

Dear John,

Thank you very much for your detailed feedback on the consultation document regarding the Community Engagement Consultation for the Steyning Glebe Farm site. I truly appreciate the time and effort you and the Parish Council Steering Committee have invested in reviewing the document and providing such comprehensive insights.

Your comments are invaluable, and I am grateful for the constructive points raised. I understand the importance of addressing the specific concerns of the Kings Barn Lane residents, particularly regarding the boundary planting and fencing design. We will ensure that the details, including planting density, species, maturity, and maintenance plans, are clearly outlined and would welcome your input and further feedback on this, indeed there will be another (and better) opportunity to review and formally comment on the application once the application is live and all the supporting documents are published – this will then be part of another process of feeding in to final design/ plan iterations and agreements. Additionally, the pedestrian access point and connectivity infrastructure will be reviewed to provide more precise information following the members pre-briefing and the feedback we receive from officers and councillors alike.

I acknowledge the need for more definitive responses to the issues raised during the consultation. We will work diligently to enhance the document by including detailed action-based responses and explanations where changes cannot be made. This can include greater detail on planting and landscaping as well as the boundary buffer zones – again there will be a formal period to accept these comments once the full application and supporting documentation is live. This will help demonstrate our commitment to addressing the community's feedback effectively by reiterating plans following the full public consultation period.

Regarding the outstanding discussions on Play Area provision, Road naming, and the 'Access to Site' policy, we will prioritise these topics and provide the necessary details as soon as possible. Your continued support and collaboration are crucial, and we look forward to working closely with you to ensure a successful outcome for the community particularly around the LEAPs and the construction management plan. Vistry are committed to providing more detail in advance – particularly for the build phasing and the construction management plan – often these are details that are determined much later in the process generally following full approval, but we have already begun plan drafting preparations to be shared with the parish council and made public to residents.

Once again, thank you for your thorough review and for highlighting these important aspects, apologies for not preparing/ providing or sharing some of this information at this stage but I hope you are satisfied we are aware of your primary concerns and are trying to be proactive and pre-emptive in our preparations to communicate early with and appease affected residents as well as your community. Please feel free to reach out if there are any further points you would like to discuss or if there is anything else we can assist with. In the meantime, I will encourage Vistry and the technical team to expedite the construction management plan along with the landscaping/ planting schedule for your review and comment – although as I said these are currently being drafted for public review and the full application submission in the coming weeks and so will be made available imminently.

Best regards,

Jonathan

Jonathan England | Account Manager

From: John Fullbrook <Sent: 16 May 2025 15:04

To: Jonathan **Cc:** David Scane < John Longhorn < Victoria.Finnegan **Subject:** Feedback response to draft document regarding Vistry Community Engagement Consultation for Steyning Glebe Farm site

Dear Jonathan, (For distribution to Vistry and SEC Newgate)

Once again, thank you for sharing your consultation document with us last week.

It clearly demonstrates that you have spoken to a wide group of consultees including people in the parish of Steyning and to Officers and Councillors from Horsham District Council. You have also extensively described the statutory framework and basis for this consultation in relation to the proposed development at Glebe Farm.

As you know we swiftly convened a meeting of the Parish Council Steering Committee on the 14th May, to discuss the draft document as part of what we still believe to be an ongoing process of active consultation, and in keeping with your timeframe and request for urgency, I am sending this correspondence to outline some of the points raised.

Indeed, I believe it's worth reiterating, the members had hoped to assist you with the compilation of this document at an earlier stage by underscoring an official commentary of all of the groups and to help prioritise via an informed perspective and by using the expertise from within the Steering Committee to be truly representative of the whole Parish, and we hope that we have not lost this opportunity and what we thought had been agreed within our first meeting on the 13th March. To this end, we have considered the description of the feedback from consultees shown in your document alongside our knowledge of this feedback collated by the parish office team, and through personal representation by members of the Neighbourhood Planning Committee. As would be expected there is a correlation between these, however, there are many examples of omission and generalisation within your record.

For example, an issue raised by numerous Kings Barn Lane residents concerning their boundary with the new development and more specifically the proposed planting and fencing design. I suspect residents would prefer to have insight into the detail of the planting, its density, the species involved and their maturity when planted plus a confirmation of proposed ongoing maintenance. Then distance of planting from new fencing and the nature of that fencing (height, design and location), would be advantageous. Another example is the proposed pedestrian access point on the south east of the site, its precise positioning and nature of the infrastructure installation for walking and cycling connectivity in so far as ensuring the White Bridge and associated pathways could link more directly through the Glebe Farm site, to School and Steyning High Street beyond.

At the first meeting between yourselves and the NP committee we requested that there should be evidence of the issues raised within the realms of the planned programme of Community Engagement we jointly put together, and to work with you on your response to those issues. Whilst accepting that there are some changes and actions that Vistry will undertake as a result of our (the parish councils') feedback, there are many examples of very general responses e.g. more conversation, ongoing dialogue etc, but very few definitive statements which elucidate upon your consequent action or give explanation for not being able to make suggested changes.

We do appreciate the extensive dialogue you have entered into across our community and at our urging, and with our elected representatives, and know that there are issues and questions raised by Cllr Victoria Finnegan that you are likely in the process of responding to but, as this consultation document stands, it only demonstrates that you have been diligent in gaining feedback from our community but has not shown clear responses to the issues raised.

There are also significant discussions still not effectively entered into, which include likely SPC patronage of and assistance with decisions on, Play Area provision and Road naming. And we are yet to discuss the framework by which, when work begins, you intend to allow us to be a credible contact, to help you with any issues you may face.

We are yet to see, and remain eager to peruse, your 'Access to Site' policy, and or detailed proposals, as per intended Construction Management Plan.

Enhancing the consultation document to include more detail about the issues raised and evidencing positive action-based responses to these issues will, we believe, change this document from a general overview of the process for, and findings of, the consultation to one that positively demonstrates a listening organisation who can respond positively to concerns, questions and ideas.

Our belief is that these changes will improve the quality of the consultation document and enhance the application for a *reserved matters* application. It will also diminish the potential for iteration and consequent delay in the planning proposal.

I look forward to your response and remain,
yours faithfully

John

John Fullbrook
Clerk to the Council