
Retail	7%
Retired	43%

Please note that all statistics have been rounded to the nearest 0.1%. All statistics that follow are rounded to the nearest 1%

Stakeholder Status

83

% of respondents are residents in the village of Copthorne, 16% have a business in Copthorne and 1% were developers.

Age Profile

All but 1 respondent submitted their age group.

18-24 1.47%

25-34 2.94%

35-54 22.06%

55-64 36.76%

65-74 26.47%

75-84 10.29% 82% of the respondents are late middle age or elderly, with only 6% below the age of 35.

[Text in square brackets has been inserted by the data collator. The intent is to aid clarity and not change the meaning of comments made by respondents]

Please note that all statistics are displayed rounded to the nearest whole decimal point, this can cause an apparent error when two such values are added, giving the impression that an extra 1% has been added

The Areas of Consultation were:



1.  **Social and Cultural**
2.  **Equity and Prosperity**
3.  **Economy**
4.  **Housing and the Built Environment**
5.  **Transport & Connectivity**
6.  **Services**
7.  **Environmental**
8.  **Governance**
9.  **Village Assets**



1.

Social and Cultural

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree Disagree	Decision
1. I feel that Copthorne has a strong sense of community and belonging.	63	26	6	6			89% agree
2. I feel that Copthorne has opportunities for cultural activities	24	52	24	0			76% agree
3. I feel that there are opportunities for community events in Copthorne	61	33	6	0			94% agree
4. I feel that there is a need for leisure and recreation facilities in Copthorne	41	41	18	0			82% agree
5. I feel that there are opportunities for sport in Copthorne	46	49	6	0			94% agree
6. I feel that there are opportunities for activities for youth and children in Copthorne	37	60	3	0			97% agree
7. I feel that there is effective policing in Copthorne	3	24	38	35			74% disagree
8. I feel that there are good life chances in Copthorne	36	42	21	0			79% agree
9. I feel safe in Copthorne and that that crime levels are low	31	51	17	0			83% agree

10. I feel that we are a safe community where crime is actively discouraged (Mid Sussex District Plan)	15	56	29	0			71% agree
Additional Points							

Social and Cultural (Section 1)

Comments and additional points

General Point

There has to be a balance between what Copthorne itself needs and what might encourage people from outside the village. For example tennis courts are not rare so might suit the village, whereas a swimming pool would bring people from a large radius.

We used to know our local police officer by sight and by name. I feel that this is now sadly not the case.

There are opportunities, but too often there is a lack of support in attending events or activities.

Policing is much improved over the last 2 years, but opportunist crime is just as prevalent.

The villagers could help themselves more. The more we do and participate, the more activities that will be available.

Opportunities are there but we actively need younger parents to continue to volunteer to continue the work older members of the village have done, our the community will decline.

Q1

mainly with the older members of the community

I feel that this is only with the older members of our community. There has been a distinct lack of attendance of the village's younger generation.

Q10

Lack of visible policing in the village.

I would strongly agree except that we hardly ever see a police officer on patrol.

I feel safe but I never see a PC or PCSO.

Q4

Unfortunately Copthorne lacks an identifiable centre.

We need to fully use the facilities we already have.

This should be run by parish and district council, not by volunteers.

Village playing field is rather small.

Leisure for 15-25 year olds needed.

Q5

No tennis facilities, no bowls facilities, limited badminton facilities.

- Q6
- 413 Should be developed by WPC and MSDC.
 - 414 Could be improved.
 - 165 Very strong Scout and Guide groups.
 - 288 Need a youth club.
 - 289 The village needs a youth club.
 - 291 More opportunities needed for adolescents.
 - 404 Opportunities for youth are lacking.
- Q7
- 165 Seldom see a uniformed police officer.
 - 288 Hardly ever see a policeman.
 - 289 Police never seem to be around.
 - 291 Policing is non-existent and ineffective in the village.
 - 314 We no longer see police patrolling the village.
 - 407 Hardly ever see a PC/PCSO patrolling the streets.
 - 409 Certainly see a patrol car in the Meadow.
 - 414 Never see any police or PCSO
 - 418 Road safety suffers due to ineffective policing
 - It would be nice to see a policeman or PCSO more often, walking around the village
 - 419 and talking to people.
 - 432 No obvious police presence.
 - 440 It was safer when we had a village policeman that everyone knew.
- Q9
- 322 We need more proper policing.
 - 428 Lots of break-ins, drug problems, plimsolls over telephone lines.



Equity and Prosperity (Section 2)

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree Disagree	Decision
1. I feel that the community in Copthorne recognises individuals' rights	13	72	13	3			85% agree
2. I feel that individuals in Copthorne recognise their responsibilities	7	73	17	3			80% agree
3. I feel that the community in Copthorne works to respect the rights of others	29	52	16	3			81% agree
4. I feel that Copthorne is committed to a sustainable future	31	44	22	3			75% agree
5. I feel that Copthorne strives to provide for the needs of future generations in the actions that we are taking now	48	30	21	0			78% agree
6. I feel that Copthorne provides opportunities for those on income levels which are below average	11	11	44	33			77% Disagree
7. I feel that Copthorne offers employment opportunities for people of all ages	16	29	26	29			55% Disagree
8. I feel that Copthorne is served by a wide range of businesses which can offer employment	16	22	31	31			62% Disagree
Additional Points							

Equity and Prosperity (Section 2)

Comments and additional points

General point

- 10 Copthorne is a village and should stay a village.
We are a village and not a town. There should be a limited number of jobs. We do
193 not want to attract too many jobs due to traffic.
288 I can't see the relevance of these questions really!
Other than shops, other businesses are not generally well known to most people.
321 There are many small businesses in small business parks.

Q1

- 407 We are subjected to speeding vehicles and inconsiderate parking, etc.

Q2

- 321 Some do, others don't care. Apathy!



















Q7

- 407 This is not to be expected in a village. In a town, yes.

Q8

- 165 Most local businesses are not large enough to provide a career structure.
288 We are a village not a town.

Economy (Section 3)

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree Disagree	Decision
1. I feel that there are a wide range of jobs and training opportunities which are accessible from Copthorne	51	29	15	5			80% agree
2. I feel that there is sufficient land available that is suitable for buildings and activities that support economic prosperity in Copthorne	16	34	36	14			50% agree Whilst there is no clear opinion, the median point is for agreement.
3. I feel that that Copthorne offers a dynamic business environment which promotes job and business creation	7	25	56	12			68% disagree
4. I feel that the business environment in Copthorne contributes to the well being of the village	20	54	14	12			75% agree
5. I feel that Copthorne has a strong business community with links to the wider community	21	38	31	10			59% agree
6. I feel that Copthorne is an economically viable community	25	52	18	5			77% agree
7. I feel that Copthorne has an attractive business and retail centre	11	14	46	29			75% disagree
8. I feel that Copthorne is served by a wide range of businesses and employment opportunities	19	25	36	20			56% disagree
9. We should encourage greater levels of tourism and increase the uptake of overnight stays in local accomodation	15	42	19	24			56% agree
10. My main job is (Please state)	Notes in Introduction						

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Decision
11. I am employed locally	Yes 15%% No 21% No: -Retired 65% <small>Note that 15% work locally and 86% are retired or work away. The figures are recorded from those who answered this question.</small>							
Additional Points								

Economy (Section 3)

Comments and additional points

General Point

165 Copthorne is a village, not a major business and employment hub.
 I don't feel that we need more business in the village. There is enough easily
 436 accessible.

Q2

288 This is a village not a town. We do not need industrial units etc.
 The land available is not necessarily in Sussex and therefore may not be available to be
 411 used.

Q4

32 We have sufficient commercial units.

Q7

165 It would be better with a centre. A good butcher would be nice.
 193 We don't want one!
 288 This is a village not a town. We do not need industrial units etc.
 321 No village retail centre. All scattered.
 388 We need a village centre.
 407 What we have is sufficient for our needs.
 428 A butcher would be good.
 432 No village centre.
 439 We could have so much more. A café would add some character.

Q8

There is a wide range of business offering employment and business opportunities in
 418 adjacent areas.

Q9

407 No, we are a village not a holiday resort.

Should not be a t public expense. Local business should be responsible for their own
414 advertising.
429 We already have two large hotels and a naturist colony.



Housing and the Built Environment (section 4)

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree Disagree	Decision
1. I feel that Copthorne is a place with a positive feeling for local people	63	34	3	0			97% agree
2. I feel that Copthorne is a distinctive place to live	67	30	3	0			97% agree
3. I feel that Copthorne is a user friendly village with spaces for public use	60	28	10	1			88% agree
4. I feel that Copthorne has good provision of green spaces for the use of children	46	33	18	3			79% agree
5. I feel that Copthorne has good provision of green spaces for the use of older children and adults	34	26	35	5			60% agree
6. I feel that there are sufficient family homes in Copthorne	59	34	2	5			94% agree
7. I feel that there are sufficient affordable homes in Copthorne (homes which are subsidised in purchase cost)	26	26	33	16			52% agree
8. I feel that there are sufficient homes in Copthorne which are accessible to the frail and physically impaired	24	40	22	15			64% agree
9. I feel that we have a well balanced housing stock in Copthorne	36	39	22	3			75% agree
10. I feel that housing developments in Copthorne are of an appropriate size and scale	32	44	19	5			76% agree
11. I feel that housing developments in Copthorne are of an appropriate density	24	49	22	5			73% agree
12. I feel that the layout of housing developments in Copthorne are of an appropriate layout	22	52	17	8			75% agree

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree Disagree	Decision
13. I feel that the Copthorne offers opportunities for high quality, mixed-use, durable, flexible and adaptable buildings, using materials which minimise negative environmental impacts;	13	41	28	18			54% agree
14. I feel that the Copthorne offers buildings and public spaces which promote health and are designed to reduce crime and make people feel safe;	20	50	23	6			70% agree
15. I feel that Copthorne offers accessibility of jobs, and key services by public transport	25	50	17	8			75% agree
16. I feel that Copthorne offers accessibility of jobs, and key services by walking	8	32	45	15			60% disagree
17. I feel that Copthorne offers accessibility of jobs, and key services by cycling.	11	34	35	20			55% disagree
18. I feel that there are sufficient homes available for rent in Copthorne	23	52	13	12			75% agree
19. I feel that there are sufficient homes available for purchase in Copthorne	48	43	8	2			90% agree
20. I agree with the statement from the Mid Sussex District Plan that everyone has the right to live in a decent, sustainably constructed and affordable home	53	32	12	3			85% agree
21. I feel that we will need this number of new homes in Copthorne over the next 20 years (please tick)	67% <input type="checkbox"/> 0-100 15% <input type="checkbox"/> 101-200 12% <input type="checkbox"/> 201-300 1.5% <input type="checkbox"/> 301-400 5% <input type="checkbox"/> 401-500 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 500+					More than 90% of respondents do not want to see a large expansion of the village with 68% wanting to limit expansion to 100 or less new homes. Several respondents felt that the village would not benefit from future building.	

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree Disagree	Decision
22. I feel that we need to confine new developments within the present village boundaries	76	10	10	5			86% agree
23. I feel that future developments need to be in accordance with the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms of ensuring that these are not constructed in areas where there is an identified flood risk	89	8	3	0			97% agree
24. I feel that future developments need to be in accordance with the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms of ensuring that these are not constructed in areas where there may be a detrimental impact to public well being, the economy and/or the environment from flood events	94	6	0	0			100% agree
25. I feel that future developments need to be in accordance to the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms improving the efficiency of land use by the re-use of previously developed land, including the re-use of materials	79	16	3	2			95% agree
26. I feel that, in accordance with Mid-Sussex District Plan, we should conserve and protect the District's biodiversity, by prohibiting construction of new domestic or commercial premises where there are ancient woodlands, areas of important wildlife and geological importance	92	2	3	3			94% agree
27. I Feel that, in line with the Mid Sussex District Plan, and the Worth Parish Sustainability Scoping Report, that the strategic gap between Copthorne and neighbouring conurbations be given high priority in any planning proposals for the future	91	3	0	6			94% agree

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Decision
28. I feel that we should protect our open spaces by restricting the number of dwellings within 300m of accessible green spaces, in accordance with the Mid Sussex District Plan	86	12	2	0				98% agree
29. Whilst there is uncertainty about future development at Gatwick Airport, all proposals for housing and commercial development should take into account the likely increase in sound and air pollution which may arise from future Gatwick Airport development	80	14	6	0				94% agree
Additional Points Whilst Copthorne may not be the prettiest village [but] that should not make us the dumping ground for the Government's (or MSDC) development plans.								

Housing and the Built Environment (section 4)

Comments and additional points

General point

- Nothing should be built until the Plan is agreed. Too many applications going in by
 288 local developers trying to capitalise on the situation.
 289 Too many planning applications made before the Plan has been agreed.
 MSDC must refuse infilling applications such as Cloverdene, Brookhill Road (Double
 291 garage replaced by 2 bed house). Totally inappropriate identity.
 386 Great fear of Gatwick Expansion and future of village status.
 We have lost naturism in Brighton, how many more to go? We have many visitors
 422 spending their Euros.
 We should set minimum standards and sizes for new buildings that are better than
 429 basic housing association standards.

Q10

- 165 Tend to be large houses in small plots.
 193 No more houses.
 234 I do not think that we have the capacity for any more homes.

- 404 Proposed estate to West of village is too large.
 407 Yes, at the moment. No if St Modwen development goes ahead.
 420 Existing housing estates are large enough for a small village.
- Q11
- 165 Tend to be large houses in small plots.
 234 I feel that many more houses would be in too many in terms of density.
 288 It is ok at the moment, but we are beginning to get too much infill building.
- Q12
- 193 No more housing needed.
 288 It is ok at the moment, but we are beginning to get too much infill building.
- Q14
- Disagree as, for example, the new pavilion at St George Field; nice facility, wrong
 407 place.
 432 Always young people hanging around people don't feel safe.
- Q15
- 234 Bus services are not good enough to rely on as sole means of transport.
- Q16
- 321 No continuous pavements in some roads, E.g. Borer's Arms Road.
 404 Walking is unsafe along Shipley Bridge Lane, Copthorne Road and Copthorne Bank.
 A footpath/cycleway connecting Copthorne to the Worth Way would be very
 407 beneficial.
 432 No footway to Crawley.
- Q17
- I have had to give up cycling in Copthorne as it far too dangerous - Speed of Traffic. I
 234 felt safer cycling in Brighton.
 291 Cycling is dangerous because of speeding traffic.
 A footpath/cycleway connecting Copthorne to the Worth Way would be very
 407 beneficial.
 432 Roads are too dangerous to cycle.
 436 Cycling is too dangerous.
- Q19
- 234 Two estate agents suggest that this must be the case.
- Q2
- 234 The more the village expands, the less distinctive it is as a place to live in.
- Q20
- 165 Great aspiration, but I am not sure that anyone has the right to anything.
 288 Immigrants should have to earn this right, i.e. Contribute before they get this right.
- Q21
- 165 I would prefer 0, but that is probably not an option.
 Since 1950, about 1700 new houses have been built in Copthorne. We are full up.
 291 No more houses!
- Q22
- 234 We must protect the precious areas of nature that surround the village.

St Modwen project must not go ahead. We must not become part of Crawley and
291 fight to keep our identity.

314 This essential to maintain the character of Copthorne.
Yes. Nothing to South of A264 and definitely no to the proposed St Modwen
407 Development.

424 The County Line between Sussex and Surrey is a problem.

438 Parking is getting worse.

Q24

Site 12 (Land to west of Copthorne) is a flood plain and should be rejected for that
10 reason.

438 There is pressure on existing schools in the village.

Q25

I feel that brownfield sites should always be redeveloped before greenfield sites, but
165 some brownfield sites are now grown over and so appear green.

Q26

Ancient woodland needs to be protected and woods preserved. There is hardly any
193 woods to enjoy located in the village.

Q27

288 This is very important if Copthorne is to retain its own identity.
404 We don't want to become part of Crawley.
Yes, instead of the St Modwen development, plant trees and create a recreational
407 area.

438 We must not merge with Crawley, or the community will be lost.

Q28

234 It should be more than 300m!

438 Loss of allotment space is a loss of a valuable amenity.

Q29

Some say that if a new runway restricts development, then build the runway. I'm not
165 interested in the lesser of two evils, just no evils!

We should take into account the threat this would pose to areas of biodiversity
234 around Copthorne, if airport expansion included building of new roads and housing.

432 I disagree, because I would object to the 2nd runway!

Q3

I am worried that St Modwen will get there way and harm the village and the sense
165 of open space within the village.

413 Very limited open space. Insufficient for village of this side.

Q5

291 Allotments controlled by Worth Parish Council are needed.

Q7

165 How many affordable homes are there in Chelsea!






Q9

404 Too few 2 bedroom houses.



Transport & Connectivity (Section 5)

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree Disagree	Decision
1. I feel that Copthorne has good public transport links	30	45	18	6			76% agree
2. I feel that Copthorne has a good infrastructure that allows travel, to work and social events, by car	55	30	9	6			85% agree
3. I feel that Copthorne has a good infrastructure that promotes cycling and reduces the dependance on cars	15	21	36	27			64% disagree
4. I feel that the infrastructure in and around Copthorne encourages walking	19	34	34	13			53% agree
5. I feel that Copthorne has a generally good provision for vehicle parking	3	16	35	45			81% disagree
6. I feel that parking issues, such as pavement parking and parking causing obstruction, are well managed	3	13	19	66			84% disagree
7. I feel that there is sufficient parking to promote business growth in Copthorne	7	14	38	41			79% disagree
8. I feel that we have effective telecommunications in Copthorne	38	41	22	0			78% agree
9. I feel that we have an effective and reliable access to the internet in Copthorne	32	48	19	0			81% agree
10. I feel that we have good access to national and International transport systems from within Copthorne	47	38	9	6			84% agree

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree-	Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Decision
<p>11. There are this number of cars in my household</p>  <p>6% <input type="checkbox"/> 0 cars 34% <input type="checkbox"/> 1 car 50% <input type="checkbox"/> 2 cars 3% <input type="checkbox"/> 3 cars 9% <input type="checkbox"/> 4 cars 3% <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more</p> <p>The average number of cars per respondent is 2, which is also the median for the sample. It should be noted that 50% of respondents had 2 cars and that 15% of the sample have 3 or more cars, and so it would appear reasonable to include planning for car parking at a rate in excess of two places per residence.</p>									
12. I feel that the current capacity of local roads is adequate	16	23	48	13					61% disagree
13. I feel that traffic on the main through routes is well managed	3	20	37	40					77% disagree
<p>Additional Points</p> <p>Improved parking needed for Humphries field. Stop general traffic cutting through village.</p> <p>Copthorne roads should discourage their use as "rat runs" and much greater efforts need to be made to calm speeding.</p> <p>Whilst I understand that pavement parking is not an offence, how about introducing a Bylaw prohibiting it. It is a real problem for pedestrians, particularly for mothers with prams</p> <p>New M23 link at J9 from East. (Gatwick Turn)</p>									

Transport & Connectivity (Section 5)

Comments and additional points

General Comment

As Copthorne has expanded, it has become normal for people to drive rather than walk. Constant traffic and speeding make crossing roads and walking on pavements feel dangerous. It is not unusual for cars to speed at 50mph+ alongside children using the p

General Point

291 Speeding
291 Congested roads
291 Too much heavy traffic in the village.
291 Village used as a rat run.
Copthorne roads should discourage "rat runs" and much greater efforts need to be
340 made to calm speeding.
403 Will 500 homes with cars help our traffic problems? No!
Heavy goods vehicles and cars moving at high speeds through our village. This
403 increases year by year.
I understand that pavement parking is not currently an offence. How about
introducing a bye law prohibiting it. It is a real problem for the elderly and mothers
407 with prams.
411 Car parking is needed on Copthorne Bank and Humphries field.
411 Traffic management is needed at the Copthorne Way/Brookhill Road roundabout.
411 Stop the general rat run traffic.
438 Too many large HGV's coming through the village.
Very pleased that Southdown Coaches are maintaining the 424 Service, despite low
441 passenger numbers. Lower fares might help.

Q1

404 Transport links to Gatwick are poor.
428 Bus service is limited.
431 No direct bus to Gatwick.
432 Buses are limited.
438 Too much through traffic.
441 I would like to be able to go to Horley on a Sunday.

Q12

165 Roads are adequate for residents, but not for the current rat runs.
321 Many roads are too narrow for driving and parking
407 Roads within the village are adequate.
440 Have you seen the village roads at 8am?

Q13

165 Copthorne should not be a through route, especially for HGV's
Copthorne Bank and Brookhill Road should not be through routes, especially for
165 HGV's.
234 We need pedestrian crossings and speed cameras.
314 There are too many large vehicles using the village roads.

- Q2
- 321 Many vehicles drive through the village rather than the main roads around it.
 420 Village is very busy throughout the day.
- 165 Parking can be a problem.
 386 Over congested roads.
 409 It's alright unless there is an incident on the M23: causes total gridlock.
 420 Gridlocked throughout the morning and evening.
 420 Village is used as a cut through.
- Q3
- The culture of car dependency in Copthorne makes cycling dangerous. This is worsened by the number of cars, and speeding through the village. Speed cameras on Brookhill Road and Copthorne Bank are surely necessary as only a minority seem to respect
- 234 to respect
 234 Pavements are often unusable because they have vehicles parked on them.
 291 Cycling is too dangerous.
 319 No street lights or road markings on some local roads.
 321 Roads are fairly narrow for cars and cycles.
 414 Need cycle lanes.
 420 Need to improve public transport frequency and timing.
 427 Cycling is too dangerous.
 429 Very crowded roads. We need footpaths and cycle ways.
 432 Too dangerous to cycle now.
 436 There are no cycle ways. Painting a line at the side of the road is not a cycleway.
 438 Roads are not suitable for cycling. Too many parked cars.
 440 It is too dangerous to cycle around Copthorne.
 441 Local roads are not safe for cycling.
- Q4
- 165 Walking is encouraged because we have open spaces.
 291 Speed limits are ignored.
 291 Poor or absent footways on several local roads.
 319 No pavements in roads out of village.
 321 Lack of pavements and lighting.
 324 No footway to Three Bridges.
 Walking is poor along Shipley Bridge Lane, Copthorne Road (to West) and Copthorne Bank (to North)
 404
 414 Footpaths are narrow in places.
 418 Shipley Bridge is not walking friendly.
 427 Limited by lack of footways.
 429 No footpath to Crawley.
 436 We lack good quality footpaths.
 440 We have lots of lovely woods to walk in.
 441 Lack of footways makes walking unsafe.
- Q5

10 New properties, recently built, have not included adequate parking.
 32 More parking needed near to shops.
 165 Parking is very poor.
 165 Parking is very poor in places.
 319 Yellow lines are in the wrong places, and they are not enforced.
 321 No Car parks other than for pubs and halls.
 Insufficient parking near to schools, shops and social centres, encouraging
 355 inconsiderate and often illegal parking.
 407 Parking is adequate, but only because the Prince Albert kindly allows it.
 420 Most roads are full of parked cars and airport parking.
 427 Not enough parking around shops.
 440 Need more parking spaces around shops.

Q6

165 There is nobody to enforce parking.
 165 parking is poor because there is no enforcement
 Increasingly pavements are being used as parking spaces. There is a bad attitude to
 234 people using pavements.
 There are some appalling examples of parking on pavements, causing serious danger
 291 to pedestrians.
 Cars are parked on pavements causing prams, wheelchairs and blind people to walk
 314 in the road.
 Parking is not managed at all. An example being the entrance to Calluna Drive. It is
 319 just an accident waiting to happen.
 321 Obstruction of pavements and pavement parking is really bad.

Every day pavements are illegally parked on pavements. This is both inconsiderate
 and potentially dangerous, especially for the elderly, those with push chairs and
 prams, those in wheelchairs, and those with site impairment. In addition our grass
 355 verges
 407 The newly installed yellow lines are ignored. We never see a MSDC traffic warden.
 423 Double yellow lines not enforced. What is the point of the expenditure?
 440 Need to ban cars from near the schools to keep children safer.



Q7

407 Why do we need business growth?
 440 The yellow lines are not enforced.



Services (Section 6)

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree-	Agree	Decision
1. I feel that Copthorne has sufficient primary school places for the needs of the village at present	33	42	21	4			75% agree
2. I feel that Copthorne has sufficient primary school places for the needs of the village for the future	17	43	35	4			61% agree
3. I feel that Copthorne has a need for a secondary school	10	13	32	45			77% disagree
4. I feel that the schools in Copthorne perform at a high standard and offer sound education opportunities	68	32	0	0			100% agree
5. I feel that Copthorne has high quality health care services	17	37	30	17			53% agree
6. I feel that the health services in Copthorne are easily accessible	23	34	29	14			57% agree
7. I feel that the health services in Copthorne offer appointment times which are suitable and available	13	19	19	48			68% disagree
8. I feel that we have good access to, and availability from, hospital and specialist health care professionals	20	37	30	13			57% agree
9. I feel that there is a good integration of health care with other services, such as social services, in Copthorne	13	57	17	13			70% agree
10. I feel that we have high quality services for families and children, including early years provision	38	45	14	3			83% agree
11. I feel that there is a good range of affordable public, community, voluntary and private services, including retail and commercial services, which are accessible to the whole community	21	43	32	4			64% agree

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree-	Agree	Decision
12. I feel that there is sufficient consultation with the local community in preparing and planning for the future provision of service providers.	15	42	30	12			58% agree
Additional Points Local shopping and restaurant facilities are shocking compared to other similar local villages.							

Services (Section 6)

Comments and additional points

General point

- 409 East Grinstead is our main problem. Any incident on motorways leads to gridlock.
Vision is impaired by larger vehicles both for bus stops, and pulling out from
409 Meadow Approach on to Copthorne Bank.

Q1

- There are sufficient places in the local schools if places are confined to only children
165 from the village.

Q10

- 234 Two very good playgroups, Sunshine and Jack & Jill.
321 There are many good facilities for children, but not for the whole family.

Q11

- Two estate agents are too many! Would be better if these shops were used for
234 something more useful for the people who live here.
321 There is a very limited range of services and shops.
409 The shops are a bit scattered and a butchers would be nice.
441 A Day Centre for the elderly would be useful.

Q12

- 165 Consultation yes, but how much notice is taken by the powers that be.
Consultation may be adequate, but does not mean views will be taken into
314 account.
381 All seems very cloak and dagger!
422 There is no consultation with the naturists in Copthorne.
438 CVA does an excellent Job.





Q5

- 165 High quality, but poor efficiency.
 234 Bad service at the Copthorne surgery is the norm.
 322 Too few appointment slots available.
 407 A pity that GP's are now 9-5. Labour's fault!
- Q6
- Parking restrictions need to be enforced; otherwise money spent on them is
 407 wasted.
 409 The laybys by shops need to be deeper.
- Q7
- 165 Difficult to get an appointment at short notice.
 234 The surgery seems unable to meet demand.
 288 Do we want more businesses? We are a village!
 319 Very difficult to get an appointment.
 High telephone charges when you 'phone the surgery and you have to sit and wait
 319 for an answer.
 322 We need more GP hours.
- Q9
- If there is no [contrary] evidence, we should take full advantage of this free source
 407 of energy (contrary inserted to match opinion of agreement).
- When dealing with Social Services for an elderly relative it was very difficult as
 services are in Crawley or East Grinstead. Some services from one some from
 420 another. We should have social services from one location.



Environmental (Section 7)

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree Disagree	Decision
1. I feel that any future planning should actively seek to minimise climate change, through energy efficiency and the use of renewables	64	24	9	3			88% agree
2. I feel that any future planning should actively seek to protect the environment by minimising pollution on land, in water or in the air	79	21	0	0			100% agree
3. I feel that we should seek to actively promote the minimisation of waste by efficient recycling and waste management	82	18	0	0			100% agree
4. I feel that we should protect and improve bio-diversity by protecting and managing wild life habitats, including the wildlife areas that surround the village of Copthorne	88	12	0	0			100% agree
5. I feel that we should work to enable a lifestyle that minimises negative environmental impact and enhances positive impacts. (e.g. by creating opportunities for walking and cycling, and reducing noise pollution and dependence on cars)	79	18	3	0			97% agree
6. I feel that we should work to create a cleaner, safer and greener environment within Copthorne, including the management of street grass verges and the management of parking	78	22	0	0			100% agree
7. I feel that we should work to improve the safer, cleaner, and greener environment by improved reduction in litter and graffiti, and maintaining public open spaces	79	21	0	0			100% agree

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree Disagree	Decision
8. The protection of our water aquifers is of great importance, in accordance with the Mid Sussex District Plan	82	18	0	0			100% agree
9. The extraction of gas by "fracking" should be discouraged, unless there is clear evidence that our aquifers will not be damaged	50	25	19	6			75% agree
Additional Points							

Environmental (Section 7)

Comments and additional points

General point

- It is a pity that only fracking is mentioned, but not oil or gas exploration in general. Western Europe's largest oilfield is in the UK. In an area including AONB's and SSSI's. We should not be afraid of it but look to encourage it.
- 165
- 436 Reduce the number of HGV's coming through the village.

Q1

- We should minimise pollution and be as efficient as reasonably possible, but for the UK to defeat climate change is daft (This respondent strongly disagreed with the question).
- 165
- 407 No wind farms please.

Q3

- Needs to fit in with the village, and not like the waste site opposite the Cherry Tree PH.
- 413

Q4

- We should not over manage biodiversity.
- 165
- 340 Stop chopping down strong trees on the golf course.

Q5

- If you build houses too far away from the infants and junior schools, then the parents will drive.
- 10
- 407 We need a footpath and a cycle way linking Copthorne to Worth Way.

Q6

- 314 We need adequate parking without loss of green areas.
- 436 Green verges are a waste of time. Use them to improve parking.
- 438 We should create one way systems around our schools.

Q9

- There is a lot of nonsense spoken about fracking, oil and gas exploration in general.
- 165 I would prefer to see quadrilla rather than St Modwen.
- There are many arguments against fracking, including the amount of water needed
- 429 to push down. We are already short of water.



Governance (Section 8)

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Strongly Disagree	Strong Agree- Agree- Disagree- Strong Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Decision
1. I feel that those who manage the village of Copthorne are representative of the views of the community	28	34	19	19				63% agree
2. I feel that we have sufficient accountability for those who represent and govern the community and domain of Copthorne	17	28	28	28				55% disagree
3. I feel that we have a visionary leadership in those who represent Copthorne	27	23	10	40				50% disagree
4. I feel that I have a "voice" through those who represent us and by those who represent us	29	29	29	13				58% agree
5. I feel that those who represent us should engage with the community at neighbourhood level to build the community's skills, knowledge and confidence	75	22	3	0				97% agree
6. I feel that those who represent us engage with the community to build community skills, knowledge and confidence	47	33	13	7				80% agree
7. I feel that we have a strong informed leadership that lead by example in business, governance and community matters	23	29	26	23				52% agree
8. I feel that we have a strong and inclusive voluntary and community sector	48	45	7	0				93% agree
9. I feel that those who live and work in Copthorne have a strong sense of civic values, responsibility and pride	38	50	13	0				88% agree
10. There are many charity organisations who contribute to life in Copthorne	46	29	21	4				75% agree
Additional Points Copthorne should have its own Parish Council								

Governance (Section 8)

Comments and additional points

General point

- 234 The community groups run by the villagers, e.g. CVA does an amazing job in representing the people of the village, which the local councils do not do so well.
- 291 We have lost too much farm land over the last 50 years, and now our last remaining green "lung" between Copthorne and Crawley is under threat.
- 411 Copthorne should have its own parish council.
- 441 CVA and Parish Council do a good job generally.
- 441 We should have had more publicity for this consultation.

Q1

- 10 No young people involved. Chris Larkin is biased due to his family who will benefit financially.
- 32 Local council jump to the will of Whitehall.
- 165 There may be a conflict between WPC and MSDC.
- 291 Councillor Walker appears keen on the CIL and St Modwen Development would bring.
- 381 Who are they and what are their views?
- 404 Except for Philip Coote who has proved where his allegiance lies.

Q10

- 404 Except for parents who park on yellow lines outside schools, and speeding drivers.

Q2

- 291 Councillor Coote has proved himself to be no friend of WPC or Copthorne.
- 317 District planning decisions are too remote
- 404 Chris Larkin has a very poor reputation in this village and should not be on the planning committee.
- 407 How can we remove councillors who do not appear to represent the views of the residents? In my many communications with Worth Parish Council over the last 30 years or so, I have often found the Parish Clerk to be unhelpful and hard to communicate with.

Q3

- 32 Residents committee is fine. Parish Council not so!

Q4

- 165 Letters are not always answered, but the councillors try to be as helpful as possible.
- 234 We don't have a "voice" in terms of the parish council, but the CVA gives us a voice.

Q5

- 165 True, but sometimes they can seem remote.

Q6

- 165 Limited by policies of WPC and MSDC.
- 234 Only through the CVA.

Q7

- 165 I think our village needs support rather than leadership.

- Q8
- 234 There are many volunteers who do an enormous amount for the village, not so
much from local government.
- Q9
- 234 Really good Guides, Scouts NTC, etc.
- 234 Many people do.
- 291 Parents who park on double yellow lines and across residents driveways lack civic
responsibility.



Village Assets (Section 9)

Protection for Sites, Buildings and Open Spaces

The	Asset	
Neighbourhood	"Sheltered" Housing	1
Plan can	Cherry Tree PH	9
propose	Church Hall	4
buildings or	Corner Shop	3
sites of	Delmar Morgan Hall	7
significant	Golf Club House	6
Importance,	Junior School	1
which	King George's Pavilion	4
enhance the	Kwick Mart	3
cultural and	Londis	3
social well-	Post Office	3
being of	Prince Albert PH	11
residents ,to	Scout-Guide Hut	6
the	Shops at Harbour's	
local authority	Yard	5
to be	Social Club	5
designated as	St John's Church	2
"Assets of	Village Hall	9
Community	Village Shops	1
Value".		
These can be		
pubs, village		
halls, church		
halls, shops,		
etc. If any of		
these becomes		
vulnerable and		
is put up for		
sale, the		
community can		
require a 6		
month delay in		
the sale so that		
the community		
has the		
opportunity to		
come together		
to bid for the		
asset.		
Please let us		
know which		
buildings or		
sites in the		
community		
should be		
considered for		
such purpose.		

The neighbourhood plan can be used to protect the existing local green and open spaces, identify new ones to be designated , and to create more areas for family and leisure activities. Where in Copthorne, could the neighbourhood plan consider inclusion of the open space, to serve this purpose? Please let us know where the open spaces are that should be considered .		No. Times Suggested
	Open Space Asset	
	Common north of A264 (Holes 1 & 18 Copthorne Golf)	3
		2
	Common South of A264	5
	Copthorne Common	1
	Courthouse Farm	1
	Fields adjacent to Recreation Ground	2
	Fields either side of A264 from M23 to Copthorne Roundabout	3
	Golf Course	2
	Heathy Ground	3
	Humphrey's Field	6
	Hunter's Moon Allotments	7
	King George's Sports Field	3
	Land and Common East of Copthorne Hotel on South of A247	7
	Land to West of Copthorne	1
	Old Hollow Woodlands	6
	Recreation Ground	2
	School Playing Fields	6
	Top Common (Copthorne Upper Common)	6
	Village Green	1
	Westway Ancient Woodland	1
	Woods around Copthorne	

General Point

438 We should buy the allotment land from Burstow PC.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

Those in bold type are in addition to those identified in the Worth Parish Council Scoping Report for Sustainability

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe community environment • Quality schools • Outstanding landscape setting, designated land e.g. AONB • Strong opportunities • New pavilion • Village identity • Good range of leisure facilities • Post Office • Local shops • Church • Friendly doctors' surgery. <p>Dance facilities</p> <p>Good Community Spirit</p> <p>Good links to London and Coast</p> <p>Pride in community</p> <p>Scouts and Guides</p> <p>Sense of Community, e.g. Neighbourhood Plan and village fete bring people together</p> <p>Sense of Community, delivering carnival and jubilee events</p> <p>Village still has a village feel, which needs to be protected</p> <p>Women's Institute</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic speed • Visual clutter • Pedestrian vulnerability • Infrequent public transport • High house prices • High rental prices • Lack of affordable housing • No allotments. • Parking issues (lack of, and inappropriate parking) <p>Aircraft Noise</p> <p>Doctor surgery too small for needs of village</p> <p>Housing density increasing</p> <p>Inappropriate use of local roads by HGV's</p> <p>Inconsistent Boundaries</p> <p>Lack of parking around shops</p> <p>Lack of Speed Cameras</p> <p>Lack of village centre</p> <p>Lack of visible policing</p> <p>Loss of aesthetics due to inappropriate parking on verges</p> <p>Loss of appreciation of "Village Ethos" by new residents</p> <p>No bank or free ATM</p> <p>parking around shops and social centres</p> <p>Planning procedures - insufficient attention to parking issues on new builds and alterations to existing properties</p> <p>Poor communication by Councils</p> <p>Poor road layout contributes to congestion</p> <p>Poor shopping as shops are scattered around village</p> <p>Ridiculous boundaries around village</p> <p>Too many HGV's</p> <p>Traffic Congestion</p> <p>Traffic Volume</p> <p>very poor parkin facilities near shops and businesses</p>

Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve pedestrian safety • Implement traffic management • Improve contact and service to elderly • Strengthen village identity • Provide allotments • Organise events to encourage inclusion, improve links between local businesses <p>Opportunity</p> <p>Expansion of sporting facilities at King George Field</p> <p>Improve access to Horley and Three Bridges (construction of proper footpaths.</p> <p>Improve local knowledge about local businesses</p> <p>Improve Policing</p> <p>provide increased takeaway food businesses</p> <p>Provision for Restaurant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of biodiversity • Drought • Danger from hgv's and fast traffic • Over development leading to loss of rural character • Loss of pride in community • Reduce street clutter • Loss of services such as buses, shops, mobile library • Loss of agricultural land and local food self sufficiency • Loss of local distinctiveness through cumulative loss of local vernacular such as local building materials <p>"Rat run" traffic through village</p> <p>Adjoining planning authorities imposing unwelcome developments within the village.</p> <p>Air and noise pollution, particular threats from M23 and the proposed expansion at Gatwick.</p> <p>Coalescence with Crawley</p> <p>Coalescence with Crawley</p> <p>Crawley Expansion</p> <p>Elderly driven out of village when they want to downsize.</p> <p>Expansion of Gatwick Airport</p> <p>Gatwick expansion (New Runway)</p> <p>Infill development</p> <p>Lack of care of village by residents</p> <p>Large housing development to West of village</p> <p>Large scale development to West of Village, damaging village identity</p> <p>Local vernacular can still be maintained by use of FLB or West Hoathly bricks</p> <p>Loss of Allotments in village</p> <p>Loss of green areas</p> <p>Loss of local biodiversity as open land is built upon</p> <p>Loss of Public House</p> <p>Loss of Top Common</p> <p>loss of village identity an coalescence with neighbouring conurbations</p>

Copthorne Plan Housing Needs Survey Analysis

Introduction

During February 2014 all residents within the built boundary of Copthorne received a questionnaire to be completed and returned on an anonymous basis. The completed forms could be returned to one of several collection points, or posted directly to Worth Parish Council. Approximately 580 forms were received. Of these 562 contained valid data suitable for data entry. This represents approximately 34% of the households within Copthorne. 8 further envelopes were received on 24th March which are not included in this report.

The questionnaire asked 12 discreet questions, with a further question allowing free text to be entered so that the data subject could offer an independent comment which the respondent wished to make.

Not all respondents answered every question, and this is reflected in the analysis below. Similarly some questions allowed for multiple responses, and so there are some questions that will appear to have many more responses than the number of forms received.

The Questions and Methodology of Analysis

- Q1 asked about owning or renting the home. A single response being allowed
- Q2 asked about the number of bedrooms in the current home. A single choice being allowed from four choices indicating 1, 2, 3 or 4 or more bedrooms.
- Q3 asked about the ages of those residing within the home. The choices offered were under 16, 16-24, 25-34, 35-54, 55-64, 65-74 and 75 and above. To be consistent in the data analysis the youngest age group has been entered to reflect a 0-15 age range with the next option being 16-24. It is recognised that the overlapped age ranges of the questionnaire may lead to a small error in the analysis as a 16 year aged respondent could have been entered into either answer box. This question allowed for multiple responses with each age group offering the opportunity to give the number of residents in each age group.
- Q4 and Q5 asked about the duration of residence in the current home and within Copthorne. A single response was allowed for each of Q4 and Q5
- Q6 asked about the main reason for living in Copthorne. The intention of the questionnaire was for a single answer, however many respondents treated this question as a multiple response question, including a free text option. The free text responses have been simplified into one of the following :

12. Reason for living in Copthorne	
1	Born here
2	Work in the village or nearby
3	Relatives nearby
4	Village life attractive
5	Attractive property
6	Proving Cost
7	Unafforded
8	Accessibility (Health)
9	Scenic / rural nature
10	Transport Links
11	Community
12	Something else (if the respondent has a box for free text)


To: Q8 Reason: Why Copthorne?	
Reason: Q9	Response
13	Better House we could find.
14	New Build home
15	Getwick /Gfront Nearby
16	Home nearby
17	Quality of estate
18	Downsized to a smaller home.
19	Warmer already lived here.
20	Go to house nearby.

These options covering all responses and enabling statistical analysis.

- Q7 asked if the respondent expected to move out within the next 5, 10 or 20 years. A single response being allowed.
- Q8 asked if you were to move out would you consider other properties in Copthorne. A single choice was allowed. The intent of the question was as a subsidiary of Q7, but many answered this question regardless of any intention to move within the next 20 years (the life of this Neighbourhood Plan). The analysis of this question will address those who intend to move within the next 20 years as a **priority**, as this is the number relevant to this plan. As a matter of interest the results for those who do not intend to move within the 20 year period and a composite of all responses is included. Please note that these last two sets of figures are outside the scope for planning concerns in this document, but may be of use for longer term consideration.
- Q9 asked about reasons to move. The question clearly asked for a single response, however many respondents treated this as a multi choice option. The data for all responses has been allowed and more than one reason attributed for wanting to move for a single respondent.
- Q10 asked about any member of the household who may wish to leave the respondents home. This was a multi response question. For each of the time periods of 5, 10 or 20 years a yes/no choice was allowed. There was a further opportunity to allocate a number of people who may wish to move for each of the time periods, but this was not mandatory. The analysis has allowed the multi response options and the number moving for each time period including a null response for the number. The second part of this question was attempting to discover the type of ownership required. There is no link between the numbers or time periods and the time periods asked in the first part of the question and this part of the question and so multiple responses have been allowed, but cannot be related satisfactorily to the responses in the first part of the question. Similarly the responses about the size of home(s) required allow for a multi response which cannot be linked back to the type of ownership or the numbers or time periods sought in the first part of the question.
- Q11 asked about members in the immediate family who may wish to move to Copthorne. The responses indicated the 5, 10, 20 year time periods and the numbers for each period. The second part asked about the type of ownership and the house size to be sought. The comments about Q10 apply to this question also, so that there is no direct relationship between the responses to the first part of the question and the latter two sections.
- Q12 asked about income levels. Choices offered being annual income in £'s grouped as 0-30, 30-40, 40-50, 50-60 and 60+. There is an overlap for each of these options,

- Finally the option to make further comment. The data has been entered verbatim and some overview conclusions will be attempted. All comments are included as part of this analysis.


The relationships between the various questions are complex and do not lend itself to flat file processing. The data has therefore been processed using a relational database which allows for data consistency, avoids data duplication and allows the data to be analysed using various relationships. It may be that further relationship totals and data may be required in addition to this initial report. I hope to meet with interested members over the immediate future who may wish for additional figures to be extracted.



Data Received

Q1 Do you own or rent your home?


There were 561 responses of these 555 reported as being home owners, with just 6 respondents renting their home. This translates into a 98.93% home ownership.



Q2 How many bedrooms does your home have?

There were 562 responses.

Qty Number Beds		
Q2 Bedrooms in Current Home	CountOfQ2 Bedrooms in Current Home	Percentage to nearest 0.001%
1 Bed	3	0.53%
2 Beds	53	9.43%
3 Beds	272	48.39%
4+ Beds	234	41.63%




As can be seen there is a significant number of 3 bedroom homes and those with 4 or more bedrooms. There is a relatively small number of 1 and two bedroom homes. This shortage may well impact on the desire of some residents who may wish to downsize as their family moves away. This will be discussed further in the responses to questions 9, 10 and 11.


Q3 Please indicate the numbers that live in your home.

There 2467 residents identified in this response. The proportional distribution is

Q3 Age Range	Sum Of Q3 Number at this age	Percentage at this age
0-15	449	18.20%
16-24	301	12.20%
25-34	152	6.16%
35-54	725	29.39%
55-64	362	14.67%
65-74	337	13.66%
75+	141	5.72%




A conclusion that could be drawn from this survey is that the relatively low number of 25 – 34 year old respondents may indicate that there are insufficient smaller homes available as starter homes within Copthorne forcing young families to move away, and that the housing cost only becomes affordable to those with established careers and salaries, and are looking for a larger family home to accommodate the growing family. Copthorne having a relatively high proportion of three, and especially four or more bedroomed homes makes the housing market within the village a desirable prospect. Especially so as commuting is relatively good (as indicated in responses in Q9). It is to be noted that the village remains an attractive place for long term residence. The following chart shows the number of each age group by house size.



It would seem reasonable to interpret the data as showing small numbers residing in the one bedroom homes and a normal distribution in the two bedroom homes. The smaller numbers is as a result of the smaller number of 1 and 2 bedroom homes in the survey. Within the 3 and 4+ bedroom homes, the chart shows the occupation of children and young adults who are likely to be in education, or below the age of education. In the 3 and 4+ bedroom homes a sharp depression is seen at the age group 25-34. This may be an indication that there are insufficient smaller homes to retain this age group within the village.


Q4 How long have you lived in the village.

There were 558 valid responses to this question



Q5 How long have you lived in Cophthorne

There were 558 responses




As can be seen from the charts above the peaks are at 11-15 years in the current home. This strongly correlates to the duration of residence in the village. Residence in the village peaks at 26-30 years, with 20 responses (representing 3.6% of the responses received) who have resided in Cophthorne for more than 60 years. One resident declaring residence of 38 years in the current home and a lifetime of 93 years in Cophthorne.

Q7 Do you currently expect to move within the next 5, 10 or 20 years?

This question was not answered by all respondents. There were 287 responses representing 51.1% of all forms processed.

Q7 When Intend Move	CountOfQ7 When Intend Move	% of Q7
5 Yrs	136	47.39%
10 Yrs	89	31.01%
20 Yrs	62	21.60%

Extrapolating from these figures would imply that approximately half of the homes in Copthorne will remain occupied by the present resident for the life time of this Neighbourhood Plan, and that approximately half of all homes will become available for resale or re-rent. 78% of the homes being sold will change hands within 10 years and 47% within 5 years.




Q8 If you were to move would you consider another property in Copthorne?

This question did not indicate whether the request was for an indication of timescale. Many respondents answered this, even if they had no current intention to move within the next 20 years. Similarly the respondents answered Q9 whether or not there was an intention to move within 20 years. As this Neighbour Plan Survey only relates to the next 20 years I report on those who responded that they had intent to move within the next 20 years first.

There were 287 responses.

Q7 When Intend Move	Would Consider	Would not Consider	% Yes	%No
10 Yrs	56	33	19.51%	11.50%
20 Yrs	55	7	19.16%	2.44%
5 Yrs	84	52	29.27%	18.12%
Total	195	92	67.94%	32.06%


percentages are of all respondents



As can be seen there are a significant majority of respondents who appear to value life within the village and would consider a further property. Perhaps of concern is that this appears to decline for those respondents who have lived here the shortest.

For all respondents the results are as follows

Chart to show All responses - Would Consider Copthorne as a future move!



Again there is a growing affinity to living in Copthorne as length of residency grows. This is probably to be expected as by nature most will prefer to stay with the familiar, especially so as we age.


Q9 What would be a reason for wanting to move?


This question was intended to have a single response. However many forms included multiple responses. For completeness all responses have been collated. Where free text has been exercised, these have been summarised so as to allow simpler processing and data analysis.

For those responses where respondents indicated a move within 20 years

Tbl Q9 SurveyMoveOutReason Query1 Query	
Move Reason	SumOfCountOfSurvey_ID
Bigger property	45
Smaller property	158
Own not Rent	6
Work opportunity	5
Attracted by non-village Life	6
Family Death or Infirmary	3
Traffic Issues	1
Village grows too large	1
Live away from locality	2
Gatwick Airport Expansion	3
More rural location	2
Larger garden	1
Hard to manage garden	1
Village becomes too urban	13
Care Home/Nursing Home	1
Closer to shops and supermarkets	1
Sheltered accommodation	1
Use present home as a rental investment	3
Bungalow	3
Nearer to relatives	1
Reason unclear	1
Tenancy agreement expires	1
Access to better schools	1

Chart to show Principal reason for moving for those moving within 20 Years





There were 475 responses from all respondents. In both the responses from those moving in the next 20 years and all respondents there is a strong correlation. Responses indicate that there is likely to be a demand for more, smaller, homes in new developments for residents currently within the village. With 158 such smaller homes as a potential within 20 years and with 121 likely within 10 years.

Q10 Is anyone in your household likely to want to move within the next 5, 10, or 20 years. This question did not clearly specify whether those included in the question included those who were targeted in Q7. It is therefore likely that there is some duplication in the results processed, as the responder may interpret the question in more than one way. The further part of the question regarding ownership and size of home was not related to the answers in the first part of the question and multiple answers are given. There are therefore significant limitations as to the outputs from the analysis of this question.

Sum of Number Moving	Column Labels						Grand
Row Labels	No Response	Not Known	Owned	Rented	Shared Ownership	(blank)	Total
05 Yrs	3	3	6	4		6	22
10 Yrs		10	10	2		4	26
20 Yrs		10	3	3		3	19
(blank)							
Grand Total	3	23	19	9		13	67

Row Labels	1 Bed	2 Beds	3 Beds	4+ Beds	Grand Total
05 Yrs	26	52	25	5	108
No Response	1			2	3
Not Known	5	8	2		15
Owned	9	30	23	3	65
Rented	3	5			8
Shared Ownership	8	9			17
10 Yrs	6	42	17		65
Not Known	4	11	6		21
Owned	1	24	11		36
Rented		2			2
Shared Ownership	1	5			6
20 Yrs	13	35	19	2	69
Not Known	6	6	3		15
Owned	2	18	12	2	34
Rented	3	4	2		9
Shared Ownership	2	7	2		11
Grand Total	45	129	61	7	242

The table above shows the anticipated movement of residents from their current place of residence to a new home. 242 people indicated intent to move within the next 20 years.

Q11. Are any members of your immediate family likely to want to move into Copthorne?


67 sets of data were processed. The qualifications of the data are as for Q10, in so far as relationships are not possible and multi choices could be made.

Row Labels	1 Bed	2 Beds	3 Beds	4+ Beds	Grand Total
05 Yrs	14	45	56	23	138
No Response		6	7	6	19
Not Known	1	4			5
Owned	7	29	38	17	91
Rented		1	7		8
Shared Ownership	6	5	4		15
10 Yrs			4	5	9
Owned			4	5	9
20 Yrs	6	6	10		22
No Response			1		1
Owned	2	2	5		9
Rented	2	2	2		6
Shared Ownership	2	2	2		6
Grand Total	20	51	70	28	169

Q12 Earners in the household

The data processed in this question is in my view unreliable to a degree, as some respondents may have indicated an age of the earner rather than the value of income! In addition there is an overlap between each salary level. Please see the introductory notes as to the variation made at the analysis level. Data has been regarded as £0-£30000, £30001-£40000, £40001-£50000, £50001-£60000 and £60001 or more.

Chart to show income distribution in the household by individual



It may be of use to see the incomes coming into the home grouped by residence.

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
1	2	0 - 30,000
2	1	30,001 - 40,000
3	1	0 - 30,000
4	1	0 - 30,000
5	1	0 - 30,000
6	1	0 - 30,000
6	1	50,001 - 60,000
7	1	30,001 - 40,000
7	1	40,001 - 50,000
8	2	50,001 - 60,000
9	1	0 - 30,000
9	1	50,001 - 60,000
10	1	0 - 30,000
10	1	60,001+
11	1	0 - 30,000
11	1	30,001 - 40,000
13	2	60,001+
14	1	0 - 30,000
15	1	0 - 30,000
15	1	60,001+
16	2	0 - 30,000
17	1	0 - 30,000
17	1	30,001 - 40,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this Income	Income_ID
18	1	40,001 - 50,000
18	2	0 - 30,000
19	1	0 - 30,000
19	1	30,001 - 40,000
20	1	30,001 - 40,000
20	1	60,001+
21	2	0 - 30,000
22	1	0 - 30,000
23	2	0 - 30,000
24	1	60,001+
25	1	0 - 30,000
25	1	60,001+
26	2	0 - 30,000
27	2	30,001 - 40,000
28	1	60,001+
29	1	0 - 30,000
31	2	0 - 30,000
32	1	40,001 - 50,000
32	1	50,001 - 60,000
33	2	0 - 30,000
34	1	0 - 30,000
36	1	30,001 - 40,000
36	1	50,001 - 60,000
39	1	60,001+
41	1	0 - 30,000
41	1	30,001 - 40,000
42	2	30,001 - 40,000
43	1	0 - 30,000
44	1	0 - 30,000
45	2	40,001 - 50,000
46	1	0 - 30,000
46	1	40,001 - 50,000
47	2	0 - 30,000
48	2	0 - 30,000
49	2	50,001 - 60,000
50	2	60,001+
51	1	0 - 30,000
51	1	60,001+
52	1	0 - 30,000
53	2	0 - 30,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
54	2	0 - 30,000
56	2	0 - 30,000
58	2	60,001+
59	1	0 - 30,000
60	1	40,001 - 50,000
61	2	0 - 30,000
62	1	0 - 30,000
62	1	60,001+
63	2	0 - 30,000
64	2	50,001 - 60,000
65	2	0 - 30,000
66	2	0 - 30,000
67	1	0 - 30,000
67	1	30,001 - 40,000
69	1	0 - 30,000
70	2	50,001 - 60,000
71	1	30,001 - 40,000
72	2	0 - 30,000
73	2	0 - 30,000
74	1	0 - 30,000
75	2	0 - 30,000
76	1	0 - 30,000
77	1	60,001+
79	2	0 - 30,000
80	1	0 - 30,000
80	1	60,001+
81	2	0 - 30,000
82	1	0 - 30,000
84	1	0 - 30,000
84	1	40,001 - 50,000
85	1	30,001 - 40,000
86	2	0 - 30,000
87	1	60,001+
88	1	0 - 30,000
89	1	0 - 30,000
89	1	60,001+
91	2	0 - 30,000
92	1	0 - 30,000
94	1	60,001+
95	1	30,001 - 40,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
95	1	60,001+
96	1	0 - 30,000
96	1	60,001+
97	2	0 - 30,000
98	2	0 - 30,000
99	1	40,001 - 50,000
99	2	0 - 30,000
100	2	30,001 - 40,000
101	1	0 - 30,000
101	1	40,001 - 50,000
102	1	0 - 30,000
102	1	40,001 - 50,000
103	1	0 - 30,000
104	1	60,001+
106	1	30,001 - 40,000
106	1	40,001 - 50,000
106	4	0 - 30,000
107	1	0 - 30,000
108	1	0 - 30,000
108	1	50,001 - 60,000
109	1	0 - 30,000
111	2	30,001 - 40,000
112	1	0 - 30,000
112	1	50,001 - 60,000
113	2	0 - 30,000
114	2	0 - 30,000
115	2	50,001 - 60,000
116	1	0 - 30,000
117	1	0 - 30,000
117	1	60,001+
119	1	0 - 30,000
119	2	30,001 - 40,000
120	1	0 - 30,000
125	2	0 - 30,000
126	2	0 - 30,000
127	1	0 - 30,000
127	1	30,001 - 40,000
128	2	0 - 30,000
129	1	60,001+
130	1	30,001 - 40,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
130	1	40,001 - 50,000
131	2	0 - 30,000
132	1	60,001+
135	2	50,001 - 60,000
137	1	0 - 30,000
137	1	60,001+
138	1	60,001+
139	1	0 - 30,000
140	1	40,001 - 50,000
140	2	0 - 30,000
140	2	30,001 - 40,000
141	2	50,001 - 60,000
142	1	0 - 30,000
143	3	30,001 - 40,000
144	1	0 - 30,000
144	1	60,001+
145	1	60,001+
146	1	0 - 30,000
146	1	30,001 - 40,000
147	2	0 - 30,000
148	1	0 - 30,000
148	1	30,001 - 40,000
149	1	60,001+
150	1	0 - 30,000
150	1	30,001 - 40,000
151	1	60,001+
152	2	0 - 30,000
153	1	0 - 30,000
154	1	0 - 30,000
154	1	40,001 - 50,000
155	2	0 - 30,000
156	2	30,001 - 40,000
158	1	0 - 30,000
158	1	30,001 - 40,000
159	1	0 - 30,000
159	1	30,001 - 40,000
161	2	0 - 30,000
162	2	0 - 30,000
163	1	0 - 30,000
164	1	0 - 30,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
165	1	0 - 30,000
166	2	0 - 30,000
167	1	60,001+
168	2	0 - 30,000
169	2	0 - 30,000
170	2	0 - 30,000
171	2	0 - 30,000
173	1	30,001 - 40,000
173	3	0 - 30,000
174	2	0 - 30,000
175	1	0 - 30,000
175	2	30,001 - 40,000
179	1	0 - 30,000
179	1	40,001 - 50,000
182	1	30,001 - 40,000
183	2	60,001+
184	2	40,001 - 50,000
186	2	0 - 30,000
187	2	50,001 - 60,000
188	1	0 - 30,000
189	1	0 - 30,000
190	1	0 - 30,000
190	1	60,001+
192	2	0 - 30,000
193	2	0 - 30,000
194	2	0 - 30,000
196	1	40,001 - 50,000
198	2	0 - 30,000
199	1	0 - 30,000
200	1	0 - 30,000
202	1	0 - 30,000
203	1	0 - 30,000
203	1	40,001 - 50,000
205	1	40,001 - 50,000
206	2	0 - 30,000
207	3	0 - 30,000
208	1	0 - 30,000
209	4	0 - 30,000
210	1	0 - 30,000
212	1	30,001 - 40,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
212	1	40,001 - 50,000
214	1	60,001+
215	1	50,001 - 60,000
216	1	60,001+
217	2	0 - 30,000
221	1	0 - 30,000
221	1	30,001 - 40,000
222	2	0 - 30,000
223	1	0 - 30,000
223	1	40,001 - 50,000
224	1	60,001+
225	1	0 - 30,000
226	1	0 - 30,000
226	1	30,001 - 40,000
227	1	60,001+
227	3	0 - 30,000
228	1	0 - 30,000
228	1	40,001 - 50,000
229	2	60,001+
230	2	0 - 30,000
233	1	0 - 30,000
234	1	40,001 - 50,000
235	1	30,001 - 40,000
236	1	60,001+
237	1	0 - 30,000
237	1	40,001 - 50,000
238	1	50,001 - 60,000
240	2	0 - 30,000
241	3	0 - 30,000
243	1	0 - 30,000
243	1	30,001 - 40,000
244	2	0 - 30,000
245	1	0 - 30,000
245	1	40,001 - 50,000
247	1	0 - 30,000
248	1	30,001 - 40,000
249	2	40,001 - 50,000
250	2	0 - 30,000
251	2	0 - 30,000
253	1	60,001+

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
254	1	0 - 30,000
255	2	0 - 30,000
256	1	0 - 30,000
258	1	0 - 30,000
258	1	30,001 - 40,000
258	1	40,001 - 50,000
259	2	30,001 - 40,000
260	1	0 - 30,000
261	2	60,001+
262	1	50,001 - 60,000
262	2	0 - 30,000
264	1	0 - 30,000
264	1	50,001 - 60,000
265	2	0 - 30,000
266	1	0 - 30,000
268	2	0 - 30,000
269	1	30,001 - 40,000
269	2	0 - 30,000
270	1	0 - 30,000
270	1	50,001 - 60,000
273	1	60,001+
275	1	0 - 30,000
277	2	0 - 30,000
278	1	0 - 30,000
278	1	30,001 - 40,000
279	1	50,001 - 60,000
280	1	0 - 30,000
280	1	30,001 - 40,000
281	1	40,001 - 50,000
281	1	60,001+
281	2	0 - 30,000
283	1	0 - 30,000
283	1	60,001+
284	2	60,001+
285	1	40,001 - 50,000
285	1	60,001+
286	2	0 - 30,000
287	1	0 - 30,000
287	1	30,001 - 40,000
288	2	0 - 30,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
288	2	30,001 - 40,000
289	1	0 - 30,000
289	1	30,001 - 40,000
290	1	0 - 30,000
291	1	0 - 30,000
291	1	30,001 - 40,000
292	2	0 - 30,000
293	2	0 - 30,000
294	2	0 - 30,000
295	1	0 - 30,000
296	1	0 - 30,000
298	1	40,001 - 50,000
299	1	0 - 30,000
299	1	60,001+
301	1	0 - 30,000
302	1	0 - 30,000
303	1	30,001 - 40,000
305	2	0 - 30,000
306	1	0 - 30,000
307	2	0 - 30,000
308	1	40,001 - 50,000
308	4	0 - 30,000
309	1	0 - 30,000
309	1	60,001+
310	1	60,001+
314	2	0 - 30,000
316	1	0 - 30,000
317	1	0 - 30,000
317	1	30,001 - 40,000
318	2	0 - 30,000
319	1	0 - 30,000
320	1	0 - 30,000
321	1	0 - 30,000
322	2	0 - 30,000
323	2	0 - 30,000
324	2	0 - 30,000
327	1	0 - 30,000
327	2	30,001 - 40,000
328	1	50,001 - 60,000
328	2	0 - 30,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this Income	Income_ID
329	1	60,001+
329	2	0 - 30,000
330	1	30,001 - 40,000
330	1	50,001 - 60,000
332	1	0 - 30,000
333	1	30,001 - 40,000
334	2	0 - 30,000
335	1	30,001 - 40,000
335	2	0 - 30,000
336	2	0 - 30,000
337	1	0 - 30,000
339	1	60,001+
340	1	0 - 30,000
340	1	30,001 - 40,000
341	2	0 - 30,000
342	1	0 - 30,000
343	2	40,001 - 50,000
345	1	60,001+
346	1	0 - 30,000
348	1	0 - 30,000
349	2	0 - 30,000
351	2	0 - 30,000
353	1	40,001 - 50,000
353	3	0 - 30,000
355	2	0 - 30,000
356	1	0 - 30,000
357	2	0 - 30,000
358	2	0 - 30,000
360	1	30,001 - 40,000
360	3	0 - 30,000
362	1	30,001 - 40,000
363	2	0 - 30,000
364	1	0 - 30,000
364	1	50,001 - 60,000
365	1	0 - 30,000
366	3	0 - 30,000
367	2	0 - 30,000
368	1	0 - 30,000
369	1	0 - 30,000
369	1	30,001 - 40,000

Tbl_Q125surveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this Income	Income_ID
370	2	0 - 30,000
371	2	0 - 30,000
374	1	0 - 30,000
375	1	0 - 30,000
375	1	30,001 - 40,000
377	2	0 - 30,000
378	1	30,001 - 40,000
378	2	0 - 30,000
379	1	0 - 30,000
380	3	0 - 30,000
380	3	40,001 - 50,000
381	1	0 - 30,000
381	1	60,001+
382	1	30,001 - 40,000
384	1	40,001 - 50,000
384	2	60,001+
385	1	0 - 30,000
386	1	0 - 30,000
386	1	30,001 - 40,000
388	3	0 - 30,000
389	2	0 - 30,000
391	1	0 - 30,000
391	2	50,001 - 60,000
392	1	0 - 30,000
394	3	0 - 30,000
395	1	0 - 30,000
396	2	0 - 30,000
399	2	40,001 - 50,000
403	2	0 - 30,000
404	2	0 - 30,000
404	2	30,001 - 40,000
405	2	0 - 30,000
406	2	0 - 30,000
407	2	0 - 30,000
408	1	0 - 30,000
410	3	0 - 30,000
411	2	0 - 30,000
411	2	50,001 - 60,000
412	1	60,001+
413	1	0 - 30,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
414	1	40,001 - 50,000
415	3	0 - 30,000
416	2	0 - 30,000
417	2	0 - 30,000
419	3	0 - 30,000
420	2	0 - 30,000
421	2	0 - 30,000
423	1	0 - 30,000
423	1	30,001 - 40,000
424	2	0 - 30,000
425	1	40,001 - 50,000
426	1	0 - 30,000
426	1	60,001+
427	1	0 - 30,000
427	1	40,001 - 50,000
428	2	60,001+
429	1	60,001+
429	3	0 - 30,000
430	1	30,001 - 40,000
431	2	40,001 - 50,000
433	1	60,001+
434	2	0 - 30,000
435	1	30,001 - 40,000
435	1	40,001 - 50,000
436	1	0 - 30,000
436	1	40,001 - 50,000
437	1	0 - 30,000
438	1	0 - 30,000
438	1	30,001 - 40,000
439	1	60,001+
440	1	30,001 - 40,000
440	1	60,001+
441	2	0 - 30,000
444	1	40,001 - 50,000
444	1	50,001 - 60,000
444	2	0 - 30,000
445	2	0 - 30,000
446	1	0 - 30,000
446	1	50,001 - 60,000
447	1	0 - 30,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
447	1	50,001 - 60,000
448	2	0 - 30,000
449	1	60,001+
450	1	30,001 - 40,000
451	1	0 - 30,000
451	1	60,001+
453	2	0 - 30,000
454	1	40,001 - 50,000
455	1	0 - 30,000
455	1	30,001 - 40,000
456	1	30,001 - 40,000
457	1	30,001 - 40,000
457	2	0 - 30,000
459	1	60,001+
459	3	0 - 30,000
460	1	40,001 - 50,000
460	1	60,001+
461	1	0 - 30,000
461	1	30,001 - 40,000
462	2	0 - 30,000
463	1	0 - 30,000
464	1	0 - 30,000
465	1	0 - 30,000
465	1	60,001+
466	1	40,001 - 50,000
467	1	0 - 30,000
467	1	50,001 - 60,000
468	1	0 - 30,000
469	1	0 - 30,000
469	1	40,001 - 50,000
471	1	40,001 - 50,000
471	1	50,001 - 60,000
473	2	0 - 30,000
474	1	0 - 30,000
474	1	40,001 - 50,000
475	1	0 - 30,000
476	1	0 - 30,000
476	1	40,001 - 50,000
477	1	40,001 - 50,000
477	1	50,001 - 60,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
478	1	40,001 - 50,000
478	2	0 - 30,000
480	1	0 - 30,000
481	1	30,001 - 40,000
481	1	40,001 - 50,000
483	2	0 - 30,000
484	1	0 - 30,000
484	1	30,001 - 40,000
486	1	50,001 - 60,000
487	1	0 - 30,000
487	1	30,001 - 40,000
488	1	0 - 30,000
489	1	0 - 30,000
489	1	40,001 - 50,000
490	3	0 - 30,000
491	1	60,001+
492	1	0 - 30,000
492	1	60,001+
493	1	0 - 30,000
493	1	30,001 - 40,000
494	1	0 - 30,000
494	1	60,001+
496	1	60,001+
497	1	0 - 30,000
497	1	40,001 - 50,000
498	1	0 - 30,000
499	2	0 - 30,000
500	1	30,001 - 40,000
500	2	0 - 30,000
501	4	0 - 30,000
502	1	40,001 - 50,000
502	1	60,001+
503	1	0 - 30,000
503	1	50,001 - 60,000
504	1	50,001 - 60,000
504	1	60,001+
507	1	0 - 30,000
508	4	0 - 30,000
509	1	60,001+
511	1	40,001 - 50,000

Tbl Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
512	1	0 - 30,000
512	1	50,001 - 60,000
514	1	0 - 30,000
514	1	30,001 - 40,000
515	1	60,001+
516	4	0 - 30,000
517	1	60,001+
518	1	50,001 - 60,000
518	1	60,001+
520	1	0 - 30,000
520	1	40,001 - 50,000
522	2	0 - 30,000
523	2	60,001+
524	1	40,001 - 50,000
524	1	50,001 - 60,000
525	1	0 - 30,000
525	1	30,001 - 40,000
526	1	0 - 30,000
527	2	0 - 30,000
528	1	0 - 30,000
529	1	30,001 - 40,000
532	1	40,001 - 50,000
533	1	0 - 30,000
533	1	60,001+
534	1	0 - 30,000
534	1	60,001+
535	2	0 - 30,000
536	1	60,001+
537	1	0 - 30,000
537	1	50,001 - 60,000
538	1	0 - 30,000
538	1	40,001 - 50,000
540	1	30,001 - 40,000
540	1	40,001 - 50,000
541	2	0 - 30,000
542	2	0 - 30,000
543	1	0 - 30,000
543	1	50,001 - 60,000
544	1	0 - 30,000
544	1	30,001 - 40,000

Tbl_Q12SurveyIncomeLevels Query		
Survey_ID	Number at this income	Income_ID
546	1	0 - 30,000
548	1	0 - 30,000
548	1	30,001 - 40,000
549	2	60,001+
550	1	30,001 - 40,000
551	1	60,001+
553	2	0 - 30,000
554	2	0 - 30,000
556	1	0 - 30,000
556	1	60,001+
557	2	40,001 - 50,000
558	3	0 - 30,000
559	1	0 - 30,000
559	1	60,001+
560	2	0 - 30,000
562	1	60,001+
563	1	30,001 - 40,000
563	1	40,001 - 50,000
564	1	0 - 30,000
565	1	60,001+
565	2	0 - 30,000

Q13 Free text comments.

These are included in full. They are not shown here attributed by responder, but this data is available if required. Many comments relate to the over expansion of the village, and the reduction of open space between Copthorne and neighbouring conurbations. Other principle concerns include the possible expansion of Gatwick airport, and the likely impact that each of these will have on traffic flow, making Copthorne feel more urban than its present semi-rural feel.

Comments
Although I know that more houses are needed in Copthorne, I am worried that the roads/schools/doctors would not be able to cope with a huge increase in the population of the area.
Always a need for growth, but not the size planned by the latest development plans.
Anonymous surveys are a complete waste of paper.
Any future housing should be medium volume and built by housing association to provide housing for young people.
Any growth needs to be carefully and sympathetically managed.
Any increase in the village will only increase the traffic, especially on the A264, which is bad enough now at peak times. When there is a westerly wind the noise from the M23 is bad. They need to build a bank up between the village and the motorway.

Any new houses should either be on a fill in or replacement of existing property basis in order to preserve a village environment. No expansion or coalescence.
As a village we need greater shopping opportunities to suite all ages, & more starter homes for the young.
As well as young families, there are older residents that may need to move to smaller accommodation other than residential care, i.e. sheltered accommodation that is affordable, i.e. not Maccilly-Stone!
Being a pensioner & widow [I] would like to see some affordable homes, not luxury flats, for those of us that want to downsize on property and garden, but be able to stay among people we know, especially if we have no family locally.
Can more facilities be guaranteed as part of the St Modwen development? This is certainly going to happen so what can they give to the village? Exploit is too strong a word, but you see my meaning.
Continue building more houses within a sensible framework, so that more young families can live within the village.
Control building in village. Keep Green Belt.
Controlled expansion is a good idea. Mass expansion is not practical.
Copthorne does not need any more houses in the village. The village cannot cope with any more and the facilities need improving and updating (i.e. play areas, school, doctors, etc.). No more houses.
Copthorne does not need large numbers of low cost housing that is snapped up by the rental market which contributes little to the community and due to the transient nature have little regard for the neighbourhood.
Copthorne has enough houses. No more should be built. It is already too busy. Any more development & it will lose its character as a village.
Copthorne is a good place to live. It would be nice to keep separate from Crawley.
Copthorne is a nice village, apart from Crawley. Vast development would change the feeling of the village and the status of the village to a small town. Dreadful prospect!
Copthorne is not a friendly village. We have lived here 25 years and have not found people wishing to be friendly.
Copthorne needs to keep its village status, and as already stated no infill building on open space building is necessary.
Copthorne provides a good mixed selection of property. You cannot always move in to exactly what you want in the exact location, no matter where you are choosing to live.
Copthorne should provide low cost starter homes for the younger generation.
Copthorne village is great as it is, but would be ruined by another large development.
Copthorne was once a village but now is very busy and a large commuter village with the same facilities that were here 37 years ago, and a vast increase in population which it no longer supports.
Copthorne would be ruined by any more large scale developments. We want to keep the village atmosphere. Roads, Doctors, etc. could not cope with large influx of people.
Copthorne, a beautiful village, infrastructure lacking to support the wider community. However we cannot ignore the country's housing crisis so I do not know the answers.
Cost of housing in the village is too high. Young people who would wish to remain here are unable to. In doing so we do not always have a good social mix.
Currently there is enough housing for the size of the village and the facilities provided. Traffic coming along Copthorne Bank has increased dramatically and is a real problem, with an accident waiting to happen. Please no more traffic through the village
Developments in the village, aircraft noise and road noise have spoilt the village. It is no longer a pleasant place to live.
Dislike busy road/speed of traffic.

Do not make Copthorne a satellite of Crawley.
Do not want the new housing at "Copthorne West" to go ahead.
Do not want to live much longer in what was originally a village and now becoming just a suburb. No decent village shops like Crawley Down.
Do not want to lose Copthorne's village identity. Do not want to overpopulate the village as it will lose its appeal.
Do your best please to retain Copthorne as a pleasant place to live.
Doesn't have enough alternative tick boxes making it necessary for me to say N/A. See above.
Don't let large developments link us to Crawley.
Don't let them build any more houses, the A264 and J10 can't cope already at peak times.
Don't overbuild like Crawley Down.
Due to traffic volumes already, I think any developments should be kept to a minimum in and around the village.
Excessive building in the area will completely kill off the present village atmosphere.
Family houses with decent sized gardens seem to be very limited. I wonder if they have all been knocked down and the land "developed".
Far too many houses being built. Schools not equipped to take more children. Surgery unable to take more patients.
Future developments should be small and in keeping with the village environment, including retaining the strategic gap and improvement of village facilities.
Historically, Copthorne has grown far too quickly, and sadly too much greenery and fields has been lost. The whole of the village needs to remain as it is with regard to loss of land and development. Brownfield sites are good to be developed, but not Gr
Hopefully no more homes or it will no longer be a village.
Housing in village needs to be carefully planned as there are already traffic issues.
I believe that Copthorne's infrastructure is at its maximum capacity, and any more building would be detrimental to the village as a whole.
I do not see a problem increasing the number of houses in the village. 1 - 2 - 3 Beds are preferred as long as 2 parking places per bedroom are allocated per build.
I do not want to lose the village identity & be swallowed up by Crawley. Infrastructures must be in place before any significant number of new houses is built.
I do not wish the village to become a part of Crawley. I wish it to remain a village community.
I don't like the way the village has been swallowed up by new housing, losing its character. Too much pressure on local infrastructure.
I feel that allowing of flats to be built in the village was a mistake, at has led and will lead to more flats being built. Not enough parking and an influx of non-village minded people. Copthorne is fast becoming just another part of Crawley.
I feel the development on the site proposed will be detrimental to life in the village.
I have never liked infill, and the loss of trees in the village is diminishing the village feel.
I have no objection to development as long as it is carried out in a controlled manner, with no loss of Green Belt.
I love the village and oppose the proposed new Copthorne Way Development, which will add nothing to the village except more traffic and congestion, more people and loss of our identity.
I strongly object to housing developments in the village.
I think adding more housing to the village would ruin the feel of the village. It is currently quiet and not too much traffic, and putting more housing would defeat the reason we moved here and would make us want to move.

I understand the concern to maintain a village atmosphere; however Copthorne has expanded greatly since I moved here and further development is inevitable.
I would be very sad to see Copthorne lose its village appeal due to becoming too big & joining up with outlying areas.
I would not like an additional 500 homes to be built on the land behind Copthorne to the M25, but understand the need for further housing.
I would prefer to keep the village feel - No more estates nearby
I would remain in the village if work allowed me to.
If Copthorne became overdeveloped, we would no longer be a village, just an extension of Crawley.
If Copthorne gets much bigger it will no longer be a village and all the values that a village has [will be lost]
If the plans for 500 new houses are built, Copthorne can never be called a village any more.
If the village loses its identity as a result of over-population / more housing being built. We will move away as we came here for a small quiet village and [to] start a family.
If this new development goes ahead, I would seriously consider moving to a smaller quieter village with fewer houses. Copthorne is perfect as it is.
If too many more houses are built in the village there will be more flooding and more traffic congestion.
If we lose the village due to housing developments, I would be more likely to move elsewhere, to a different village. I would not want move to "new housing developments".
Infilling - not expansion under any circumstances.
Information by post for folks unable to attend meetings and not computer oriented on local village input. i.e. proposed developments and valid infrastructure to meet needs.
It is perfect as it is, so would not like to see change, there is a variety of property with a wide range of prices. There seems to be plenty to be involved in, if one wishes. Please, no more development.
It seems clear that Copthorne Village will merge into Pound Hill & Crawley as the adjacent field areas and forest are developed. Gatwick No. 2 Runway will be built I have no doubt given the pressures an air travel etc. It will lose its identity in time f
It would be ideal to keep the village as a village. Prevent over development of the nearby surrounding areas.
It would be nice if Copthorne didn't get any bigger.
It would be nice to keep it as a village & only infill in small numbers.
It would be really desirable not to become a dormitory for Crawley.
It would be sad to have more cheap houses here. We have too many poor quality developments.
Prospective developers should look at Poundbury in Dorset for inspiration, giving high density, mixed use and leading layout.
Just leave our village alone!
Keep Copthorne a small village. There is no more space for more houses. We moved from Crawley to come to a village. If we wanted to stay in a town we would have bought another house in Crawley.
Keep Copthorne a village, that's why people live here.
Lack of bungalow accommodation.
Lane End, Chapel Lane, has been left to deteriorate by Copthorne Hotel.
Large numbers of houses will not serve local people, but will only attract residents from elsewhere. We should not become a dormitory for other local authorities, nor become a suburb of Crawley.
Limit any building in the village to keep its integrity as a village.
Lovely village to live in.
More 1 - 2 bedroom houses needed for retired people wanting to downsize.

More 2 bedroom homes please.
More houses are needed, but please no more flats.
More smaller houses/flats would be good (2/3 beds). There are enough larger properties already.
More starter homes for young families to keep the village young, alive & dynamic, & abreast of changing social needs. Also to avoid it becoming a dormitory village.
More off road parking must be provided to relieve congestion in the village at this time.
Need for new homes to be built for families/pensioners not flats.
Need to keep Copthorne a village.
No large developments needed to stay as a village.
No large developments on green field sites - smaller infill's OK.
No large developments on Green Field Sites - Smaller infill's OK.
No large housing estates to be built. Bungalows preferable.
No longer a village and no more homes to be built. Roads cannot take the traffic now and not enough facilities.
No longer a village, and now an annexe to Crawley if more buildings, i.e. houses, are built in Copthorne.
No more [houses] unless we have more doctors, schools and facilities.
No to St Modwen without buses or doctors.
Not enough cheaper properties or apartments.
Our children had to buy outside the village as there were none the right size or budget available.
Our village is big enough and has a super community. We do not want any more building.
Perhaps not relevant, but as a priority I feel that Copthorne needs good quality smaller property (some wardened or sheltered) for the retired and elderly. This would free up the larger family houses.
Perhaps this survey will help to stop the St Modwen proposal. The present balance of housing and rate of building appears satisfactory.
Please can you maintain the Strategic Gap to preserve the values of the village and people's health and well-being?
Please do not build on the countryside at all. Build "quality" flats/houses on infill land.
Please refer to the recent speech by Princess Anne on housing. Instead of building large housing projects, small villages and towns could expand by 10 - 20 houses at a time, and evolve naturally without putting pressure on existing infrastructure.
Please, no more housing in Copthorne. It was a lovely little village when we moved here, now you can't move. The roads are heavily congested. Not good at all.
Sadly, the village has become more of a residential area, looking like part of Crawley rather than a village.
Schools are insufficient for more houses, which would mean more people.
Shame that the Copthorne is changing from a village to a part of Crawley.
Shame the government create pressure on housing by making hard working divorced non-resident parents have to take such actions as to avoid "gold diggy" sanctions. P.S. I fully support my children from my earnings, this is fully supported by the CSA and m
Simply disappointed that traffic will increase and also change village & surrounding area atmosphere.
Since moving here several small developments have been built which have integrated quite well with the village. However we feel that capacity has now been reached and the village is unable to sustain any further development.
Small scale development is acceptable, but huge new estates would destroy the village atmosphere. Smaller units should be built because more families are separating, therefore two dwellings for the male/female apart.
Some new housing should be allowed (small plots). New homes should have adequate parking. Parking on kerbs and inconsiderate parking needs to be looked at.

Stop the St Modwen Scheme; it won't be covered under the flood insurance scheme.
Survey OK. Keep Copthorne as a village and not a further estate of Crawley. Would not move to another property in Copthorne if 2nd runway at Gatwick.
Thank you for all that is being done to keep Copthorne as the wonderful village that it is. No to Copthorne Village West. Who thought up that name? I have recently written letter of objections to the Council.
The current village resources are stretched to their limit and additional housing would not only destroy the reason we moved here and how we feel about living here, but would also spread those resources to breaking point.
The numbers of houses proposed to be built would ruin the feel of the village and increase traffic in the area. Thank you for this survey.
The plan for 500 new houses off Copthorne Way should not be allowed to go ahead. Too large a development which would destroy Copthorne as a village.
The village cannot accommodate the proposed 500 houses to the west of the village as this would close the gap with Crawley, destroy the village identity and be very divisive.
The village does not need any more houses. Most of the places they have chosen to build have been flooded this winter.
The village does not require more housing developments.
The village has enough people and houses at the moment. The proposed new housing would cause bad traffic problems, plus not enough doctors, schools, etc.
The village has little to offer other than as an expanding adjunct to Crawley. Further housing will diminish whatever character Copthorne has.
The village is big enough. Too many vehicles now causing congestion everywhere. Further housing will cause more aggravation.
The village is fantastic, but I don't think it could sustain a large development.
The village is getting too big and the facilities are poor for a village of this size.
The village is rapidly losing its village status and becoming a small town. Roads are not sufficient to accommodate the extra traffic further development would bring.
The village is so unique & infilling and refurbishment is the way to return its character & to provide future steadily increasing housing supply.
The village must not join with Crawley and start a conurbation with East Grinstead, as they are doing with Horsham.
The village needs to grow, but with infill and small groups of houses, not by big new estates the size of another small village.
There are very few starter houses in the village, so one's children cannot afford to buy houses in the village.
There is a need for sensible development in this area and few would dispute this need. Character and identity are important to homeowners here. More inclusive conversation with villagers would be welcome in achieving consensus in planning that fits in w
There is enough housing in the village, unless the idea is to become part of Crawley is planned then I would consider moving to another village. Don't want to live in Crawley.
There should be more social housing for youngsters to start, especially if they grew up in Copthorne. Also small units for retired people so that they can vacate.
This is a friendly village that does not have the capacity for any more houses.
This seems to focus on family members who will move. The issue is those villagers that will leave and be replaced by airport workers, etc. - not local families.


This village is fine as it is. To even consider building Copthorne West is sheer lunacy. The schools and doctors are full! The new proposal won't build and pay for those facilities on site; they will just make provision for others to do so.
Too many homes crammed in the area taking over the countryside and becoming a town.
Too many houses already, causing sewers to overflow into [the] roads that children walk through to get to school.
Too many houses crammed in together, small gardens, busy roads, too many parked cars. Roads too busy to cycle on. Few cycle paths and lanes.
Too many new properties are being built without enough car parking spaces, and the gardens are tiny! New properties should enhance the village and not drop in standard.
Too much development in the village in recent years without improving the infrastructure - This must stop.
Too much redevelopment in the village is not good, it will take the village element out and choke the village of its resources such as doctors, roads and traffic, schools etc.
Traffic on the A264. When Gatwick expands, will ruin Copthorne. Little developments not large ones.
Unless 50% of new housing is affordable, the prospect of my children living in the village is non-existent.
Very clear and easy to fill in. This makes a pleasant change!
Village does not need the Modwen development - the village is large enough.
Village has got too large for the amenities it possesses.
Village is large enough. No big housing developments needed. Roads infrastructure cannot cope anymore. Thank you for all you do in the village, it is much appreciated.
Village needs smaller units for first time buyers and couples breaking up.
We accept the need for more housing but are very concerned about the increase in traffic as Copthorne is already very polluted by traffic (noise and air pollution) and plagued by speeding vehicles. Heavily congested A264/M23 at peak hours.
We appreciate the pressure by Government to build additional housing, but it is essential developments are sympathetic and maintain the village environment.
We are a retired couple! Housing should meet the needs of Copthorne residents and families.
We are against the 500 houses development being proposed in Copthorne.
We are concerned about the number of proposed houses that may be built in Copthorne and the devastating effect this will have on the heart of the village. The centre of the village will be used as a rat run for traffic to get to proposed new development,
We are concerned that if more housing is built in Copthorne, as has been proposed, we will lose our village life and become part of Crawley which would make me move away.
We are very worried about the proposed developments in the village. These may devalue our homes and detract from village life and stretch facilities.
We do not need any new houses in the village. It can't cope now with busy roads, schools and doctors, plus the recent flooding. Don't let our village be ruined please!
We do not require large housing development in Copthorne to satisfy regional targets by housing speculators interested in short term profit at the expense of quality of life of existing residents. We definitely do not want development in the strategic g
We do not think houses built on Green Belt [should be allowed].
We do not want any large scale housing developments, or building on the common or local woodlands.
We do not want the village enlarged by additional estates.
We don't want to see the village expand from its current size.
We enjoy living in Copthorne with its village atmosphere. However, we feel that it is now suffering from too much expansion and the roads/infrastructure are at capacity.

We feel that more use should be made of small plots of land for building houses rather than large developments. (500 houses!!! No. No. No.
We feel that the village and the surrounding area will be spoiled if more houses are built. Young people usually look elsewhere to rent or buy - not in a village like Copthorne.
We feel the Crabbet development option is preferable to the St Modwen option.
We have no problem to small areas of development, but are not keen on whole new "Copthorne West" We want Copthorne to remain a village.
We have our fair share of housing for the disadvantaged in the village, we do not require any more.
We like the village as it is. More cleaning of road gutters and pavements should be in place, otherwise a nice village atmosphere and we would hate to see it turn into a suburban town attached to Crawley. If that happened we would move.
We love living here and would not be against new houses being built. But not the huge development being considered at the moment. We do not want our village split in two and must consider our infrastructure.
We love this village. We moved from a 2 bed Victorian characterful semi to a 4 bed 60's detached. Both perfect for our needs / schools etc.
We love village life. By extending Copthorne this will be ruined.
We moved to this village because of exactly the way it is. We lived in central London before and deliberately moved away from the hustle and bustle and we don't want Copthorne to become anything like that at all.
We must stop the developments.
We need more affordable housing in smaller houses. Nearly all are family homes. I would love to stay in the village, but too expensive and not much choice in shared ownership 1-2 beds or what about park homes?
We need one and two bed roomed properties, not more of three/four bed executive style. Older people move out of the village in order to downsize.
We need small affordable houses for the elderly to move in to - not flats. Just easy to manage. Courtyard gardens (one or two beds) to release up larger property.
We wish Copthorne to stay as a village. We are opposed to the new housing development.
We would like to stay a village.
We would not like any large development (50+), as we feel this would impact on the sustainability of the village.
We would not like to see this village grow as it will put more traffic on the roads and also affect our schools and doctors.
We would not want to stay in the village if we effectively become part of Crawley.
Whatever building may be considered should fit the integrity of the village life and not just make us an extension of Crawley.
Whatever building may be considered, fit the integrity of village life and not just make us a part of Crawley.
When is Copthorne going to be upgraded? (e.g. lights) It needs to be made more appealing. This also applies to the stat of the footpaths.
When or if we move, we would look at existing older properties within Copthorne, not new builds.
Whilst accepting the need for some housing development, any major projects could spoil the village and would be difficult for the village to face without the whole character being changed
Whilst appreciating future housing needs, if Copthorne is to remain a village, then any future development must be strictly controlled.
Whilst we have made a home and enjoy the current environment immensely, we would welcome the opportunity to purchase a modern affordable (not social) house.

Why are you wasting time on this? It has been agreed so why bother.
With so many extensions in recent years, smaller detached properties are in short supply in most areas. But we do not want major new developments like the one proposed.
Would be nice to keep Copthorne as a village.
You should be asking where new housing should be built. I have already made my views known but there may be many receiving this questionnaire that has not.

COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

OVERVIEW



The Vision for Copthorne


"A thriving and attractive village community set in unspoilt and accessible countryside that provides an excellent quality of life for residents, visitors, and those who work in, or travel through, the area."



Pre-Submission Draft Plan

Copies of the full plan are available from the Worth Parish Council Offices, The First Floor, The Parish Hub, Borers Arms Road, Copthorne, West Sussex, RH10 3ZQ and at

www.copthorneplan.org.uk



The Plan has been issued for formal consultation and comments from local residents and anyone with an interest in the Village.

Representation Forms are available from Worth Parish Council at the link below. Comments need to be submitted to Worth Parish Council at the address above, or to

clerk@worthparishcouncil.co.uk

By 28th April 2017

Overview

The Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (NP) has been written and developed after considerable consultation and opinion of the local community. The Copthorne NP fully complements the Government's intent that it should allow and involve the community to determine where new homes and offices should be built.

The Copthorne NP is constructed with strong alignment to the Localism Act of 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), where it states that "people are able to influence decisions about new and modified buildings and facilities in the area" and "to give people more control over development of their local area".

Integration within the village and prevention of any gap erosions are very serious considerations. Any development favours smaller properties rather than larger property builds. There must be no detrimental impacts on all existing traffic conditions which is already seen as dangerous on many village roads. Consideration must be given to any flooding risks. It was identified that the Plan should be based on a policy led approach.

The Copthorne Plan sets out twelve policies which together with the Local District Plan and NPPF ensures that new development will be sustainable and in accordance with the "Vision for Copthorne". Critically, new developments must address local housing needs, maintain existing character and identity of the village, must provide enhancement of infrastructure and services and must avoid any loss of green or recreational spaces, and prevent any coalescence with neighbouring villages or loss of scenic sightlines.


In addition to the policies, the Copthorne NP sets out five proposals which address all issues identified from community consultation:

- Proposal 01 – Protection for Assets of Community Value.
- Proposal 02 – Traffic Management and Sustainable Transport.
- Proposal 03 – Enhancement of Green Infrastructure.
- Proposal 04 – Primary Education for Village Children.
- Proposal 05 – Affordable Housing for local needs.

The Policies in Summary

Policy COP01 – Securing Sustainable Local Infrastructure

Development will be permitted where social, physical and green infrastructure needed to support the proposed development is in place, or can be provided in a timely manner through developer funds.



Policy COP02- Local Green/Open Spaces

All designated areas of local green/open spaces must be protected as listed in this policy (fig 7) and which are covered by NPPF qualifications (as shown in the policy).



Policy COP03 – Retail Uses and Public Houses

Essentially all such properties must be protected from change or development unless proven that the business is not viable.



Policy COP04 – Building Extensions and Infill Housing

This policy is divided into four elements namely:

COP04.1 A general policy on building extensions with a focus on scale/mass/amenity.

COP04.2 – A general policy on infill housing with focus on plot size.

COP04.3 – A general policy seeking to resist loss of existing off street parking.

COP04.4 – A policy seeking to resist proposals to increase size of existing single level/easy access dwellings.

**Policy COP05
Control of New Developments**

Subject to the other policies of this Neighbourhood Plan, within the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan area, planning permission will be granted for sustainable residential development subject to the following criteria:

Including size, number and type, whilst protecting all aspects of the village identity and infrastructure.

**Policy COP06
Sustainable Drainage Systems**

All development must demonstrate that it incorporates sustainable drainage systems.

**Policy COP07
Retention of Existing Employment Sites and Use of Vernacular Buildings**

This policy is divided into 3 parts:

Part 1 to cover provision under Town & County planning for existing land and building sites which no longer are used and viable.

Part 2 New development land on sites.

Part 3 proposal for vernacular buildings for employment use.

**Policy COP08
Prevention of Coalescence (Actual or Perceived)**

Restriction on development outside built up village area is protected under various criteria.

**Policy COP09
Protect and Enhance Biodiversity**

Proposals for all new residential, employment and retail development is expected to protect and enhance biodiversity and wildlife.

**Policy COP10
Environment and Pollution**

General requirement regarding distances for builds to protect all from any sources of pollution.

**Policy COP11
Promoting Sustainable Transport**

Development that does not conflict with other policies providing that it promotes sustainable transport within the Neighbourhood area.

**Policy COP12
Lych Gate**

The historic Copthorne Lych Gate is unique. Any development opportunity should not impact upon its integrity and setting.



Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan

(covering the Copthorne & Worth Ward)

Pre-submission Regulation 14 Consultation

Public consultation – 6th March 2017 to 28th April 2017

Representation Form

The Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan for the Copthorne & Worth Ward, of Worth Parish, has been published for public consultation under Regulation 14 Town & Country Planning, England, Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. All comments received will be considered before the creation of a revised version of the Plan (Regulation 15), which will then be submitted to Mid Sussex District Council.

You may use this form to submit comments.

Please give your name and address. As this is a formal statutory consultation all comments submitted will be available publicly.

Please make comments as specific as possible, relating to specific Policies or paragraph numbers, and quote the relevant Policy or paragraph number(s).

Send or deliver your comments to: The Clerk to the Council, Worth Parish Council, 1st Floor, The Parish Hub, Borers Arms Road, Copthorne, West Sussex RH10 3ZQ

 or by email to: clerk@worthparishcouncil.co.uk

All comments must be received no later than Friday 28th April 2017.

Your details

Name	
Full address and postcode	
E-mail (Optional)	
Organisation/company (please state, if applicable)	
Are you a resident of Copthorne?	

Please give your comments overleaf. If you need to continue on an additional sheet, please write your name at the top of each sheet and staple sheets together.

Comments on specific Policies and / or paragraphs

Please indicate the specific Policy and / or paragraph number.

Policy and/or Paragraph No	Comments and /or suggested changes

General comments

--

Thank you



2019 Copthorne Village Survey Results & Analysis

Published: 11/02/2020

Prepared by the Copthorne
Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Contents

1	Introduction.....	2
2	Residential Property	3
	Extensions	3
3	Occupancy	4
	Moving Intentions	5
	Future Occupants.....	6
	Requirement within next 2 years	6
	Requirement within next 3-5 years	6
	Requirement within 6+ years	6
	Total housing need.....	7
4	Vehicles & Parking.....	8
5	Local Facilities	9
	Doctors Surgery	9
	Schools	9
	Other Amenities	9
6	Community Land Trust.....	11
7	Gatwick.....	12
8	Crime	13

Appendices

	Appendix 1 – The Survey	14
--	--------------------------------------	-----------

1 Introduction

- 1.1 A Steering Group, on behalf of Worth Parish Council, are preparing a new Neighbourhood Plan for Copthorne & Worth Ward. The group consulted on a draft plan under Regulation 14 of the Town & Country Planning, England, Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) between 6th March and 28th April 2017.
- 1.2 The Steering Group sought to update the plan in response to the comments received during this consultation, but it became apparent that considerable changes were required to the plan before it could proceed. Alongside this, planning policy at the local and national level was in a state of flux and so the group decided to pause, take stock and revisit the information on which the plan is based.
- 1.3 At the time of writing (January 2020) the policy position at the local and national level has settled and the Steering Group are working hard to prepare an updated evidence base and plan for a new Regulation 14 Consultation.
- 1.4 As part of the drive to update the evidence base, a survey was undertaken between July and August 2019. 2,079 hard copies of the surveys were prepared and given to a team of local volunteers to distribute to properties within the village of Copthorne asking various questions to gain evidence base for the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan. A copy of the survey is included in **Appendix 1**. It is noted that there are only 1988 properties within the Ward, and therefore this is the number that will be used for the basis of any calculations in this report.
- 1.5 This report is a summary of the analysed results of the survey responses received. Worth Parish Council (WPC) received 614 representing 30.8% of the total households in the Ward.

2 Residential Property

- 2.1 The survey part of the survey first looked at our houses. We asked about tenure and size and future need to understand our current housing stock and how or if it needs to change.
- 2.2 Of the survey responses received, 571 (93%) said they owned their property, 35 (5.7%) indicated they rent their property and 2 (0.3%) indicated they part own and part rent their property and 6 did not reply (1%). We can then estimate that the total number of households in each of these categories in Copthorne is:

Owned: 1849

Rented: 113

Part owned/part rented: 6

Did not respond: 20

- 2.3 Of the survey responses received, 4 indicated they have one bedroom, 69 indicated they have two bedrooms, 272 indicated they have three bedrooms, 199 indicated they have four bedrooms, 59 indicated they have five bedrooms, and 6 indicated they have more than 5 bedrooms (and 5 did not reply).

Extensions

- 2.4 A total of 16 (2.6%) households who responded indicated they had extended to add bedrooms to their house since 2015, totalling 19 new bedrooms. The average number of rooms other than bedrooms per household was 4.6.
- 2.5 In addition, 17 (2.7%) households who responded indicated they intend to add new bedrooms within the next 5 years.
- 2.6 If these results are extrapolated to account for the Ward, this would equate to circa. 54 homes intending to extend within the next 5 years.

3 Occupancy

- 3.1 The survey also sought to understand whether we as a community live with large households or small ones, whether we tend to stay in the same house for a long time and other traits of our residents.
- 3.2 The survey results indicate how long residents have lived in Copthorne, and how long they have lived in their current home. The results are as follows:

No. years in Copthorne	No of responses	% of responses	No. years in current home (%)						
			0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31+
0-5	97	16.1	100						
6-10	48	7.9	8.3	91.7					
11-15	65	10.8	7.7	7.7	84.6				
16-20	48	7.9	12.5	14.6	2.1	70.8			
21-25	52	8.6	5.8	3.8	15.4	9.6	65.4		
26-30	47	7.8	10.6	2.1	6.4	10.6	8.5	61.7	
31+	247	40.9	2.4	2.8	2.8	5.3	6.5	5.3	73.3

- 3.3 These results indicate that once people reside in Copthorne, they tend to stay in the same home. These results cannot be used to draw any conclusion on migration to/from the area as the survey has not captured responses from those who have lived here, but now moved away.
- 3.4 The survey also asked people why they live in Copthorne, the results are as follows:

Question answer	% of responses
Born here	4.8%
Have relatives in or nearby Copthorne	10.4%
Work in or near the village	16%
Attracted by village life, schools etc.	42.9%
Other	25.9%

- 3.5 These results indicate that Copthorne is regarded as an attractive place to live. The number of 'Other' responses is very high, and with hindsight it may have been more useful to ask respondents to clarify this response to better understand these reasons.

- 3.6 Question 5 sought to understand how many people lived in our households and some details about them. In the 614 households who replied there are 1441 people living in them. The survey results also indicate the age range of occupants as follows:

Age group (yrs)	No. of people	% of people
0-3	75	5.2%
4-10	76	5.3%
11-18	88	6.1%
19-24	90	6.2%
25-34	81	5.6%
35-44	126	8.7%
45-54	165	11.5%
55-64	256	17.8%
65-74	277	19.2%
75+	207	14.4%

- 3.7 Of the responses received, 50 people work from home. Respondents were also asked to tell us how they travelled to work and how long it takes, the results are set out below as a % of the modes of travel:

Method of transport	No who travel by this method	% who travels by this method	Time spent for each method (minutes)				
			0-30	31-60	61-90	91-120	120+
Bus	32	4.6%	22	8	1	1	0
Train	70	10%	16	39	9	3	3
Car/van	553	79.2%	388	115	31	8	11
Motorcycle	7	1%	4	2	1	0	0
Cycle	7	1%	5	1	1	0	0
Walk	29	4.2%	28	0	1	0	0

- 3.8 The survey results further indicate that 108 (28.4%) of people say their journey time to work has increased in last 4 years, 74 (19.5%) say their journey time has decreased, and 198 (52.1%) say there has been no change to their journey time.
- 3.9 There is a high proportion of people who travel to work using private motor vehicles rather than public transport. This may be indicative of Copthorne's location on J10 of the M23, which provides good connectivity North and South. It also indicates that Copthorne is primarily a commuter settlement with people travelling outside the area for work.

Moving Intentions

- 3.10 The survey responses indicate that 63 (10.4%) of householders intend to move within the next two years, 79 (13.1%) within 3-5 years, 30 (5%) in 6+ years and 433 (71.6%) said they had no intention of moving within these timeframes.
- 3.11 Of the 172 who plan on moving, 154 (90.5%) said they planned to stay within Copthorne. This further correlates with the results above that a majority of people do not move once they are settled.

Future Occupants

- 3.12 The survey results indicate the following requirements for new homes in the village based on existing residents moving to their own home in the village, or relatives of existing residents moving into the village:

Requirement within next 2 years

Dwelling size	Owned			Rented			Shared Ownership		
	Need from Household	Need from relatives	Total Need	Need from Household	Need from relatives	Total Need	Need from Household	Need from relatives	Total Need
1 bed	4	0	4	3	0	3	0	0	0
2 bed	8	1	9	0	2	2	1	0	1
3 bed	10	4	14	2	0	2	2	0	2
4 bed	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
5+ bed	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Requirement within next 3-5 years

Dwelling size	Owned			Rented			Shared Ownership		
	Need from Household	Need from relatives	Total Need	Need from Household	Need from relatives	Total Need	Need from Household	Need from relatives	Total Need
1 bed	5	0	5	1	0	1	1	0	0
2 bed	13	2	15	5	0	5	2	1	1
3 bed	8	5	13	0	2	2	0	1	2
4 bed	1	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	0
5+ bed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Requirement within 6+ years

Dwelling size	Owned			Rented			Shared Ownership		
	Need from Household	Need from relatives	Total Need	Need from Household	Need from relatives	Total Need	Need from Household	Need from relatives	Total Need
1 bed	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0
2 bed	8	2	10	1	0	1	0	0	1
3 bed	0	4	4	1	0	1	0	0	2
4 bed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5+ bed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Total housing need

- 3.13 Using the results above, it is possible to estimate the total housing need and mix across the Ward. These estimates have been prepared by multiplying the above figures by 3.25 which is the total households in the Ward (1988) divided by the number of survey responses (614). The total estimated housing need is set out below:

	Up to 2 years	3 – 5 years	6 + years
1 bed	23	20	10
2 bed	39	69	39
3 bed	59	56	23
4 bed	10	13	0
5+ bed	4	0	0
Total Need:	135	158	72

- 3.14 This shows that within the next 5 years, there is a need for around 293 new homes in the area. The vast majority of these (266 or 91%) are 1-3 bed homes. There is little identified need for larger (4+ bed) homes.
- 3.15 This locally derived housing need will be met by the two major developments currently under construction within the area (Heathy Wood and Hawthorns).

R.1 Steering Group consider housing needs across the plan area.

4 Vehicles & Parking

- 4.1 577 responses let us know how many vehicles are in their households, these households cumulatively have 1278 vehicles. The breakdown is as follows:

Vehicle Type	No of Vehicles	From this many households
Petrol/Diesel car	1062	569
Petrol/diesel van	60	56
Petrol/diesel motorcycle	124	59
Hybrid car	25	24
Hybrid van	3	2
Hybrid motorcycle/cycle	0	0
Electric car	1	1
Electric van	0	0
Electric motorcycle/cycle	3	2

- 4.2 37 households did not say they own a vehicle, these households therefore do not own a vehicle or did not answer the question. It is noted that of the 577 households who replied to this question 573 (99%) had a private car (of any type).
- 4.3 It is also noted that of the few who have adopted electric vehicles (car or motorcycle) they always had a fossil fuel powered vehicle as well. The electric car owner for example also had 2 petrol/diesel cars in their household and a household with one electric motorcycle also has 4 petrol/diesel cars, 1 petrol/diesel van and 4 petrol/diesel motorcycles. Whilst the survey cannot be considered to be definitive, we can assume that electric vehicles are not being readily adopted within our community.
- 4.4 68 households expect the number of vehicles in their household to increase in the next 5 years and 54 of households indicated they intended to replace their petrol/diesel powered vehicle with an electric one.
- 4.5 When considering parking, 582 households have garages or off-road parking which provide 1666 spaces. 122 (21%) of these households however have more cars/vans than their off-road parking can accommodate. These 122 houses have off-road parking space for 144 cars/vans yet have 310 vehicles between them meaning a shortfall of 166 spaces.

R.2 Steering Group consider including Policy to increase parking provision in plan area.

- 4.6 Alongside this, 133 households routinely park a total of 173 vehicles on the street. This is interesting as it demonstrates that some people may park on the street despite them having off-road parking available. But considering the number of responses this is a smaller number than we may have expected given the known parking issues in the area.
- 4.7 If one were to extrapolate these findings by assuming 21% of all properties cannot meet their own parking need off-road we would establish that Copthorne is short of circa 600 parking spaces.
- 4.8 It should also be noted that 327 (56.2%) of responses confirmed that they would be able to facilitate an electric vehicle charging point.

5 Local Facilities

Doctors Surgery

- 5.1 Of the 614 responses, 489 had one or more person registered at the Copthorne Doctors Surgery. These 489 households had 1002 people registered here. 126 households had one or more person registered at another surgery elsewhere meaning 216 people leave Copthorne for healthcare. This could be for a number of reasons such as people who have recently moved into the village could still be registered elsewhere or perhaps more concerning people could be forced to go elsewhere because Copthorne Surgery is at Capacity. It is also noted that 30 households have residents registered at both the Copthorne Surgery and elsewhere.
- 5.2 The Doctors Surgery was also the most mentioned community facility when asked what local facilities were considered important.

Schools

- 5.3 Regarding schools, the survey results indicate that:
- 31 children attend preschool
 - 57 attend the village primary schools
 - 8 attend a primary school outside the village
 - 66 attend a secondary school outside the village
- 5.4 Of these:
- 38.3% walk to/from school or preschool
 - 0.6% cycle to/from school or preschool
 - 37% catch a bus to/from school or preschool
 - 23.5% drive or get driven to/from school or preschool

Other Amenities

- 5.5 The survey asked people which of the local sports clubs they were members of or were involved with. The results are as follows:

Sports club/facility	No. people involved	% of people in households
Football	57	4
Table Tennis	6	0.4
Badminton	13	0.9
Cricket	8	0.6
Golf	92	6.4
Snooker	9	0.4
Fitness Class	76	5.3
Stool Ball	5	0.3
Gym	131	9.1

- 5.6 464 (80%) of households indicated that they do use local footpaths and bridleways for exercise purposes. This would indicate that these are vital resources for our community.

- 5.7 The survey asked responders to indicate which they felt were the 3 most important community facilities in the village. The top results are as follows:

Rank	Facility	No. of responses
1 st	Doctors	184
2 nd	Schools	125
3 rd	Local Shops	108
4 th	Open Spaces	105
5 th	Village Hall	80
6 th	Parish Hub	76
7 th	Copthorne Pavillion & Playing Fields	71
8 th	Church	51
9 th	Post Office	47
10 th	Playgrounds	42
11 th	Bus Service	33
12 th	Social Club	30
13 th	Pub	27
14 th	Scouts & Guides	22
15 th	Footpaths/Cyclepaths	16

- 5.8 The survey asked responders to suggest additional sports or activities that are currently not available in Copthorne that they would like to see. No individual activity received a response of more than 3% and therefore there is no overwhelming demand identified for any additional activities. For reference, the activities suggested included:

- Tennis
- Swimming Pool
- Cycling
- Walking/Running Routes
- Bowls
- Café/Restaurant
- Better Shops
- Dance
- Youth Centre
- Cycle Paths
- Better Bus Services
- Dentist
- Better Playgrounds/Parks
- Gym
- Yoga
- Playground
- Butchers
- Football Pitch
- Running
- Youth Club
- Pilates
- Walking
- Scouts & Guides
- Performing Arts Centre
- Footpaths
- Speed Control
- Restaurant
- Angling
- Rugby
- Netball
- Market
- Village Centre
- Book Club
- Cricket Club
- Ballroom
- Better Pub
- More Shops
- Police
- Ballet
- 4G Football Pitch
- Bakers
- Hockey
- Amateur Dramatics
- Horse Riding
- Church
- Outdoor Gym
- Gymnastics

6 Community Land Trust

- 6.1 The survey asked responders whether they agreed with WPC's plans to set up a Community Land Trust to develop and manage new social and affordable housing. The results were as follows (percentage shown is % of people who answered this question):

Response	No. of responses	% of responses
Strongly Agree	96	16.5%
Agree	253	43.4%
Neither Agree nor Disagree	162	27.8%
Disagree	18	3.1%
Strongly Disagree	16	2.7%
Don't Understand	38	6.5%

- 6.2 This indicates that a vast majority of respondents understood what a Community Land Trust is, and over half support the Parish Council setting up a CLT, with a further 28% indifferent.

7 Gatwick

- 7.1 The survey asked responders if any members of their household work at Gatwick airport, or a company which supports airport operations. 71 households indicated that 82 household members work at Gatwick, or in a supporting role.

8 Crime

- 8.1 The survey asked responders to indicate whether they had suffered from any crimes in the last 5 years. The results are as follows (percentage shown is % of people who responded to survey):

Crime Type	Within last 12 months	Within 1-2 years	Within 2-5 years
Assault	5	1	2
Burglary	2	5	12
Theft	10	10	16
Vandalism	23	10	18
Cyber	6	6	5
Hate	0	0	0
Anti-Social Behaviour	32	22	19
Road Rage	37	18	6

- 8.2 This generally indicates Copthorne has few crimes. A majority of the crimes that are suffered appear to be vandalism and anti-social behaviour.

Appendix 1 – The Survey



Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan Housing Survey July 2019

Your answers will help shape the future of the Village for the next 15 years.

About this survey

This is a voluntary and anonymous survey. You do not need to answer every question.

Once completed, please return the completed form by **30 August 2019**. Please do not return forms after this date as they will not be processed but the Parish Council will still be charged postage.

You can find out more about the neighbourhood plan and the work of the parish council on www.worth-pc.gov.uk

Who is preparing the plan?

The Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan Sub-Committee has been entrusted by the Parish Council to prepare the neighbourhood plan for Copthorne Ward. The Committee consists of Councillors and residents who care about our community, they also welcome like-minded individuals who want to play a role in shaping the future of Copthorne.

If you are interested in becoming involved, please email nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk.

More information?

For more information please contact Worth Parish Council on www.worth-pc.gov.uk / clerk@worth-pc.gov.uk / nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk / 01342 713407.

Q1	Did you complete the 2015 survey?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure <input type="checkbox"/>
----	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------

Q2	Thinking of your home; Do you:	Own <input type="checkbox"/>	Rent <input type="checkbox"/>	Part own/rent <input type="checkbox"/>
----	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------------	---

Q3	a) How many bedrooms does your home have?	<input type="text"/>		
	b) Have any of the bedrooms been added since 2015?	If Yes, how many? <input type="text"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
	c) Do you intend to add any bedrooms in the next 5 Years?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
	d) Excluding bedrooms, how many other rooms does your home have?		<input type="text"/>	

Q4	a) How many useable garages and other off-road parking spaces does your home have?		<input type="text"/>	
	b) Would your off-road parking spaces be able to facilitate the charging of an electric vehicle?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Unsure <input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Does your household routinely park a vehicle on the street?	If Yes, how many? <input type="text"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	

Q5	Please indicate how many people live in your household and their ages:										
	Age (yrs)	0 - 3	4 - 10	11 - 18	19 - 24	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 - 64	65 - 74	75+
	No. of people:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Q6	If there are no children in your household (age 18 or under) please go to question 7.				
	a) How many children in your household attend preschool?	<input type="text"/>			
	b) How many children in your household attend the village schools?	<input type="text"/>			
	c) How many children in your household attend a primary school outside Copthorne?	<input type="text"/>			
	d) How many children in your household attend a secondary school?	<input type="text"/>			
	e) How do the children in your household travel to school?				
	Mode of travel:	Walk	Bus	Car	Bicycle
	No. of people:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Q7 a) How many years have you lived in your current home?

Years	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 20	21 - 25	26 - 30	31+
(Please tick)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

b) How many years have you lived in Copthorne?

Years	0 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 20	21 - 25	26 - 30	31+
(Please tick)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

c) What is the main reason that you chose to live in Copthorne?

Born here	<input type="checkbox"/>	Attracted by village life, schools, etc	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have relatives in the village or nearby	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Work in the village or nearby	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Q8 a) Do you expect to move home soon?

No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes, in the next 2 years	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes, in the next 3-5 years	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes, in 6+ years	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you ticked 'No', please go to Question 9

b) Are you likely to move to another property in Copthorne?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

c) What would be the main reason for your wanting to move? (tick one box only)

Need a bigger property	<input type="checkbox"/>	Want a smaller property	<input type="checkbox"/>
Move from rented to owned	<input type="checkbox"/>	Move from owned to rented	<input type="checkbox"/>
Work opportunity	<input type="checkbox"/>	Attracted by non-village life, schools, etc	<input type="checkbox"/>
Health Reasons	<input type="checkbox"/>	Move to sheltered housing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>		

- Q9 Is anyone in your household likely to be seeking to move to their own property in the village?
If so, please enter the number of people looking for a property in the table below, making sure you select the correct tenure & property size (across the top) and when they are likely to need the property (down the side).

	Tenure & Size															Not known
	Owned					Shared ownership					Rented					
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed	
In the next 2 years																
In the next 3 - 5 years																
In 6+ years																

- Q10 Do you have any close relatives who are likely to be seeking to move to Copthorne?
If so, please enter the number of people looking for a property in the table below, making sure you select the correct tenure & property size (across the top) and when they are likely to need the property (down the side).

	Tenure & Size															Not known
	Owned					Shared ownership					Rented					
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed	
In the next 2 years																
In the next 3 - 5 years																
In 6+ years																

- Q11 The Parish Council is considering setting up a Community Land Trust (CLT). CLTs are set up and run by ordinary people to develop and manage homes as well as other assets. CLTs act as long-term stewards of housing, ensuring that it remains genuinely affordable, based on what people actually earn in their area, not just for now but for every future occupier. The Parish council would like to know if you would agree with them setting up such a scheme in principle.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Support/Disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't Understand
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q12 a) How many of your household play for, or are otherwise involved in, the following village sports clubs (please put the number of people involved in the relevant box)

Football	<input type="text"/>	Cricket	<input type="text"/>	Fitness class	<input type="text"/>
Table Tennis	<input type="text"/>	Golf	<input type="text"/>	Stool Ball	<input type="text"/>
Badminton	<input type="text"/>	Snooker	<input type="text"/>	Gym	<input type="text"/>

Other

b) Do members of your household use the local network of footpaths and bridleways for exercise e.g. walking (including dog-walking) jogging, running?

Yes
☐

No
☐

c) Are there any sports or activities you feel should be provided in Copthorne that are currently not?

Q13 a) How many vehicles does your household have?

	Cars	Vans	Motorbikes/scooters Bicycle
Petrol/Diesel	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Hybrid	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Electric	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

b) Over the next 5 years do you expect the number of cars, etc, owned by your household to increase?

Yes
☐

No
☐

c) When you replace your petrol or diesel powered vehicles will it be with an electric vehicle?

Yes
☐

No
☐

Unsure
☐

Q14 Do any members of your household work at Gatwick Airport or for a company which supports airport operations?

If Yes, how many?

No
☐

- Q15 a) How do members of your household travel to work? If they travel by train, please also include how they travel to the station. (please indicate the number for each)

		Mode of transport						
		Train	Car / Van	Motorbike	Bus	Bicycle	Foot	Work from home
Travel time	0 - 30 mins							
	31 - 60 mins							
	61 - 90 mins							
	91 - 120 mins							
	120+ mins							

- b) Has your households average travel to work time changed over the last 4 years?
- Increased ☐ No change ☐ Decreased ☐

- Q16 Please indicate which doctors surgery members of your household are registered with. Please enter the number registered in each box.
- Copthorne Surgery Another surgery

- Q17 Have any members of your household suffered from any type of crime in the last 5 years. If so please tick the relevant box which correctly indicated the type of crime and when you experienced it.

	Assault	Burglary	Theft	Vandalism	Cyber	Hate	Anti-social Behaviour	Road rage
Within the last 12 months								
1 to 2 years ago								
2 to 5 years ago								

- Q18 The neighbourhood plan is looking to protect our open spaces. Please identify any open space(s) that you would like protected. If possible please include attach a map to this form help us identify the area you identify.

Q19 Please state what you consider to be the three most important community facilities within the neighbourhood plan area.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Q20 Please let us know which community facilities your household uses in the box below:

--

Q21 Are there any community facilities you feel Copthorne is missing?

--

Q22 Do you have any comments on this survey, on issues not raised in the questions, or neighbourhood planning generally?

--

STAY UP TO DATE ON THE PLAN'S PROGRESS

If you would like to be kept up to date on the progress of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan, be informed when consultation events are to be held and when it reaches key stages of the process to adoption, please leave your name and email address below.

Please note that your name and email will not be linked to the responses you have provided above and be held in a separate database purely for the purposes set out above.

Name:

Email:

Worth Parish Council cares to ensure the security of Personal data. We make sure that your information is protected from authorised access, loss manipulation, falsification, destruction or unauthorised disclosure. This is done through appropriate technical measures and relevant policies. We will not share your data and only keep your data for the purpose it was collected for and only for as long as necessary, after which it will be deleted. (Please view our Privacy Notice & Retention Policy online at worth-pc.gov.uk)

Thank you for completing this survey!

Please fold and seal it in the pre- paid envelope provided. If you are able, please return this to one of the collection boxes located in Olivers Coffee and Wine, the Post Office, McColls Newsagent and the Parish Hub. This saves the Parish Council considerable postage costs.

Alternatively, the completed form can be posted in the pre-paid envelope.



2020 Policy Options Consultation Results & Analysis

Published: 01/05/2020

Prepared by the Copthorne
Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Contents

1	Introduction.....	2
2	Consultation Structure	3
	Publicity / Awareness	3
	Availability of material.....	3
	How people could respond	4
3	Consultation Responses	5
	Local Heritage Assets	5
	Local Green Space.....	6
	Character Areas	7
	Roads & Parking	7

Appendices

	Appendix 1 – Consultation Questionnaire	9
	Appendix 2 – A1 Drop in Session Boards	15

1 Introduction

- 1.1 A Steering Group, on behalf of Worth Parish Council, are preparing a new Neighbourhood Plan for Copthorne & Worth Ward. The group consulted on a draft plan under Regulation 14 of the Town & Country Planning, England, Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) between 6th March and 28th April 2017.
- 1.2 The Steering Group sought to update the plan in response to the comments received during this consultation, but it became apparent that considerable changes were required to the plan before it could proceed. Alongside this, planning policy at the local and national level was in a state of flux and so the group decided to pause, take stock and revisit the information on which the plan is based.
- 1.3 At the time of writing (January 2020) the policy position at the local and national level has settled and the Steering Group are working hard to prepare an updated evidence base and plan for a new Regulation 14 Consultation.
- 1.4 As part of the drive to update the evidence base, a survey was undertaken between July and August 2019. 2,079 hard copies of the surveys were prepared and given to a team of local volunteers to distribute to properties within the village of Copthorne asking various questions to gain evidence base for the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan. The responses received were used to prepare a draft evidence base on which the neighbourhood plan will be prepared.
- 1.5 Once this draft evidence was complete the Steering Group had several queries on the policy approach to take and they also wanted the community to have an opportunity to fact check and comment on the evidence gathered to date. As a result, a 'Policy Options Consultation' was undertaken between 9th March and 6th April 2020. This report is on this consultation.

2 Consultation Structure


- 2.1 This section provides an overview of how the consultation was conducted.
- 2.2 As stated above, this consultation brought together the outputs of the draft evidence prepared, and previous work, and sought our community's views on potential policy options that could be adopted within the emerging neighbourhood plan. In particular, the consultation concentrated on the following documents which have been prepared by, or on behalf of, the Steering Group:
- Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)
 - 2019 Copthorne Village Survey Results & Analysis (February 2020)
 - Draft Local Heritage Assets (February 2020)
 - Draft Local Green Space (February 2020)
- 2.3 The consultation consisted of a short topic-based questionnaire, the topics being Local Heritage Assets, Local Green Space, Character Areas and Roads & Parking. A copy of the consultation questionnaire is included in this report at **Appendix 1**.

Publicity / Awareness

- 2.4 Great efforts were made to ensure that all members of our community were aware of the consultation. At the start of the consultation the general public were notified in the following ways:
- Email mailshot to Parish Council database.
 - Posters/Notices put up on the noticeboards around the Parish.
 - Posts on social media including Facebook.
 - News article on the Parish Council website.
- 2.5 During the consultation it was planned that there would be two drop-in sessions where members of the Steering Group will be available to discuss the emerging plan and evidence base with you. These were to be held at The Parish Hub, Borers Arms Road, Copthorne, RH10 3ZQ on 16th March between 10-12 am and 2nd April 6-8 pm. Unfortunately, no one attended the first session and the second was cancelled due to social distancing measures. We believe the zero attendance at the first event was also due to COVID-19. The A1 display boards prepared for these events are included at **Appendix 2**.
- 2.6 Throughout the consultation efforts were made to engage with the local community but it is acknowledged that COVID-19 was on most peoples minds more than this consultation. Towards the end of the consultation a reminder email was sent to the Council's email database and reminders posted on social media.

Availability of material

- 2.7 Documents could be downloaded from the Parish Council website. Alternatively, hard copies could be requested from the Parish Council office.
- 2.8 A screenshot of the relevant website is below for reference:



How people could respond

- 2.9 Consultees could respond to the consultation by completing and returning the questionnaire by close of play on the 6th April 2020 to the The Parish Hub, Borers Arms Road, Copthorne, RH10 3ZQ. This could be done in person, post or by email.
- 2.10 The form was available to collect from the Parish Council office or download from the Worth Parish Council website at http://www.worth-pc.gov.uk/Copthorne_Consultations_29574.aspx as illustrated above.

3 Consultation Responses

- 3.1 Unfortunately, the consultation was running as the COVID-19 social distancing rules came into play and the country entered 'lockdown'. The result was that despite our best efforts there were only 5 responses to the consultation. Whilst this response rate was saddening, the Steering Group were grateful for any responses given what was going on in the world around them.
- 3.2 Whilst the response rate was considered too low to provide any meaningful steer of the community's views it is still appropriate to analyse the results and see whether we can learn from them.

Local Heritage Assets

- 3.3 The first section of the consultation asked consultees to consider the report on Local Heritage Assets (February 2020) which considered 65 undesignated heritage assets within the plan area with a view to establishing whether they are worthy of special identification and protection through the neighbourhood plan. The questionnaire explained that this protection would be achieved by designating them as 'Parish Heritage Assets' and including a policy indented to protect their significance.
- 3.4 The questionnaire listed the nine proposed Parish Heritage Assets and asked consultees to confirm if they agreed or disagreed with the consultation. The responses are set out below:

Undesignated heritage asset	Agree with designation	Disagree with designation
Rowfant Station	5	
Rose Cottage (formerly Rowfant Station House)	5	
The Prince Albert Public House	5	
Church of St John the Evangelist	5	
Lych Gate	5	
Copthorne CE Junior School	4	1
Claremont (former butcher's shop)	4	1
The Old Bakery	5	

- 3.5 Overall, there was strong support for all the proposed designations. One consultee disagreed with Copthorne CE Junior School and Claremont (former butcher's shop) being designated.

R.1 Steering Group review justification for designating Copthorne CE Junior School and Claremont (former butcher's shop) as Parish Heritage Assets.

- 3.6 Consultees were asked whether any further assets should be considered by the report. The following have been highlighted as worthy of consideration:
- Old cottage behind Bloomsbury Kitchens, Copthorne Bank – Rose Cottage?
 - No.2 St John the Divine Parish Marker Boundary stone dated 1881, in the west bank of the Sussex Border Parth between the A264 and Keepers Cottage. Grid ref TQ328386
- 3.7 The following question allowed consultees to highlight any potential errors or provide further information in the report titled Local Heritage Assets (February 2020). The following points were raised:

- BH31 is incorrect. It is still 2 cottages. The Retreat and Oakdene.
- BH63 was a Temperance House, this is not mentioned

R.2 Steering Group update Local Heritage Assets report in light of details provided above and consider whether the old cottage behind Bloomsbury Kitchens and No.2 St John the Divine Parish Marker Boundary Stone should be included and assessed in it.

Local Green Space

- 3.8 The next section related to the Local Green Space (February 2020) report which identified and assessed 19 open spaces within the plan area and considered whether they should be designated as Local Green Space. The draft report concluded that 9 spaces meet the tests and should therefore be designated as Local Green Space.
- 3.9 As with the heritage assets section, the first question in this section asked whether the consultee agreed with the proposed designations. The responses are below:


Space	Agree with designation	Disagree with designation
Westway designated green space area	5	
Copthorne Common	5	
Village Green	5	
Copthorne recreation ground and skate park	5	
Humphreys Field	5	
Erica Way Open Space	5	
Pinetrees Green Space	5	
St John's Churchyard	5	
Woodland East of Copthorne Common Road	5	1

- 3.10 One consultee recorded a response that they both agree and disagree with the proposed designation at Woodland East of Copthorne Common Road. We do not know whether this was in error or deliberate.
- 3.11 Further questions were asked relating to errors, further information or extra spaces that should be considered. Only one comment was received which was:
- A further green space will be the pathway from the new estate into Erica Way and this should be included.

R.3 The Steering Group consider whether the pathway from the new estate into Erica Way should be assessed in the Local Green Space report and if yes to update report accordingly.

Character Areas

- 3.12 Consultees were then asked to consider the Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019) report. This identifies five areas with distinctly different 'character' from one another. When asked whether the report provided an accurate reflection of the plan area all five responses selected 'Yes'.
- 3.13 In order to assist the Steering Group in which approach to take with regard to the formulation of policy they were asked to confirm their stance with regard to a number of statements. They had to select from the following Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree or Strongly Disagree. By applying a numerical value to each response, we are able to establish the overall level of agreement or disagreement. The table below illustrates the overall level of agreement where 2 is strongly agree and -2 is strongly disagree.



- 3.14 Whilst the response group is limited the results do indicate that there is a preference for reinforcing distinct local character, both in terms of design and materials. There is also less agreement with prioritising modern or energy efficient design.

R.4 The Steering Group consider policy approach to take with regard to character. The results above would suggest one that advocates traditional local design that responds to a developments immediate surroundings.

Roads & Parking

- 3.15 The questionnaire then asked several questions regarding roads and parking which sought to answer questions that had arisen following analysis of the results of the 2019 Copthorne Village Survey.
- 3.16 Consultees were asked to rank a number of objectives in order of their importance, the overall result of this exercise resulted in the following order of importance (1 being the most important).
- (1) Make it easier and safer for people to walk and cycle. [Average score = 1.6]
 - (2) Protect our soft road verges (grass, vegetation, etc) from all development (including pavements, driveways and parking spaces). [Average score = 2.6]

- (3) Increase the amount of off-road parking. *[Average score = 2.8]*
- (4) Promote and facilitate the move to electric vehicles (for example by requiring charging points in new developments). *[Average score = 3.6]*
- (5) Increase use of public transport and make it harder for people to own and use private motor vehicles. *[Average score = 4.4]*

3.17 Whilst the above order of objectives is interesting it is important to consider the average scores – these illustrate that objective 2 and 3, which are almost opposites in terms of objectives, score very similarly and could be described as equally important.

R.5 The Steering Group consider policy approach that concentrates on promoting walking and cycling. A balance needs to be struck in policy between the desire to provide parking and the desire to protect road verges. This is also illustrated in the responses and comments in response to the final question.

3.18 Finally, the questionnaire stated that the 'Steering Group are considering including a policy which would allow some large grassed road verges to be turned into additional off-road parking spaces. Would you support such a policy?' Consultees were asked to respond yes/no and then provide any comments they may wish to make.

3.19 Out of the 5 responses received, 3 ticked 'No' and 2 ticked 'Yes'.

3.20 Those who ticked no provided the following comments:

- In Church Lane, for example, on-road parking helps to reduce vehicle speeds.
- We need to keep our areas of vegetation, not concrete them over.
- Some areas have already been destroyed by parking. Where areas have not, they should be kept.

3.21 Those who ticked yes provided the following comments:

- Especially at the end of Westway (near Brookhill Road) the grass area is deep enough to provide parking which would remove the dangerous on-road parking currently there. All new developments must provide similar parking bays in addition to off-road parking (possibly for every 2/3 houses).
- Current parking is inadequate leading to blocked pavements and delays to road traffic.

Appendix 1 – Consultation Questionnaire



Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan Policy Options Consultation

9th March 2020 – 6th April 2020

Update & about this consultation

The Steering Group have been busy preparing evidence to support the neighbourhood plan. Last year we conducted a housing survey and prepared documents which look at our heritage and open spaces and how the plan can work to protect these important spaces.

The results of the survey and the other evidence documents can be viewed online at www.worth-pc.gov.uk or by clicking the direct links below:

- Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)
- 2019 Copthorne Village Survey Results & Analysis (February 2020)
- Draft Local Heritage Assets (February 2020)
- Draft Local Green Space (February 2020)

This consultation brings together the outputs of the above draft evidence and previous work and seeks our community's views on policy options that could be adopted within the emerging neighbourhood plan.

It is anticipated that the results of this consultation will directly influence the policies in the neighbourhood plan that is taken forward. Please complete and return this consultation questionnaire before **6th April 2020**.

Who is preparing the plan?

The Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan Sub-Committee has been entrusted by the Parish Council to prepare the neighbourhood plan for Copthorne Ward. The Committee consists of Councillors and residents who care about our community, they also welcome like-minded individuals who want to play a role in shaping the future of Copthorne.

If you are interested in becoming involved, please email nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk.

More information?

For more information please contact Worth Parish Council by email at nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk or by phone on 01342 713407.

1. LOCAL HERITAGE ASSETS

The Local Heritage Assets (February 2020) report has considered 65 undesignated heritage assets within the plan area with a view to establishing whether they are worthy of special identification and protection through the neighbourhood plan. This would be achieved by designating them as 'Parish Heritage Assets' and including a policy indented to protect their significance.

Before answering the questions in this section, we ask that you read the Local Heritage Assets (February 2020) report.

1.1 Please indicate below whether you agree with the recommended designations:

Undesignated heritage asset	Agree with designation	Disagree with designation
Rowfant Station	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rose Cottage (formerly Rowfant Station House)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Prince Albert Public House	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Church of St John the Evangelist	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lych Gate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Copthorne CE Junior School	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Claremont (former butcher's shop)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Old Bakery	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Former Prizefighting Ring in Copthorne Common Woods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.2 If there are any heritage assets missing from the draft report which are not already protected (i.e. by being listed) please let us know in the box below (please ensure you provide adequate information to enable us to identify them on the ground):

1.3 If you disagree with any of the assessment conclusions in the report, or have additional information about any of the assets considered which should inform the assessment work please provide this commentary / information in the box below:

2. LOCAL GREEN SPACE

The Local Green Space (February 2020) report identifies and assesses 19 open spaces within the plan area and considers whether they should be designated as Local Green Space. Once a space is designated as Local Green Space it is treated akin to Green Belt and development proposals are assessed in line with Green Belt policy. There are however strict policy tests (set out in national policy) which a space must meet before it can be designated and the Local Green Space (February 2020) report considers whether the spaces considered meet these tests. The draft report concludes that 9 spaces meet the tests and should therefore be designated as Local Green Space.

Before answering the questions in this section, please read the Local Green Space (February 2020) report.

2.1 Please indicate whether you agree with the recommended designations below:

Space	Agree with designation	Disagree with designation
Westway designated green space area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Copthorne Common	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Village Green	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Copthorne recreation ground and skate park	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Humphreys Field	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Erica Way Open Space	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pinetrees Green Space	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
St John's Churchyard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Woodland East of Copthorne Common Road	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.2 If there are any spaces missing from the draft report which you believe should be considered, please let us know in the box below (please ensure you provide adequate information to enable us to identify them on the ground):

2.3 If you disagree with any of the assessment conclusions in the report, or have additional information about any of the spaces considered which should inform the assessment work please provide this commentary / information in the box below:

3. CHARACTER AREAS

The Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019) report identifies five areas with distinctly different 'character' from one another. These character areas primarily relate to the built environment, age of properties and the architectural styles prevalent in each of them.

The Steering Group are keen to understand whether the community considers the distinctive character areas to be important locally.

3.1 Do you consider the Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019) provides an accurate reflection of the plan area?

Yes ☐
No ☐

If you answer "No" above, please explain your response below:

3.2 Please state whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
We should be promoting modern architectural design.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The character of each identified character area is important and new development should reflect the area in which they are built.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
New buildings should not be a pastiche of our existing buildings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Traditional building materials are important.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local building materials are important.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We should promote the use of new and innovative building techniques and materials.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We should try and unify the built style across the plan area with a single policy relating to design.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Energy efficiency in buildings is more important than design.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. ROADS & PARKING

The 2019 Copthorne Village Survey has identified some interesting statistics regarding our roads, parking spaces, private vehicle ownership and travel patterns. This section seeks to understand how the community believe we could best address the problems identified.

Please read the 2019 Copthorne Village Survey Results & Analysis (February 2020) before answering the questions in this section.

4.1 Please list the following objectives in order of importance (1 being most important, 5 being least important):

Objective	Rank
Increase use of public transport and make it harder for people to own and use private motor vehicles.	
Promote and facilitate the move to electric vehicles (for example by requiring charging points in new developments).	
Protect our soft road verges (grass, vegetation, etc) from all development (including pavements, driveways and parking spaces).	
Increase the amount of off-road parking.	
Make it easier and safer for people to walk and cycle.	

4.2 The Steering Group are considering including a policy which would allow some large grassed road verges to be turned into additional off-road parking spaces. Would you support such a policy?

Yes ☐
No ☐

Please explain your response below:

STAY UP TO DATE ON THE PLAN'S PROGRESS

If you would like to be kept up to date on the progress of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan, be informed when consultation events are to be held and when it reaches key stages of the process to adoption, please leave your name and email address below.

Please note that your name and email will not be linked to the responses you have provided above and be held in a separate database purely for the purposes set out above.

Name:

Email:

Worth Parish Council cares to ensure the security of Personal data. We make sure that your information is protected from authorised access, loss manipulation, falsification, destruction or unauthorised disclosure. This is done through appropriate technical measures and relevant policies. We will not share your data and only keep your data for the purpose it was collected for and only for as long as necessary, after which it will be deleted. (Please view our Privacy Notice & Retention Policy online at worth-pc.gov.uk)

Thank you for completing this consultation response!

Please return it in person to the Parish Hub or by email to nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk

Appendix 2 – A1 Drop in Session Boards

Review of Local Heritage Assets

A review of Heritage Assets has been prepared by the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.


Heritage assets across the UK are protected both in law and through the control of development and planning policy. That this review does not seek to add local heritage status to assets already protected by International, National or Local designations as this would unnecessarily duplicate matters.

The purpose of this review is to establish whether there are any 'non-designated heritage assets' within the parish that should be afforded protection by the neighbourhood plan for their local historical importance or significance and identify such assets.

The map below shows the locations of the 65 potential heritage assets identified and then assessed in the draft evidence base document titled 'Local Heritage Assets'.

Those highlighted with a red circle are proposed to be allocated as a Local Heritage Asset in the neighbourhood plan and protected for their historic significance. Those with black labels have been assessed but not recommended for designation - for details of these please see the associated draft document.

**Do you agree with the assessments made in the document?
Do you have any further information that would help us in our assessments? Please let us know!**



Review of Open Spaces (Local Green Space)

The community has confirmed that our Open Spaces are important. The Steering Group have therefore undertaken a review of our open spaces to establish whether any areas are worthy of protection.

National planning policy has introduced a 'Local Green Space' which is a way to provide special protection for green areas of particular importance to local communities. Once an area is designated there would be no development on it other than in very special circumstances. The space would be treated akin to Green Belt.

However, national policy is clear that Local Green Space can only be designated where the green space is:

- in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

Using comments received from the survey conducted in Summer 2019, the AECOM Heritage and Characterisation Study, and the Steering Group's local knowledge 19 spaces were identified for assessment.

The draft assessments are included in the Local Green Space document we are consulting on. Those spaces which we currently consider worthy of protection are set out in the table below and marked in red on the map below.

Ref.	Name	Reason
2	Westway designated green space area	Recreational value, Tranquility & Wildlife
3	Cophorne Common	Beauty, Historic significance, Recreational value, Tranquility, Wildlife
4	Village Green	Historic significance, Recreational value
6	Cophorne recreation ground and skate park	Recreational value
7	Humphreys Field	Historic significance, Recreational value
9	Erica Way Open Space	Historic significance, Recreational value, Wildlife
12	Pinetrees Green Space	Tranquility
15	St John's Churchyard	Beauty, Historic significance, Tranquility, Wildlife
17	Woodland East of Cophorne Common Road	Beauty, Recreational value


What do you think?

Have we missed any spaces that should be considered?

Do you agree / disagree with our draft conclusions?

Should we be protecting these spaces? Or not?

Please let us know your views by completing the consultation questionnaire - your view matters!



COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Regulation 14 Consultation

Worth Parish Council are running an 8-week consultation on a new neighbourhood plan for Copthorne in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Once the plan has been agreed at referendum and 'made', it will have the same legal status as the Local Plan prepared by Mid Sussex District Council and will be used in the determination of planning applications.

The draft plan contains planning policies, that will apply in our area, relating to:

- Green Spaces
- Design
- Traffic and Travel
- Character Areas
- The Historic Environment
- Community Buildings
- Economy
- Infill Development
- Homes for Older People

We want to know what you think about the plan and its accompanying documents so that we can make sure the plan reflects the views of the community. This is the **last opportunity to comment** before the plan is submitted to Mid Sussex District Council.

All responses to this consultation must be received in writing prior to the end of the consultation period at midnight on 13 November 2020.

If you have any questions regarding this consultation, please contact us by emailing nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk or phoning 01342 713407.

For more information about neighbourhood plans please visit <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

CONSULTATION PERIOD

This consultation is running from
18 September 2020 till midnight on
13 November 2020.

CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS

All consultation documents and
details of how to submit your
comments can be found at
www.worth-pc.gov.uk

If you are unable to access this
website or view the documents online,
please phone the Parish Council on
01342 713407 who will ensure you
have access to a hard copy, taking into
account current COVID-19 restrictions.





Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan

17 September · 🌐

...

This is the last opportunity to comment and influence the plan before it is submitted. The 8 week consultation starts on 18 September until midnight 13 November. More details can be found at www.worth-pc.gov.uk

COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Regulation 14 Consultation

Worth Parish Council are running an 8-week consultation on a new neighbourhood plan for Copthorne in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Once the plan has been agreed at referendum and 'made', it will have the same legal status as the Local Plan prepared by Mid Sussex District Council and will be used in the determination of planning applications.

The draft plan contains planning policies that will apply in our area, relating to:

- Green Spaces
- Design
- Traffic and Travel
- Character Areas
- The Historic Environment
- Community Buildings
- Economy
- Infill Development
- Homes for Older People

We want to know what you think about the plan and its accompanying documents so that we can make sure the plan reflects the views of the community. This is the **last opportunity to comment** before the plan is submitted to Mid Sussex District Council.

All responses to this consultation must be received in writing prior to the end of the consultation period at midnight on 13 November 2020.

If you have any questions regarding this consultation, please contact us by emailing nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk or phoning 01342 713407.

For more information about neighbourhood plans please visit <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning-2>

CONSULTATION PERIOD

This consultation is running from
18 September 2020 till midnight on
13 November 2020.

CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS

All consultation documents and details of how to submit your comments can be found at
www.worth-pc.gov.uk

If you are unable to access this website or view the documents online, please phone the Parish Council on 01342 713407 who will ensure you have access to a hard copy, taking into account current COVID-19 restrictions.





Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan

26 October · 🌐



Comment on the Draft Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan

The Parish Council are now consulting on the draft plan, and its associated evidence base, to make sure that the plan reflects the aspirations of the local community whilst adhering to its legal requirements and constraints before it is submitted to Mid Sussex District Council. The deadline for submissions is midnight on 13 November 2020.

We are seeking views and comments from everyone that has an interest in the parish. All consultation documents and details of how to submit consultation responses can be found at www.worth-pc.gov.uk. We look forward to receiving your consultation response.



1

1 share



Like



Comment



Share



Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan

5 November at 11:20 · 🌐

...

Comment on the Draft Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan!

The Parish Council are seeking views and comments from everyone that has an interest in the parish to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the aspirations of the local community.

Please let us know what you think. Your comments really matter!

All consultation documents and details of how to submit consultation responses can be found at www.worth-pc.gov.uk.

The deadline for submissions is midnight on Friday 13 November 2020.

**ONLY 7
DAYS LEFT!**

APPENDIX 13 Example Regulation 14 notification email

Squires Planning

From: Squires Planning
Sent: 18 September 2020 15:01
To: planningpolicy@midsussex.gov.uk
Subject: Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Consultation

COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Regulation 14 Consultation

Dear Mid Sussex District Council,

We are writing on behalf of Worth Parish Council to invite your comments on the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan which is now out for consultation in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. It is an eight-week consultation which runs from today, 18 September 2020, until midnight on 13 November 2020.

You are receiving this email as you have either engaged previously and asked to be kept informed of the plan as it progresses, or because you are a statutory consultee.

Views and comments are sought from everyone that has an interest in the parish. Views and comments may relate to the proposed policies, the content/wording of the plan, whether the evidence base is appropriate/correct or whether anything is missing from the plan. If your comments do not fit into one of these categories, please do not worry – please submit your comments anyway as your input is valued.

The purpose of the consultation is to ensure that the proposed Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan reflects the aspirations of the local community whilst adhering to its legal requirements and constraints. Once we have taken consultation responses into account the plan will move to the next regulatory stage and be submitted to Mid Sussex District Council. This is the last opportunity for you to comment and influence the plan before it is submitted.

The consultation documents comprise:

1. Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (August 2020)
2. Draft Consultation Statement (August 2020)
3. Copthorne SEA Screening (July 2020)
4. Assessment of Local Heritage Assets (August 2020)
5. Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)
6. Local Green Space Assessment (August 2020)

All consultation documents and details of how to submit consultation responses can be found at www.worth-pc.gov.uk. If you are unable to access this website or view the documents online, please phone the Parish Council on 01342 713407 who will ensure you have access to a hard copy, taking into account current COVID-19 restrictions.

All responses to this consultation must be received in writing prior to the end of the consultation period and will likely be published verbatim when the plan is submitted to Mid Sussex District Council. Anonymous responses, responses that contain inappropriate language, defamation or are deemed to be offensive will not be accepted.

We look forward to receiving your consultation response, please ensure it is submitted before midnight on 13 November 2020.

Squires Planning

From: Squires Planning
Sent: 23 October 2020 12:25
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan - Consultation Reminder

COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Regulation 14 Consultation

Dear Mid Sussex District Council,

We are writing on behalf of Worth Parish Council to remind you that the current consultation on the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012) **ends in 20 days** at midnight on 13th November 2020. Please accept our thanks if you have already provided your consultation response – we value your input. If you have not yet responded, we look forward to receiving your consultation response.

Views and comments are sought from everyone that has an interest in the parish. Views and comments may relate to the proposed policies, the content/wording of the plan, whether the evidence base is appropriate/correct or whether anything is missing from the plan. If your comments do not fit into one of these categories, please do not worry – please submit your comments anyway as your input is valued.

The purpose of the consultation is to ensure that the proposed Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan reflects the aspirations of the local community whilst adhering to its legal requirements and constraints. Once we have taken consultation responses into account the plan will move to the next regulatory stage and be submitted to Mid Sussex District Council. This is the last opportunity for you to comment and influence the plan before it is submitted.

The consultation documents comprise:

1. Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (August 2020)
2. Draft Consultation Statement (August 2020)
3. Copthorne SEA Screening (July 2020)
4. Assessment of Local Heritage Assets (August 2020)
5. Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)
6. Local Green Space Assessment (August 2020)

All consultation documents and details of how to submit consultation responses can be found at www.worth-pc.gov.uk. If you are unable to access this website or view the documents online, please phone the Parish Council on 01342 713407 who will ensure you have access to a hard copy, taking into account current COVID-19 restrictions.

We look forward to receiving your consultation response, please ensure it is submitted before midnight on 13 November 2020.

Should you have any difficulty accessing www.worth-pc.gov.uk or require any further information about this consultation, please contact Worth Parish Council on 01342 713407 or nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk.

This email has been sent by Squires Planning on behalf of Worth Parish Council.

01293 978 200 | www.squiresplanning.co.uk

Squires Planning

From: Squires Planning
Sent: 11 November 2020 11:54
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan Reg.14 Consultation - Final Reminder

~ FINAL REMINDER ~

COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Regulation 14 Consultation

Dear Turners Hill Parish Council,

We are writing on behalf of Worth Parish Council to remind you that the current consultation on the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012) **ends in 2 days at midnight on 13th November 2020**. We really value your input so if you have not yet responded please do so.

Views and comments are sought from everyone that has an interest in the parish. Views and comments may relate to the proposed policies, the content/wording of the plan, whether the evidence base is appropriate/correct or whether anything is missing from the plan. If your comments do not fit into one of these categories, please do not worry – please submit your comments anyway as your input is valued.

The purpose of the consultation is to ensure that the proposed Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan reflects the aspirations of the local community whilst adhering to its legal requirements and constraints. Once we have taken consultation responses into account the plan will move to the next regulatory stage and be submitted to Mid Sussex District Council. This is the last opportunity for you to comment and influence the plan before it is submitted.

The consultation documents comprise:

1. Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (August 2020)
2. Draft Consultation Statement (August 2020)
3. Copthorne SEA Screening (July 2020)
4. Assessment of Local Heritage Assets (August 2020)
5. Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)
6. Local Green Space Assessment (August 2020)


All consultation documents and details of how to submit consultation responses can be found at www.worth-pc.gov.uk. If you are unable to access this website or view the documents online, please phone the Parish Council on 01342 713407 who will ensure you have access to a hard copy, taking into account current COVID-19 restrictions.

Please ensure your response it is submitted before midnight on 13 November 2020.

Should you have any difficulty accessing www.worth-pc.gov.uk or require any further information about this consultation, please contact Worth Parish Council on 01342 713407 or nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk.

This email has been sent by Squires Planning on behalf of Worth Parish Council.

01293 978 200 | www.squiresplanning.co.uk



Mia (age 7) and Chloe (age 9) - Tribute to all Key Workers



Richard B - Two books written during the May-July 'lockdown', both horror stories (one VERY loosely part-based on real events), and although I have not yet received a review, a spooky story, they are both very much in the horror genre, so some of the more ghoulish Copthornians should 'go in' for free on Amazon Kindle 3, but I will happily send all copies to my non-Kindle users.



Robert Vickers - Designed and made from pallets collected from residents of the village

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ For the village by the village ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
Thank you to all our advertisers and contributors, your support helps the magazine to continue!

SHELLEY COPTHORNE EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

Registered Charity No. 306408

ARE YOU ATTENDING COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY THIS YEAR?

Small grants towards the expenses of college or university courses are available to students, under the age of 25 years, who are resident in or around the civil and ecclesiastical parishes of Worth.

Applications for grants should only be made for courses where a confirmed offer of a place has been accepted.

Application should be by letter, giving brief details of yourself, including date of birth, your education and the course you will be undertaking, and addressed to:

The Honorary Secretary,
The Shelley Copthorne Educational Foundation,
3, Saxton Road,
Worth,
Crawley RH10 7SA

Applications by 1st November for consideration in the current year.



THE MARTINS

INDEPENDENT FUNERAL DIRECTORS

THE CARING AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE FOR WHICH WE ARE RENOWNED IS AVAILABLE AT

38-40 Broadfield Barton,

Crawley, RH11 9BA

01293 552345 (24hrs)

www.themartinsfuneraldirectors.co.uk

Free parking in front of the premises or if you wish arrangements can be made in your own home



An established family concern owned by Alex Jones and family

COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Regulation 14 Consultation

Worth Parish Council are running an 8-week consultation on a new neighbourhood plan for Copthorne in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Once the plan has been agreed at referendum and 'made', it will have the same legal status as the Local Plan prepared by Mid Sussex District Council and will be used in the determination of planning applications.

The draft plan contains planning policies, that will apply in our area, relating to:

- Green Spaces
- Design
- Traffic and Travel
- Character Areas
- The Historic Environment
- Community Buildings
- Economy
- Infill Development
- Homes for Older People

We want to know what you think about the plan and its accompanying documents so that we can make sure the plan reflects the views of the community. This is the **last opportunity to comment** before the plan is submitted to Mid Sussex District Council.

All responses to this consultation must be received in writing prior to the end of the consultation period at midnight on 13 November 2020.

If you have any questions regarding this consultation, please contact us by emailing nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk or phoning 01342 713407.

For more information about neighbourhood plans please visit <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning-2>

CONSULTATION PERIOD

This consultation is running from 18 September 2020 till midnight on 13 November 2020.

CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS

All consultation documents and details of how to submit your comments can be found at www.worth-pc.gov.uk

If you are unable to access this website or view the documents online, please phone the Parish Council on 01342 713407 who will ensure you have access to a hard copy, taking into account current COVID-19 restrictions.





WORTH PARISH COUNCIL

NEWSLETTER - Autumn 2020



CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

As I write this to you all, we are still trying to interpret the latest Government advice on limiting social gatherings to 6. This limit applies both inside and outside, and is now legally enforceable with fines etc. Please be aware when congregating on the green and other open spaces! We believe that this applies in our play areas, so please try to avoid entering play areas if there are others already using them. We will put up additional signage if this is indeed confirmed.

Organised indoor and outdoor sports, physical activity and exercise classes are still allowed with

more than 6 attendees, which will be a relief to many.

Whilst I do appreciate that this advice is necessary, it does get very confusing at times - please spare a thought for our staff and those running community buildings whose job it is to read all the guidance and to keep our communities safe.

In the meantime, stay healthy and safe.

Elaine Annscomb, Chairman

WORTH PARISH COUNCIL

The Parish Council continues to meet virtually. You are very welcome to attend any of our meetings; contact the Clerk who will give you joining instructions. All agendas and minutes are on our website worth-pc.gov.uk.

The Parish Council Office itself remains closed to the public for the foreseeable future. Please contact the Clerk to make an appointment should

you have to meet in person with a member of staff.

We are short staffed at the moment due to one of the groundsmen being off sick, so please bear with us as our remaining man tries to keep both villages clean and tidy on his own. Please continue to take your litter home with you, as litter picking does take up a lot of our team's time - thank you!

COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION

Worth Parish Council are running an 8 week consultation on a new Neighbourhood Plan for Copthorne in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Once the plan has been agreed at referendum and 'made', it will have the same legal status as the Local Plan prepared by Mid Sussex District Council and will be used in the determination of planning applications.

The draft plan contains planning policies, that will apply in our area, such as green spaces, character areas, historic environment etc.

All consultation documents and details of how to submit your comments can be found at www.worth-pc.gov.uk

If you are unable to access this website or view the documents online, please phone the Parish Council on 01342 713407, who will ensure you have access to a hard copy, taking into account current COVID-19 restrictions.

The consultation runs from 18th September 2020 to midnight on 13th November 2020.

WORTH PARISH COUNCIL Autumn 2020

Parish Councillor Contact details

To assist compliance with data protection, any email contact regarding Council matters, should be made via the email addresses listed below:

Crawley Down Ward

Elaine Annscomb	elaine.anscomb@worth-pc.gov.uk	01342 715213
Phillip Coote	Phillip.coote@worth-pc.gov.uk	01342 713443
Alex Cruickshank	Alex.cruickshank@worth-pc.gov.uk	01342 714328
Les Flanagan	les.flanagan@worth-pc.gov.uk	07763 121124
Ian Gibson	Ian.gibson@worth-pc.gov.uk	01342 716790
John Hitchcock	John.hitchcock@worth-pc.gov.uk	01342 716831
Chris Mayor	Chris.mayor@worth-pc.gov.uk	07710 039277
Kerry Scott	kerry.scott@worth-pc.gov.uk	01342 712213
Roger Webb	Roger.webb@worth-pc.gov.uk	01342 719029

Copthorne & Worth Ward

Graham Casella	Graham.casella@worth-pc.gov.uk	07710 019516
Tony Dorey	Tony.dorey@worth-pc.gov.uk	07802 359123
Andrew Dymond	Andrew.dymond@worth-pc.gov.uk	07834 486098
Trevor Hodsdon	Trevor.hodsdon@worth-pc.gov.uk	07771 810220
Bob King	Bob.king@worth-pc.gov.uk	07851 332918
Chris Larkin	Chris.larkin@worth-pc.gov.uk	01342 714350
Eddie Lord	Eddie.lord@worth-pc.gov.uk	01342 714905
Chris Phillips	Chris.phillips@worth-pc.gov.uk	01342 712668

Mid Sussex District Councillor Contact details

Copthorne & Worth Ward

Chris Phillips	Chris.phillips@midssussex.gov.uk	01342 712668
Vacancy		

Crawley Down & Turner Hill Ward

Phillip Coote	Phillip.coote@midssussex.gov.uk	01342 713443
Ian Gibson	Ian.gibson@midssussex.gov.uk	01342 716790
Roger Webb	Roger.webb@midssussex.gov.uk	01342 719029

West Sussex District Councillors Contact details

Imberdown Ward

Heidi Brunson	Heidi.brunson@westsussex.gov.uk	01342 327200
Bill Acraman	Bill.acraman@westsussex.gov.uk	01444 400079

Worth Forest Ward

Jennifer Nagy	clerk@worth-pc.gov.uk	
Ellen Smith	rf@worth-pc.gov.uk	
Tracy Cruickshank	astclerk@worth-pc.gov.uk	

Parish Council Officers

Clerk
Finance Officer
Assistant Clerk

The Council Offices are currently CLOSED to the public.

Worth Parish Council, First Floor, The Parish Hub, Boreis Arms Road, Copthorne, West Sussex, RH10 3ZQ
Tel: 01342 713407 www.worth-pc.gov.uk

HELP WANTED!

Copthorne Magazine is looking for volunteers to help with the delivery of the magazine. The magazine is delivered to homes in and around the village every two months. If you are interested in helping, please contact the Church Office on 01342 712063.

Squires Planning

From: Squires Planning
Sent: 25 September 2020 11:31
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Worth Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan
Subject: Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Consultation

COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN Regulation 14 Consultation

Dear Copthorne Golf Club,

We are writing on behalf of Worth Parish Council to invite your comments on the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan which is now out for consultation in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. It is an eight-week consultation which runs until midnight on 13 November 2020.

You are receiving this email as land within your ownership is proposed to be designated as Local Green Space (LGS) by policy **CNP7 Local Green Space** of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (August 2020). Open spaces may be designated as LGS where they are demonstrably special to the local community. An assessment of all sites considered is set out in the evidence document which supports the plan titled Local Green Space Assessment (August 2020).

The land parcels within your ownership which are proposed to be designated as LGS, as referenced by policy **CNP7 Local Green Space** of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (August 2020), are:

- b) Copthorne Common
- i) Woodland East of Copthorne Common Road

Views and comments are sought on the proposed plan from everyone that has an interest in the parish. Views and comments may relate to the proposed policies, the content/wording of the plan, whether the evidence base is appropriate/correct or whether anything is missing from the plan. If your comments do not fit into one of these categories, please do not worry – please submit your comments anyway as your input is valued.

The purpose of the consultation is to ensure that the proposed Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan reflects the aspirations of the local community whilst adhering to its legal requirements and constraints. Once we have taken consultation responses into account the plan will move to the next regulatory stage and be submitted to Mid Sussex District Council. This is the last opportunity for you to comment and influence the plan before it is submitted.

The consultation documents comprise (click on document title to open):

1. Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (August 2020)
2. Draft Consultation Statement (August 2020)
3. Copthorne SEA Screening (July 2020)
4. Assessment of Local Heritage Assets (August 2020)
5. Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019)
6. Local Green Space Assessment (August 2020)

All consultation documents and details of how to submit consultation responses can be found at www.worth-pc.gov.uk. If you are unable to access this website or view the documents online,

please phone the Parish Council on 01342 713407 who will ensure you have access to a hard copy, taking into account current COVID-19 restrictions.

All responses to this consultation must be received in writing prior to the end of the consultation period and will likely be published verbatim when the plan is submitted to Mid Sussex District Council. Anonymous responses, responses that contain inappropriate language, defamation or are deemed to be offensive will not be accepted.

We look forward to receiving your consultation response, please ensure it is submitted before midnight on 13 November 2020.

Should you have any difficulty accessing www.worth-pc.gov.uk or require any further information about this consultation, please contact Worth Parish Council on 01342 713407 or nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk.

This email has been sent by Squires Planning on behalf of Worth Parish Council.

01293 978 200 | www.squiresplanning.co.uk

Squires Planning is the trading name of Squires Planning Ltd. The company is registered in England & Wales with Company Number 11917764. The registered office is Home Farm, Purley on Thames, Reading, Berkshire, RG8 8AX. The office address is Squires Planning, The Long Barn, Poplars Place, Turners Hill Road, Crawley, RH10 4HH.

COPTHORNE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM



This is a formal consultation on the Pre-Submission Copthorne Neighbourhood Development Plan in accordance with Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. This consultation runs from 18 September 2020 until midnight on Friday, 13 November 2020.

All responses to this consultation must be received in writing prior to the end of the consultation period. Comments will be published verbatim when the plan is submitted to Mid Sussex District Council under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Anonymous responses, responses that contain inappropriate language, defamation or are deemed to be offensive will not be accepted. If your comment is not accepted, we will notify you, so long as contact details have been provided and consent given for us to contact you. Please note that fields marked with a * are required. Failure to provide required information may result in your response not being considered.

Please use the tables on the following pages to provide your comments. All documents subject to consultation are available to download from www.worth-pc.gov.uk. If you are unable to access this website or view the documents online, please phone the Parish Council on 01342 713407 who will ensure you have access to a hard copy, taking into account current COVID-19 restrictions.

Please note that by completing this response you accept that Worth Parish Council can store the personal data you have provided in this form and use it in the preparation of the neighbourhood plan. Please return this completed form to Worth Parish Council, 1st Floor, The Parish Hub, Borers Arms Road, Copthorne, West Sussex, RH10 3ZQ no later than midnight on Friday, 13 November, 2020. Please note that digital responses are preferred as it saves valuable volunteer time.

1. About you

First Name*	Last Name*	
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
Company Name	Address 1 (Name / No.)	Address 2 (Road)
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address 3 (Town)	Address 4 (County)	Address 5 (Post Code) *
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Email address		
<input type="text"/>		
Please tick all of the following that apply to you...		
I live in the parish <input type="checkbox"/>	I am a Statutory Consultee <input type="checkbox"/>	
I work in the parish <input type="checkbox"/>	I am an Agent <input type="checkbox"/>	
None of the above <input type="checkbox"/>		

APPENDIX 18 Verbatim Regulation 14 representations

DOCUMENT: REG.14 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
7/4	7	para 1.10	correctly states policies within the CNP are a “key material consideration” but goes onto imply permission will only be granted if “all relevant policies” are “.... complied with”. Non-compliance or partial compliance with a particular policy (or policies) in the CNP may be outweighed when the Development Plan is read as a whole, in accordance with planning legislation. It may be better to consider wording such as “Planning applications are more likely to be successful if all relevant policies within this plan are considered and complied with”.	The suggestion is noted. It is considered that the current wording is appropriate.
15/9	10		General comments. If we look at the Vision it is to retain Copthorne as a Village, a theme that runs through the whole document and is entirely appropriate. The document does not however define or demonstrate what it regards as A Village or The Village. The Glossary will benefit from such clarification. There may be benefit in developing the thinking behind the Green Ring, which seems anyway inconsistent as it includes the already under development West of Copthorne and Newlands Park. Maybe the concept of an established Village and a Village Envelope including the West of Copthorne would define geographically the area. As to Newlands Park... Needs to be clearer regarding intentions, I think. I thought the document to be well constructed, concise, generally precise and helpful but think page 10 .12 should not say “to be hoped”. By definition that is not a plan. Better to state “Intends.”	Noted. The defined village boundary is shown on the MSDC District Plan Policy Map for Copthorne. The existing wording is considered suitable as the Neighbourhood Plan is part of a wider development plan.
40/2 6	10	para 3.10	Paragraph 3.10 highlights the impact created as a result of development, stating: “These developments will put a strain on the existing overstretched resources of the village, and it is to be expected that there will be some expansion of the schools, doctor’s surgery and sport and recreation facilities to cope with the increased population”. The NP sub-committee will be aware of the range of new facilities being delivered through the development of land west of Copthorne. The development provides a site for a new primary school, contributions to secondary school and sixth form provision, site for a GP surgery, and contributions to bus services and improved sports provision for the village. It should also be acknowledged that the development will also provide highway improvements, new allotments, a community park, and accessible open spaces, that will benefit existing as well as new residents, for the duration of the Neighbourhood Plan and beyond. SMD welcomes further clarification and adjustment to	Noted.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			this section of the Plan to reflect the positive contributions this development is making towards the local community.	
41/26	10	para 3.10-3.12	<p>Compliance with Development Plan</p> <p>The NP refers to the aspiration for development in the future to comprise of small scale sites within the existing built-up area (BUA) of Copthorne (paragraph 3.10-3.12).</p> <p>However, to ensure that the Plan is consistent with basic conditions 1 and 5, SMD suggests that the description of the future for Copthorne includes the ongoing development of land west of Copthorne and the sites allocated as part of the Mid Sussex District Council's (MSDC) emerging Site Allocations DPD, namely site reference SA4. This will ensure the clear consistency with the Development Plan, in line with condition 5 of the basic conditions.</p>	Noted. It has been agreed with the Local Planning Authority that the neighbourhood plan would not allocate sites. There is no need to duplicate policies elsewhere in the development plan.
53/30	10		Typos: Borers Arms Roan... and (A220) should be A2220?	Changes made.
8/4	11	CNP1.3	<p>creates a requirement for proposals to result in "enhancements to countryside features such as shaws, hedgerows, ponds and brooks". It is not clear whether this applies to "countryside features" such as hedgerows which exist within the built-up area.</p> <p>Further, it is not reasonable or feasible for every proposal to result in such enhancements. For example, a householder applying for a small extension may not have any of these features at their property to enhance, or space within their curtilage in which to provide them. Wording such as "Proposals should protect and enhance features such as shaws, hedgerows, ponds and brooks wherever possible" would protect such features wherever they exist and provide leverage for enhancement where the opportunity exists.</p>	Changes have been made to the policy to address these points.
48/30	11	CNP1	CNP1 - General Development Requirements and associated Policy Maps. It is disappointing not to see any map showing local flood plains. In recent years, these may have shifted due to development, but they continue to exist and certain areas are susceptible to flooding. This is despite extensive works to provide relief for particular locations.	Noted. The Environment Agency is the best place for applicants to view flood maps as they show the latest version. This is signposted in the MSDC District Plan and List of Validation Requirements.
69/41	11	CNP1	Due to the congestion issues identified in 9. Traffic and Travel, further developments in this area would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, or Assessment, and thus it is recommended that this is included under CNP1 – General Development Requirements.	Changes to CNP15 have been made to address this issue. It is noted however that policies should not duplicate each other.
78/46	11	CNP1	<p>1.2 – this criterion is considered too restrictive compared to the criteria included within the Mid Sussex District Plan under policy DP26 which required no 'significant harm'.</p> <p>1.3 – the systematic requirement for 'enhancement to</p>	Changes have been made to address these concerns.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>countryside features' does not reflect policy DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan which ensures a neutral impact on the countryside and where possible enhancement. Moreover, enhancement may not always be necessary, appropriate and desirable especially within the High Weald AONB.</p> <p>1.4 – the intention is supported however the requirement for enhancement goes beyond policy DP22 of the Mid Sussex District Plan. More importantly, the requirement for improvement of such infrastructure is subject to the assessment of the relevant highway authority and therefore may not always be appropriate.</p> <p>1.6 – this policy seems to refer to household extensions rather than residential extensions which could be understood as extension to the village – clarification would be welcomed here.</p> <p>Criteria a) is likely to prevent people from carrying out a number of works to their properties which would normally be considered standard and therefore is too prescriptive.</p> <p>It is unclear from criteria b) where the design guidance can be found.</p>	
9/4	12	CNP2.1 a	<p>CNP2.1(a) (Page 12) supports infill development "located on a vacant parcel of land within the built-up area". This excludes infill development on sites which are contiguous with the built up boundary which is supported by the District Plan. Within the built up area, it is difficult to identify "a vacant parcel of land" which is not already developed in some form. This policy would not support appropriate redevelopment of previously developed land and optimizing sites within the built up boundary, which are by their nature the most sustainably located. Para 3.12 (Page 10) expresses the hope "future development will be on a small scale within the existing built area" which will not be realised if CNP policy only supports development on vacant land.</p> <p>Alfred Budgen Limited have in recent years carried out development or obtained planning permission at Whitegate Close, Brookhill Road (loss 2, build 14, net gain 12), Orchard Cottage, Church Road (loss 1, build 2, net gain 1), Glencree, Copthorne Bank (loss 1, build 2, net gain 1) and none of these developments were on vacant parcels of land. A further development at Oak Close (loss 0, build 4, gain 4) was arguably on vacant land but over half the site comprised of land from within the curtilages of two existing dwellings and was occupied by conifer trees, sheds and a greenhouse. The policy could be worded to say "Development will be permitted on sites within, or contiguous with the boundary of the built up area that meet the following criteria" and then list the points currently numbered (b) to (d).</p>	Vacant parcel of land has been removed to further achieve the policy objective.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
10/4	12	CNP3.1	<p>states failure to comply with the policy should result in refusal of an application which fetters the discretion of the decision maker to attach appropriate weight to overriding material considerations in the planning balance. This policy would have weighed against the recent redevelopment of a one bedroom bungalow at Orchard Cottage, Church Road with two three-bedroom dwellings, which was arguably an appropriate optimisation of the site. CNP3.1 refers to “adding a second floor” which within the context of the policy is assumed to mean a first floor?</p> <p>The definition of bungalow as “a single storey residential dwelling” in the CNP Glossary is problematic as it is at odds with any dictionary definitions which typically describe a bungalow as “a house that usually has only one storey” or as having “in some cases, upper rooms set in the roof”. It would theoretically be possible to overcome the policy objective by converting the loft, or merely part of a loft of a bungalow using Permitted Development rights (meaning it would no longer be a “bungalow” as defined in the CNP Glossary) before applying for planning permission. Policy CNP3.1 could set out that “Proposals to convert the loft of a single storey dwelling should not involve raising the overall height of the existing ridge. A minimum of one main bedroom as defined by National Floor Space Standards and bathroom should be retained on the ground floor”.</p>	Changes have been made to CNP3.1 to address concerns.
11/4	12	CNP3.2	<p>could then read “Major development incorporating residential dwellings should not result in a net loss of existing single storey dwellings” which would maintain current stock but it is difficult to see how the rest of the policy wording is workable. How many bungalows should a developer provide in order to comply with the policy and what site constraints would be accepted as preventing delivery? And how many bedrooms should any bungalows provided have? Could they be studios, one bed, two bed, three bed etc? Larger bungalows may meet the requirement of CNP3.2 but not necessarily be suitable for older people either due to cost or level of upkeep required.</p> <p>It would seem appropriate if a scheme such as Lampson Court or Kitsbridge House were to be brought forward in the future that the policy wording should allow accessible ground floor apartments to meet the objective of providing homes for older people. As bungalows require more land than traditional houses the greatest opportunity to provide homes for older people within the village may be in the form of ground floor maisonettes within 2 or 2.5 storey units that have the external appearance of surrounding houses. The developments carried out</p>	Changes have been made to CNP3.1 to address concerns.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			by Alfred Budgen Limited at Whitegate Close and Oak Close could both have included ground floor maisonettes.	
16/9	12	CNP3.1	The wording appears too loose to achieve its' stated intent. A net retention of a poor bungalow may be satisfying the policy in numerical terms, but defeating the real intent to retain the quality and type of bungalow currently evident in the village. A clever developer could design a plan satisfying the policy but worsening the status quo. An unforeseen consequence of the current policy .	Changes have been made to CNP3.1 to address concerns.
31/20	12	CNP3	Agree ruling re bungalows but one bedroom freehold houses are also needed	Changes have been made to CNP3.1 to address concerns.
79/46	12	CNP2	Further work is required to consolidate this policy. The lead-in to the policy attempts to define 'infill development' but does not clearly specify where such development can occur (i.e. within the built-up area) although it is included within criterion a) of the policy. Should such proposals fall outside the built-up area, it would conflict with policy DP15 of the Mid Sussex District Plan. It would be most useful to show the built-up area on a map to show exactly where this policy applies. We also note the use of the term vacant which suggest that redevelopment of a site may be excluded. Criteria c) and d) introduce new test for footpath and amenities compared to policy CNP1.4 and 1.2 respectively. We would encourage you ensure that policies within the Neighbourhood Plan are consistent to ensure its appropriate implementation.	Changes have been made to address concerns. The defined built up area is shown in the MSDC District Plan Mapping and is not duplicated here. This is to avoid confusing should the District Plan boundaries be updated prior to a review of the neighbourhood Plan.
80/46	12	CNP3	Policy 3.1 is incompatible with permitted development rights. The Council does not agree that bungalows are the only appropriate solution to provide homes for older people, as noted in particular under policy 3.2. We suggest investigating further how this issue can be addressed. We would also encourage you to clearly evidence the issue by preparing a document such as a Housing Need Assessment to support this policy. Policy 3.3 introduces a lower threshold than policy DP28 of the Mid Sussex District Plan with regard to the achieving the M4(2) requirement under Building Regulations. Although the intention is supported, this is likely to have an impact on development viability and therefore needs to be supported by the appropriate evidence.	The allowances under the General Permitted Development Order are separate from development plan policy. Changes have been made to widen the types homes suitable for older people. The requirement to meet M4(2) is minor and would not materially affect viability. This objective is supported by the recent MHCLG consultation "Raising accessibility standards for new homes" which suggests that all new homes should meet M4(2) as a minimum requirement. The estimated cost per dwelling would be approx. £1,400 for units that do not already meet the M4(2) standard. The benefits of this may potentially reduce the need for social care.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
65/40	13	CNP4	CNP4.2 – There are a number of considerations when determining the location of infrastructure, which includes but is not limited to access. We request that this criterion is reworded to reflect the wider requirements for the suitable location of infrastructure.	It is not felt wording of wider infrastructure requirements is necessary as they are covered elsewhere in the development plan.
81/46	13	CNP4	The identification of important community facilities is welcomed; however, it would be useful to include a list of those facilities within the policy as well as having them included on the policies map. 4.2 – need for further clarification, if a proposal is acceptable in planning terms it would imply that access is suitable – what is meant by ‘no more difficult’? Is this to do with location? Suggest change to ‘suitable location’. Refer back to DP policy which is detailed and clear. Mention of access by foot and cycle, what about car?	Changes have been to the policy to address these concerns.
82/46	14	CNP6	We would welcome some clarification on what ‘affecting assets of community value’ means so that the aims of this policy can be appropriately achieved. Policy 6.2 does not read as a policy and could arguably be considered in contradiction with the NPPF.	Changes have been made to the supporting text and policy.
32/20	15	CNP24 (5.1)	Our Shared spaces - Without the main Leisure facility of King Georges Field and The ‘historical’ Allotments site both being located in Surrey (identified on Page 10 3.8 Copthorne Ward) there is no designated Sports field suitable for football or tennis etc.	Noted. This may be considered for future reviews of the plan.
33/20	15	CNP7.1 (d)	The Green space Recreation Ground and Sports Park is not used to capacity.	Noted. The space is nevertheless the main local resource for recreational value.
83/46	16	CNP8	The report backing policy CNP8 is clear and the methodology followed appears to be thorough and consistent. We would however query whether referring to them as non-designated heritage assets may not be more appropriate and in line with the NPPF. We noted that the Former Prizefighting Ring in Copthorne Common Woods (i) is not included within the supporting report.	Changes have been made to address these concerns. The exact location of the former prize fighting ring is unknown and therefore cannot be designated at this time.
43/26	17	Section 7	The draft character areas for Copthorne are defined within section 7 and include: • CA1: High Weald AONB • CA2: Agricultural Belt • CA3: Copthorne Common and Woodland • CA4: Historic Core • CA5: Post War Copthorne. SMD notes that land west of Copthorne and site allocation SA4 are included as part of CA3: Copthorne Common and Woodland. As the names suggests, this character area includes primarily wooded landscape interspersed by irregular shaped	The development to the west of Copthorne between the built-up area and the M23 motorway is yet to be completed. It is therefore appropriate to assess the character of the area as it stands now and review the situation when neighbourhood plan is reviewed.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>agricultural fields and common land. SMD consider this to be an inaccurate representation of the land currently subject to ongoing construction works, which is currently included within this CA3. Neither the NP nor the Character Area Assessment by AECOM acknowledges the existence of the outline planning permission or the new development that will change the landscape character.</p> <p>SMD suggests that the on-going construction of the land west of Copthorne and the allocation of SA4 should be acknowledged within a sixth character area. SMD suggests that the extent of development defined by the outline planning consent (13/04127/OUTES), subsequent Reserved Matters and the site allocations DPD and reflected in the latest BUA boundary for Copthorne as recently published by MSDC will assist in creating a new character area for this part of Copthorne. To ensure consistency, amendments to the character areas will need to be made to the policy map at section 10, including inset 1.</p> <p>This will help provide an accurate representation of the BUA at Copthorne, over the Plan period 2020 – 2031. This will further assist in ensuring the NP complies with basic conditions 1 and 5 as set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).</p> <p>Alternatively, as a minimum, the description of CA3 is revised to reflect and acknowledge the outline consent and development at land west of Copthorne and reference other allocations for development through the MSDC Site Allocations DPD. This updated description should also be reflected in the wording of draft policy CNP11 as part of that character area.</p> <p>Further, it is clear that the wording at draft policy CNP11.2 directly conflicts with the site allocations DPD and the allocation of site SA4. This allocation comprises commercial uses and is considered to be a 'sound' allocation by MSDC, given its inclusion within the Regulation 19 draft of this Plan. Therefore, to ensure that the Copthorne NP is consistent with the adopted Development Plan, this section of draft</p>	

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			policy CNP11 should be amended in line with the allocations within the MSDC's DPD or removed.	
5/6	18	CNP9	Thank you for consulting the High Weald AONB Unit on the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan. The High Weald AONB Unit responded to the original Regulation 14 Plan in March 2017 and provided maps and information about the part of the Plan area within the AONB. It is therefore disappointing that none of this information was utilised for Character Area 1 and that there is no mention of the High Weald AONB Management Plan, which is the statutory plan for the management of this area. I reattach the information and maps provided and request that they are referenced in the supporting text to CNP 9. I would also ask that the following amendments are made to the policy: "CNP9.1 Development proposals must preserve conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the High Weald AONB and have regard to the objectives of the High Weald AONB Management Plan 2019-24. In particular, development must demonstrate that it meets relevant elements of these objectives for this nationally important landscape. It must also conserve and enhance the positive aspects of CA1. These are..."	Reference to the AONB and that proposals must have regard to it has been added to Policy CNP9.
71/4 1	18	CNP9, CNP10, CNP11	Please note that any development that borders the M23 in the CA1 High Weald AONB, CA2 Agricultural Belt and CA3 Copthorne Common and Woodland areas will need to consider impact on the border of Highways England's land ownership, especially in relation to drainage and slope stability, and thus it is recommended that text is included to outline this.	Noted. It is considered that this level of detail is not appropriate for the neighbourhood plan. It would be best dealt with through the preparation of a MSDC DPD and the policies within the Local Plan regarding flooding.
70/4 1	19	CNP11	We note that no reference is made to the St Modwen's PLC Outline planning application for up to 500 homes (13/04127/OUTES) which also includes employment floorspace (B1c light industrial/B8 storage and distribution). As this is located in CA3: Copthorne Common and Woodland area, which is covered by CNP11, we would have expected reference to be made to it.	Noted.
2/1	20	CNP11 & CNP15	Note that the Copthorne Hotel Roundabout is mentioned in Policy CNP11, as it seeks to preserve and enhance the roundabout as a node and gateway to the settlement of Copthorne. CNP15 also seeks highway improvements to address any transport infrastructure inadequacies prior to new development being occupied. TDC are aware of the transport implications and support these policies.	Noted.
85/4 6	23	CNP14	With regard to policy 14.1, a definition of 'exceptional circumstances' would be helpful to ensure that the policy is appropriately implemented. We would also strongly recommend exploring the potential implications of the new use class order on this policy	A footnote has been added in response to this suggestion regarding 14.1. 14.2 and 14.3 have been

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			to ensure that the intention of the policy can be achieved. Policy 14.2 appears to be very restrictive by requiring alternative provision where and on-going use is unviable. The intention of policy 14.4 is fully supported as it will contribute to the future proofing of Copthorne although it will remain facultative. However, the second sentence is not supported by viability or feasibility evidence.	changed to address the concerns raised.
30/19	24		Copthorne bank Speeding - safety The current restrictions are not working and children en route to school or play groups are endangered every day by large lorries, delivery drivers and careless motorists. The next obvious step is an enforced 20mph restriction.	Noted. Policy CNP15 seeks to address the impacts of new development on the highway. Existing highway safety is the responsibility of the Highways Authority (WSCC).
72/41	24		The plan notes that Copthorne village 'sits in a bottleneck of the commuter rush-hour congestion' (Page 24), where the majority of traffic is the result of residents employed outside the area in Crawley, Gatwick and beyond. Thus any further developments in this area would need to be accompanied by a Transport Statement, or Assessment. Para 9.4 of the CNP states that the 'timing of and routes of bus services means rail commuter journeys must start and finish with a car journey'. Highways England would encourage increases in sustainable travel throughout Copthorne via bus or rail services and notes that the CNP is taking steps to increase the provision and use of sustainable transport methods, including cycle schemes, within the Plan Area, as indicated in Para 9.5.	Noted. Changes have been made to Policy CNP15 in response to this suggestion.
13/7	25		can find no mention of the intention to create a cycle route between Copthorne and the Worth Way. The respondent highlights the importance of creating a cycle link between Copthorne and The Worth Way and would like one to be included in the final plan.	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
23/14	25	CNP15.2	Please consider the cycle track/path/Lane from Copthorne to Worth Way or Three Bridges. There is no safe way to make this journey now by bicycle, forcing people to use their cars.	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
24/15	25	CNP15.2	I fully support the addition of a cycle lane to our Parish. It would create safer cycling and a wonderful promotion of a healthy lifestyle.	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
25/16	25	CNP15.2	An important step to keep Copthorne sustainable is to provide dedicated cycle paths or lanes to link Copthorne to the Worth Way. This is excellent for recreation, health benefits and for children getting to secondary school.	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
26/17	25	CNP15.2	I would like to see an excellent cycle link in/out of Copthorne. I would fully support the provision of a cycle path link to the Worth Way.	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
27/18	25	CNP15.2	Providing a safe cycle/footpath to Crawley is long overdue. Residents working in Crawley and wanting to travel by train would benefit greatly from such a path. This would help reduce travel by cars and promote a healthier lifestyle. Making a safe route to the Worth Way would provide good access to many other bridle ways and footpaths in the area. So whether its used for commuting or leisure it would be a great asset to Copthorne residents.	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
28/19	25	CNP15.2	The Worth Way is a valuable West Sussex asset but is difficult to access by bicycle from Copthorne. A statement of desire to construct a safe cycle path should be included in the Plan.	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
34/21	25	CNP15.2	I would like to see an off-road cycle path/lane connecting Copthorne to the Worth Way.	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
35/22	25	CNP15.2	I think this is needed having young children would be a safe and also more enjoyable way to go out as a family and staying clear of the roads. Also make the worth way and local business more accessible on foot. Very Good idea	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
36/23	25	CNP15.2	I propose that an off-road cycle path/lane should be established between Copthorne and the Worth Way. I think it would be of great benefit to leisure cyclists and also to those wishing to access Three Bridges and East Grinstead railway stations for onward commuting.	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
37/24	25	15.2	Copthorne residents needs a safe way to get to the Worth Way for villagers to exercise on foot and by bike. The existing footpath down the side of the golf course is not fit for purpose meaning villagers cannot access the Worth Way easily.	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
38/25	25	15.2	Proper Cycle paths connecting Copthorne with the Worth Way would be a really valuable resource for the village. More and more are using bikes not just for recreation but as the basic way of getting to work. Might even encourage	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
45/27	25	CNP15.2	As a keen cyclist I would like to see an off-road cycle path established between Copthorne and the Worth Way	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
46/28	25	CNP15.2	As a keen cyclist I would like to see an off-road cycle path established between Copthorne and the Worth Way	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
47/29	25	CNP15.2	A Cycle path or bridleway connecting the village of Copthorne to Worth Way would be a great benefit, enabling cyclists to access Worth Way without the hazards of negotiating Old	Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.
49/30	25	CNP15.1(b) and (c)	CNP15 – Sustainable Transport CNP15.1(b) and (c): Brookhill Road was not constructed to support the current types and	This is outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>numbers of vehicle movements. This is witnessed by the recent general state of the road, particularly turning South from Copthorne Bank, specifically partial road collapses resulting in dangerous deep holes often hidden from sight by rain. The 30mph speed limit is not observed by a vast number of vehicles, especially between the hours of 05:30 and 07:30 when there is no monitoring or enforcement. Excess speed not only exacerbates damage but increases risks for other drivers trying to join Brookhill Road from adjoining roads or driveways. Suitable permanent enforcement must be considered.</p>	
50/30	25	CNP15.1(d)	<p>CNP15 – Sustainable Transport CNP15.1(d): Many existing footpaths which are not tarmac or concrete, are not maintained resulting in overgrowth and inaccessibility, particularly for young children or older persons. Restoration of these existing footpaths would increase access and encourage use.</p>	<p>CNP15.1 addresses this issue through new development. Maintenance of the existing highway is the responsibility of WSCC as the Highway Authority.</p>
51/30	25	CNP15.2	<p>CNP15 – Sustainable Transport CNP15.2: I would strongly support that an offroad cycle path is established between Copthorne and the Worth Way to allow safe cycling from Copthorne to East Grinstead/Three Bridges.</p>	<p>Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.</p>
58/35	25	CNP15.2	<p>Would like better access to Worth Way cycle/walkway. A direct safe passage for walkers and cyclists.</p>	<p>Changes have been made to CNP15.2 in response to this suggestion.</p>
66/40	25	CNP15, CNP16, CNP17	<p>It may be useful to provide reference to West Sussex Parking Guidance in these policies, which also outline guidance for electric charging points as well as cycle storage provision.</p>	<p>Changes have been made to these policies referencing the WSCC guidance.</p>
86/46	25	CNP15	<p>Criterion b) is lacking clarity. If it seeks to require new development to address existing transport issues, we would like to draw to your attention that development can only address its own impacts and therefore this will not be implementable. If it aims at ensuring that measures are in place before occupation, we would suggest rewording the policy to avoid misunderstanding. However, the requirement for the measures to be in place prior to occupation may be too restrictive for larger schemes. We would recommend engaging with West Sussex County Council on this matter.</p> <p>Criterion c) relies on the assessment of traffic congestion which may not always exist or be required for certain size of development, therefore this policy is likely to be challenging to implement. Engagement with the highway authority, West Sussex County</p>	<p>Changes have been made to address these issues.</p>

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			Council would be useful to best design such policy. Policy CNP15.3 introduces a stricter requirement than policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan although no viability evidence is provided to support such requirement. However, it reflects the recent consultation to alter building regulations to require electric charging point on residential and non-residential buildings. It would be useful to specify here which type of development would be required to provide such equipment.	
12/4	26	CNP16.1 and CNP16.2	are unreasonable for a householder wishing to extend that currently has off street parking for a greater number of vehicles than required by CNP16.3 and would continue to if the proposed development went ahead. CNP16.1 and CNP16.2 could be merged into a single policy requiring householder extensions not to result in the loss of parking spaces which would fail to meet the requirements of CNP16.3 on completion.	Changes have been made to address these concerns.
29/19	26	CNP16	Copthorne Bank shopper's car park. Opportunities have been missed in the past to allocate space for a car park which our neighbours, Crawley Down enjoy. The haphazard parking along the Bank is more and more of a safety issue. Please make a more positive statement to show a determination to achieve a result.	Noted. Policy CNP15 seeks to address the impacts of new development on the highway. Existing highway safety is the responsibility of the Highways Authority.
44/26	26	CNP16	<p>Draft policy CNP16 outlines the Plan's aspirations for parking at new residential developments at 16.3, in which it requires a 'quantum of off-street car parking in accordance with the greater of:</p> <p>(a) WSCC guidance at the time the application was submitted, OR</p> <p>(b) One on-plot / off-street car parking space per bedroom except a 1-bed dwellings which shall have a minimum of two parking spaces.'</p> <p>Whilst SMD notes that the draft policy seeks to assist in mitigating high levels of onstreet parking currently experienced in Copthorne, in effect it requires a high level of on plot/off-street parking, over and above the guidance of the highway authority. The draft policy is considered to be inconsistent with key objectives of local, regional and national planning policy that seek to maximise sustainable transport and use of alternatives to the private car.</p> <p>However, in acknowledgment that there are current problems with on-street parking in the village, SMD suggests that the wording of this policy be revised to take account of locations such as the development</p>	The requirements of this policy are justified by the evidence supporting the Plan. Lower provision can be argued by other material considerations and justified as a departure from policy which will be considered by the decision maker.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>of land west of Copthorne that are unlikely to exhibit the same problems.</p> <p>SMD suggests that the draft policy should allow scope to allow for a lower level of off street parking where it can be justified, with reference to sustainable transport opportunities and local conditions. This can include the completion of parking surveys in immediately adjacent streets, to indicate that adhering to WSCC guidance would be appropriate.</p>	
87/4 6	26	CNP16	<p>Policy CNP 16.1 and 16.2 are too prescriptive. It fails to take into account the level of existing off-road parking available and may require additional provision where it is not needed.</p> <p>The proposed level of car parking under policy CNP16.3 b) appears to be disproportionate and is not based on evidence. Policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states that 'Neighbourhood Plans can set local standards for car parking provision provided that it is based upon evidence that provides clear and compelling justification for doing so'</p>	<p>Changes have been made to policies CNP16.1 and 16.2.</p> <p>The proposed standards are supported by evidence which demonstrates significant parking issues in the area.</p>
42/2 6	29	Section 10 - policy map	<p>Further and to ensure consistency throughout the NP itself, as well as with the emerging Site Allocations DPD and MSDC's Development Plan, the policy map at section 10 of the NP should include the BUA boundary recently published by MSDC as part of the consultation on the Site Allocations DPD. This updates the Copthorne BUA to identify the development currently underway on land west of Copthorne and the proposed allocation of site SA4 in the Site Allocations DPD.</p>	<p>The built up area boundary is shown on the MSDC plan maps. It is not duplicated here to avoid future inconsistency between plans should it be changed.</p>
60/3 7	32	Policy Map and Inset Map 3	<p>There is a small pocket of land in Lashmere that is useful for dog walkers to stop and continue to access the walks along Thorne Copse Path towards CNP7.1 (avoiding the A264) Should this also be classified as community green space?</p>	<p>This open space provides a link from the residential area to the south to footpaths out into the countryside to the north of Copthorne. It is felt that the open space is unlikely to meet the criteria for inclusion within the Local Green Space Assessment. However, Policy CNP1.4 protects footpaths, cycle paths, bridleways and Rights of Way and it is felt this is the relevant policy for protecting this link.</p>
18/1 1	11, 12	CNP2	<p>Paragraph 4.3 of the policy amplification to Policy CNP2 refers to DP6 of the Mid Sussex District Plan. It is suggested that in order to keep the policy consistent with the District Plan, the policy heading</p>	<p>Changes have been made to address these concerns.</p>

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>should be retitled 'Redevelopment and Infilling in the Built-up Area'. It is important that policy provides for some of the poorer quality built form to be redeveloped and hence allowing policy to be flexible is an important part of the development plan process and to ensure the plan is effective.</p> <p>In line with this the wording to policy CNP2.1 should be altered to reflect the above. Under part (a) it should acknowledge that development can take place not only in locations where there is a vacant parcel of land within the defined built up area, but also developed sites where redevelopment will not harm the character of the area and would also make more efficient use of a site in order to meet future housing need.</p> <p>It is suggested that infilling alone will not meet the development requirements for the village as not all infill locations are likely to come forward during the plan period. As such, it is suggested that the scope of the policy is broadened not only to be consistent with the District Plan as explained above, but also to ensure that where opportunities exist for sensitive redevelopment which might result in an improvement that these are provided for under this policy.</p>	
84/4 6	17-22	CNP9-13	Please refer to the accompanying letter (see ref 88/46)	N/A
19/1 1	19, 20	CNP11	<p>At present what the policy does well is provide a description of the type of character and areas where local public infrastructure can be improved. However, it is suggested that Policy CNP11, which refers to character area CA3 (Cophorne Common and Woodland) does little to acknowledge any suitable locations where new residential development could be met. Nor does it identify a requirement for new housing in this area.</p> <p>Policy is often seen as an essential instrument to assist housing provision and Neighbourhood Plans should identify locations where development for meeting housing need is considered to be most appropriate, and can apply to broad locations rather than identifying specific sites. Moreover, placing future targets in the Neighbourhood Plan will avoid any uncertainty for developers and the District Council alike. It is also noted that CA3 has a lower density pattern of housing when compared with areas CA4 and CA5, thus making this the most appropriate location for meeting future housing need through infill and redevelopment, provided that it maintains the key characteristics of the area in line with policy, alongside the location's good accessibility which is already recognised within the policy.</p> <p>It is quite common for policies to set parameters for housing provision and other services for an area if there is a clear scope for these, which in this case there is. In the case of housing need, there are a</p>	This is not the appropriate policy for addressing these issues and the neighborhood plan does not allocated sites as agreed with MSDC. This is done through The MSDC District Plan.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			number of locations within CA3 that are deemed appropriate for either infill or redevelopment and so in line with wider aims of CNP2 and the interrelationship with other policies in the plan, we would ask that further clarification is given to this.	
61/3 7	24-27		The traffic calming feature along Copthorne Bank designed to slow traffic is an obstacle (alongside other parked vehicles) that creates longer journeys and more pollution. Could this be replaced with centrally placed speed humps like the ones in Smallfield or a pedestrian crossing or more restrictions on parking along the road.	Existing traffic calming measures and changes to them are the responsibility of the Highway Authority. This is therefore outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan although policy CNP15 does seek to address this issue for new development and its impacts.
73/4 1	24-27		No mention is made Gatwick Airport or the proposals for the Northern Runway within the CNP. In August 2019, Gatwick published its long-term future plans for the Northern Runway, enabling Gatwick to deliver around 70 million passengers by 2032. Gatwick Airport aims to take this forward via a Development Consent Order. Being located close to Gatwick Airport, the CNP may wish to consider any future development at Gatwick within the neighbourhood plan or at least acknowledge that there are upcoming plans and what impact Gatwick Airport may have upon the area; specifically with regards to any off-airport parking developments which are known to take place.	Changes have been made to the policy in response to this issue.
74/4 1	Policies Map		Highways England notes that the Inset Map 1 (Heathy Ground), does not include detailed plans for the St Modwen's PLC Outline planning application for up to 500 homes (13/04127/OUTES) which also includes employment floorspace (B1c light industrial/B8 storage and distribution). As this application is approved any further details as to the location of the Employment site or spine roads within the site would be useful references when considering likely future transport routes.	It would be premature to include these suggestions as the exact locations have neither been confirmed or mapped on OS.
1/1		ALL	No objections to the policies within this plan.	Noted.
3/2			Southern Water do not provide water or wastewater services to the Parish of Worth. We therefore have no comments to make on the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted.
4/3			Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Noted.
6/8			Reviewed the various documents on the website and have no comments to make on their content.	Noted.
17/1 0			An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines.	Noted.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our assets.	
20/1 2			We have no comments to make on this occasion but please keep us informed of any further consultations.	Noted.
21/1 3			<p>We consider that Neighbourhood Plan should include a policy relating to wastewater/sewerage infrastructure.</p> <p>Wastewater/sewerage [and water supply] infrastructure is essential to any development. Failure to ensure that any required upgrades to the infrastructure network are delivered alongside development could result in adverse impacts in the form of internal and external sewer flooding and pollution of land and water courses and/or low water pressure.</p> <p>Thames Water seeks to co-operate and maintain a good working relationship with local planning authorities in its area and to provide the support they need with regards to the provision of sewerage/wastewater treatment [and water supply] infrastructure.</p> <p>A key sustainability objective for the preparation of Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 20 of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), February 2019, states: "Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for... infrastructure for waste management, water supply, wastewater..."</p> <p>Paragraph 28 relates to non-strategic policies and states: "Non-strategic policies should be used by local planning authorities and communities to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development. This can include allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure..." Paragraph 26 of the revised NPPF goes on to state: "Effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy. In particular, joint working should help to determine where additional infrastructure is necessary...."</p> <p>The web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) includes a section on 'water supply, wastewater and water quality' and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that</p>	This is already covered by MSDC District Plan Policy DP42: Water Infrastructure and the Water Environment. There is no need to duplicate existing policy and guidance.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>"Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development" (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306). It is important to consider the net increase in wastewater [and water supply] demand to serve the development and also any impact that developments may have off site, further down the network. The Neighbourhood Plan should therefore seek to ensure that there is adequate wastewater [and water supply] infrastructure to serve all new developments. Thames Water will work with developers and local authorities to ensure that any necessary infrastructure reinforcement is delivered ahead of the occupation of development. Where there are infrastructure constraints, it is important not to underestimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades take around 18 months and Sewage Treatment & Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 3-5 years.</p> <p>The provision of water treatment (both wastewater treatment and water supply) is met by Thames Water's asset plans and from the 1st April 2018 network improvements will be from infrastructure charges per new dwelling.</p> <p>From 1st April 2018, the way Thames Water and all other water and wastewater companies charge for new connections has changed. The economic regulator Ofwat has published new rules, which set out that charges should reflect: fairness and affordability; environmental protection; stability and predictability; and transparency and customer-focused service.</p> <p>The changes mean that more of Thames Water's charges will be fixed and published, rather than provided on application, enabling you to estimate your costs without needing to contact us. The services affected include new water connections, lateral drain connections, water mains and sewers (requisitions), traffic management costs, income offsetting and infrastructure charges.</p> <p>Thames Water therefore recommends that developers engage with them at the earliest opportunity (in line with paragraph 26 of the revised NPPF) to establish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developments demand for Sewage/Wastewater Treatment and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; and • The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met. <p>Thames Water offer a free Pre-Planning service which confirms if capacity exists to serve the development or if upgrades are required for potable water, waste water and surface water requirements. Details on Thames Water's free pre planning service</p>	

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>are available at: https://www.thameswater.co.uk/preplanning In light of the above comments and Government guidance we consider that the Neighbourhood Plan should include a specific reference to the key issue of the provision of wastewater/sewerage [and water supply] infrastructure to service development proposed in a policy. This is necessary because it will not be possible to identify all of the water/sewerage infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (Asset Management Plans or AMPs). We recommend the Neighbourhood Plan include the following policy/supporting text: PROPOSED NEW WATER/WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE TEXT “Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.” “The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.”</p>	
22/13			<p>Comments in relation to Flood Risk and SUDS The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states that a sequential approach should be used by local planning authorities in areas known to be at risk from forms of flooding other than from river and sea, which includes "Flooding from Sewers". When reviewing development and flood risk it is important to recognise that water and/or sewerage infrastructure may be required to be developed in flood risk areas. By their very nature water and sewage treatment works are located close or adjacent to rivers (to abstract water for treatment and supply or to discharge treated effluent). It is likely that these existing works will need to be upgraded or extended to provide the increase in treatment capacity required to service new development. Flood risk sustainability objectives should therefore accept that water and sewerage infrastructure development may be necessary in flood risk areas. Flood risk sustainability objectives should also make reference to 'sewer flooding' and an acceptance that</p>	<p>This is already covered by MSDC District Plan Policies DP42: Water Infrastructure and the Water Environment and DP41: Flood Risk and Drainage. There is no need to duplicate existing policy and guidance.</p>

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>flooding can occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site sewerage infrastructure and capacity is not in place ahead of development.</p> <p>With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, watercourses or surface water sewer. It is important to reduce the quantity of surface water entering the sewerage system in order to maximise the capacity for foul sewage to reduce the risk of sewer flooding.</p> <p>Limiting the opportunity for surface water entering the foul and combined sewer networks is of critical importance to Thames Water. Thames Water have advocated an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system. By doing this, SuDS have the potential to play an important role in helping to ensure the sewerage network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the effects of climate change.</p> <p>SuDS not only help to mitigate flooding, they can also help to: improve water quality; provide opportunities for water efficiency; provide enhanced landscape and visual features; support wildlife; and provide amenity and recreational benefits.</p> <p>With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan: "Surface water drainage - It is the responsibility of a developer to follow the sequential approach to the disposal of surface waters with proper provision for surface water draining to ground, water course or surface water sewers being given. The discharging of surface waters to the foul sewer can be a major contributor to sewer flooding and should therefore be avoided."</p>	
39/2 6			<p>It is acknowledged that, unlike a Development Plan document, the examination of a NP does not include any requirement to consider whether the Plan is 'sound' and so the requirement of soundness in paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019, does not apply. However, prior to the NP referendum, the draft Plan will need to meet all seven basic conditions, as required by paragraph 37 of the NPPF and as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).</p> <p>As the NP progresses, SMD consider it to be helpful if the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan sub-Committee were to set out how the basic conditions have been taken into consideration and demonstrate how the Plan complies with the relevant legislation.</p>	Noted. The Basic Conditions Statement is a requirement of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations and will be submitted at the next stage.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
54/3 1			Felbridge Parish councillors discussed the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan at their meeting on 5th November and took the decision that no response was necessary.	Noted.
55/3 2			I have consulted my churchwardens about the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan and we are content to support the proposals. For interest, I attach copies of correspondence from the early 1990s relating to the Green	Noted.
56/3 3			My only comment would be that I sincerely hope that the restrictions on new build and parking along with the maintaining a "village environment" succeed. However, with the eventual loss of our protest over the Modwen site increasing the size of the village by 1/3, I feel it is highly possible that that may not be possible.	Noted.
62/3 8			I moved to Copthorne from Hanworth Pk Middx 22 yrs ago because nearly all green areas were being built on. It appears that Copthorne will become another village that will disappear along with green areas and wildlife. The council should stop places like Heathy Wood building warehouses and houses etc, Hawthornes more crowded houses. From my house I see fields, trees, and wildlife like deer, badgers, foxes, snakes, lizards, and all types of birds, it will all disappear if no one stops large scale building projects on all brown/green field areas.	Noted.
63/3 9			Based on the environmental constraints within the area, we therefore have no detailed comments to make in relation to your Plan at this stage. However please find attached a copy of a Neighbourhood Plan checklist we have developed to help provide Environment Agency advice at the earlier stages of Neighbourhood Plan preparation.	Noted.
64/4 0			<p>The focus of the County Council's engagement with the development planning process in West Sussex is the new Local Plans that the Districts and Boroughs are preparing as replacements for existing Core Strategies. Whilst welcoming the decisions of so many parishes to prepare Neighbourhood Plans, the County Council does not have sufficient resources available to respond in detail to Neighbourhood Plan consultations unless there are potentially significant impacts on its services that we are not already aware of, or conflicts are identified with its emerging or adopted policies.</p> <p>In general, the County Council looks for Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the District and Borough Councils' latest draft or adopted development plans. The County Council supports the District and Borough Councils in preparing the evidence base for these plans and aligns its own infrastructure plans with them. The County Council encourages Parish Councils to make use of this</p>	Noted.

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>information which includes transport studies examining the impacts of proposed development allocations. Where available this information will be published on its website or that of the relevant Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>In relation to its own statutory functions, the County Council expects all Neighbourhood Plans to take due account of its policy documents and their supporting Sustainability Appraisals, where applicable. These documents include the West Sussex Waste Local Plan, Joint Minerals Local Plan, West Sussex Transport Plan and the West Sussex Lead Local Flood Authority Policy for the Management of Surface Water. It is also recommended that published County Council service plans, for example Planning School Places and West Sussex Rights of Way Improvement Plan, are also taken into account.</p>	
67/4 1			In the case of the Copthorne Neighbourhood plan, Highways England is interested in the potential impact that any development might have on the SRN, in particular on the M23 in the vicinity of Junction 10 and Junction 10A.	Noted.
68/4 1			We note that the MSDC Local Plan 2014-2031 identifies the Minimum Residual requirement from 2017 onwards (accounting for commitments and completions) for Copthorne to be 49 dwellings, although no sites are identified to meet this requirement within the document.	Noted. The Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate sites but does include a policy that applies to infill and redevelopment within the built up area..
75/4 2			No comments	Noted.
77/4 5			The plan is extensive and detailed and we have no specific comments we wish to make.	Noted.
88/4 6			<p>The Council supports the presentation of the plan and in particular the concise format which allows a focus on the proposed policies.</p> <p>However, the Council provided informal comments on the draft Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan early August 2020 to ensure that it would be in general conformity with the District Plan. It is therefore, disappointing to note that a number of the Council's comments have not been addressed, in particular those outlining contradictions with national policies and the Mid Sussex District Plan.</p> <p>As a consequence, the Council's comments remain unchanged. The Council advises that further work is required for the plan to be successful at Examination and to ensure that it is well understood and implemented in line with the aspirations of the local community. This later point was discussed in detail by experts at the recent Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) event on Neighbourhood Planning. A recording of this webinar is available on the RTPI YouTube channel and can be accessed here.</p> <p>Detailed comments on the policies have been</p>	<p>The policies do not describe the characteristics, they state the "positive aspects" of each area that should be sustained or reinforced in order retain the overall distinct character of that area. These important aspects would be lost if set out in a background document and would carry limited weight therefore undermining the policy objective.</p> <p>Changes have been made to the policy addressing the comments regarding the level of protection the policy provides.</p>

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>provided in the attached. The Council would recommend that you refer to the Toolkit for neighbourhood planners prepared by Locality and in particular the 'Writing Planning Policies' paper which provides helpful advice.</p> <p>In particular, the Council would like to draw attention to the proposed policies on character areas. The Council fully supports the initiative to provide detailed design guidance as part of Neighbourhood Plans to include a fine grain level of detail and draw out the specificities of areas. However, the proposed policies are descriptive as opposed to providing clarity about what your local community would like to see. It would be more useful if the policies focused on the specific design guidance, rather than the characteristic of the area which would normally be included in the supporting text or background documents.</p> <p>In this respect, we would invite you to review some of the good practice examples such as the Ascot, Sunningdale and Sunninghill Neighbourhood Plan. Finally, the Council notes the character area policies require development proposals to 'preserve and enhance' the positive aspect(s) of the character area. This would introduce a level of protection equivalent to, if not higher than, that applied to Areas of Outstanding Beauty, which benefit from some of the highest levels of protection. We would therefore suggest this such approach is not proportionate.</p> <p>Mid Sussex District Council trusts these comments are helpful in progressing the Neighbourhood Plan. Officers would welcome further detailed discussions, ahead of the next stage, to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions test, in order to ensure it is successful at Examination.</p>	

DOCUMENT: ASSESSMENT OF LOCAL HERITAGE ASSETS (AUGUST 2020)

Ul.	Page	Policy	Comment	Response
59/36	5		<p>I am surprised that the Prize Fighting Ring (note your spelling mistake) opposite the old Abergavenny Arms pub site has been excluded from the assessment. It is not easy to find as it is overgrown but it is of huge historical importance to Copthorne as recorded in the book 'Copthorne, the story so far' pages 51-54. Excerpt attached.</p> <p>I am surprised that Rose Cottage, Copthorne Bank (behind Bloomsbury Kitchens) has been excluded from the assessment. A timber framed building and recorded in the book mentioned in the section above, it is considered to be one of the oldest houses in Copthorne. Excerpt from the book attached.</p>	<p>It is not clear exactly where the Prize Fighting Ring is located and therefore it cannot be assessed. Rose Cottage could not be assessed due to issues with access. These assets will be reviewed again when the Neighbourhood Plan is reviewed.</p>

DOCUMENT: DRAFT CONSULTATION STATEMENT

UI.	Page.	Policy	Comment	Response
30/19	24		Copthorne bank Speeding - safety The current restrictions are not working and children en route to school or play groups are endangered every day by large lorries, delivery drivers and careless motorists. The next obvious step is an enforced 20mph restriction.	Noted. Policy CNP15 seeks to address the impacts of new development on the highway. Existing highway safety is the responsibility of the Highways Authority.
52/30	25		A number of the consultation documents included are 7 years old or more. A lot has changed in the village and surrounding area in that time. To use some of the statements as a basis for planning to 2031 seems anachronistic; although I appreciate there are other more contemporary documents.	The evidence to support the policies within the plan are considered up-to-date.
57/34	34		In many places throughout the documents many responses refer to heavy traffic through the village and especially HGV. In the plan not much attention has been paid to this problem. Vehicles "rat running" through the village is a daily problem and the HGVs transit far too fast and are breaking up the roads and are dangerous. (I have even seen them running along Church Lane, which is a school caution area) Can we please make the village an access only area for HGVs and take other actions to reduce rat running traffic.	Policy CNP15 seeks to address these issues through new development. It should be noted that West Sussex County Council are responsible for highway safety.

DOCUMENT: LOCAL GREEN SPACE ASSESSMENT

UI.	Page.	Policy	Comment	Response
76/43	12		The area of hatched land on the plan Space Ref. 3 is not occupied by the golf course. Copthorne Golf Club have no title or ownership of this land	Noted. Wording amended to clarify.

APPENDIX 19 MSDC Meeting Notes



Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
West Sussex
RH16 1SS

Switchboard: 01444 458166

DX 300320 Haywards Heath 1
www.midsussex.gov.uk

Contact:

Planning Policy, Telephone: 01444 – 477053
E-mail: neighbourhoodplans@midsussex.gov.uk

Your Ref:

Our Ref: Copthorne NP

Date: 22/12/2020

nplan@worth-pc.gov.uk

By e-mail only

Dear Worth Parish Council,

Notes from Informal Meeting between Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Mid Sussex District Council Officers on 17th December 2020

The Council welcomes this meeting to discuss the progress of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan and will continue to support Worth Parish Council in the preparation of their second neighbourhood plan to ensure that the Plan is successful at examination (i.e. Meet the Basic Conditions).

It was particularly helpful to be able to review the documents that you are preparing for the formal submission of your plan to us ahead of the meeting to allow officers to provide advice. As mentioned during the meeting, we took the approach to focus our comments on the issues which must be addressed prior to submitting your plan to the Council under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.

For your information, we have also included within this letter additional comments which we believe would help clarify and strengthen your Neighbourhood Plan. Finally, further to our discussion on a potential timing for the referendum on the Plan, we have included an indicative timeframe to adoption.

Key issues

CNP2: Redevelopment and infill development

This policy appears to directly conflict with policy DP6 of the District Plan which directs development within the built-up area where the principle of development is accepted and sets out acceptability criteria for development outside such area to allow for sustainable expansion of settlements. The proposed policy which seems to solely allow for redevelopment and infill development within the planning boundary is likely to have a direct impact on the delivery of windfall sites which is fundamental to the achieve the housing delivery target set within the District Plan.

Although it was confirmed during our meeting that it was not the intention to conflict with the District Plan policy, it is thought that the proposed policy is confusing and duplicates existing as well as other policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.

Recommendation: deletion

Working together for a better Mid Sussex



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Planning Policy and Economic Development
Business Unit

0000



CNP3: Homes for older people

Further work would be key to ensure this policy is fit for purpose. We would like to reiterate that paragraph 1 of this policy immediately conflicts with the current permitted development rights. Although it is clear to officers that only planning applications will be assessed against the Neighbourhood Plan, the Plan will be subject to referendum by local residents who may not have such detail knowledge of the planning system. We would therefore strongly recommend providing clarification to manage voter's expectations.

Paragraph 2 and 3 both introduce stricter criteria than respectively policies DP30 and DP28 which are considered to be onerous and prescriptive. Evidence of the need is essential to appropriately support the proposal under paragraph 2. Moreover, both criteria will cumulatively with other requirements contained within adopted strategic policies have an impact on viability and therefore on housing delivery. The preparation of a viability report accounting for all costs is key to have appropriate justification for this policy.

For information, at the point of submission to the Planning Inspectorate, the Council intended to request the achievement of the M4(2) of the optional requirements in the Building Regulations for all new development. Despite the evidence of a higher housing need for older people in Mid Sussex, the Inspector considered such requirement to be disproportionate (see para.41 of the [Inspector's report](#))

Recommendation: additional evidence and clarification

CNP15: Sustainable Transport

The changes proposed for paragraph 1(c) remains in conflict with National Policy and adopted Strategic Policies. Although the assessment required is not specifically named 'Transport Assessment', it does seem to be very alike. In first instance it would therefore be useful to clarify the type of supporting document development proponent would be required to provide.

The National Planning Policy Framework defines a Transport Assessment as "A comprehensive and systematic process that sets out transport issues relating to a proposed development. It identifies measures required to improve accessibility and safety for all modes of travel, particularly for alternatives to the car such as walking, cycling and public transport, and measures that will be needed deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the development." The [Mid Sussex validation criteria list for planning applications](#) provides a list of the information that needs to be included within a Transport Assessment.

Paragraph 111 of the NPPF requires development which generates significant amounts of movement to be supported by a transport assessment. This requirement is replicated under policy DP21 of the District Plan. As a consequence, it is important to note that not all impacts are required to be mitigated. The threshold for requiring transport assessment or statement (a simpler version of transport assessment are detailed within the [Mid Sussex validation criteria list for planning applications](#)). They apply to residential development of more than 50 units and certain types of commercial development. The introduction of a lower threshold would therefore need to be justified by strong evidence appropriately.

We note the introduction of a new paragraph under policy CNP15. This policy has never been consulted upon and in our view could trigger the requirement for a new Regulation 14 consultation.

Working together for a better Mid Sussex

Overall, we would strongly recommend contacting key stakeholders, such as the Highway Authority, for advice on how to best design and progress this policy.

Recommendation: additional evidence and clarification

CNP14: Our Economy

Like Policy CNP3, proposals under this policy conflicts with permitted development rights. Further clarification would be welcomed to manage local resident's expectations on what the planning system can and cannot achieve.

Recommendation: clarification

CNP16: Car Parking

The introduction of additional car parking standards remains in our views unnecessary and often lead to misunderstanding and challenges at the implementation stage. The Highway Authority regularly updates the data set used to calculate the car parking level requirements to best serve dwellings which we believe should be relied on.

Should you wish to maintain such policy, the submission of appropriate evidence will be useful.

Recommendation: additional evidence

Other comments

Policy	Comments
CNP1	The reference to 'a good standard of amenity' is considered vague and likely to generate a subjective interpretation. The Council recently adopted a Design Guide SPD which is likely to provide support in this respect in particular under chapter 8 and 9.
Character Areas: CNP9-13	The comments submitted at the Regulations 14 stage remain relevant
CNP15.1(b)	The proposed is clumsy as new development is unlikely to have caused issues prior to occupation.

Timeframe

You mentioned during our meeting that you would like to see the Neighbourhood Plan Referendum combined with the coming District By-Election for Copthorne & Worth. Having thoroughly reviewed the timeframe for each stage, based on a formal submission of your plan by the first week of February and considering that it is unlikely that we would be able to consult in the run-up to the By-Election (as it may fall within the 'pre-election period' known as Purdah), this timeframe will be unfortunately unachievable. Therefore, we would strongly recommend taking an additional couple of weeks to finalise all your documents to ensure everything is to the appropriate standard.

Working together for a better Mid Sussex

For your information, we have provided below an estimate timeframe for each stage to formal making of the neighbourhood plan:

Stage	Timeframe (weeks)
Review of submission documents	2
Consultation	6
Finalise submission pack	2
Examination	12 (estimate)
Decision on Examiner's report	5 (max)
Publication	1
Time to referendum	4 (min)
Making	8 (max)

Mid Sussex District Council trusts this summary of our advice is helpful to continue in progressing the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan. If you require further support, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Estelle Maisonnial
Senior Planning Policy Officer

Working together for a better Mid Sussex



Planning Policy and Economic Development
Business Unit

