

**PLANNING
FOR OUR FUTURE**



**HORSHAM DISTRICT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**HORSHAM DISTRICT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
TO 2016**

**Analysis and
Response to Representations**

**following the
Issues and Options Consultation
June 2004**

This document is printed on environmentally friendly material
Published by Horsham District Council

www.horsham.gov.uk/strategic_planning

The mapping used in this document is based on Ordnance Survey material with
the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
(c) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes copyright and may lead to
civil proceedings. Horsham District Council, Licence Number 100018563 - February 2005.

The following report contains a summary of the responses received on the Issues and Options Consultation in June 2004. The responses have been analysed in the order in which they appeared in the document. The text in bold is the Council's response to the issues raised. This document should be read in conjunction with the 'Core Strategy: Preferred Options' and the 'Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options'.

Comments on the consultation process and the contents of the Issues and Options document

There were a number of people who commented on the consultation process, the documents and, in particular, exhibitions held throughout the District.

The presentation and content of the document and exhibitions was generally well received but it was suggested that there was not enough background information contained within the document. There was some concern that the document did not use 'Plain English'. In terms of exhibitions there was some concern that they had not been held at all the relevant locations and that the publicity surrounding them was unclear and could have been more informative. The use of more interactive techniques where people could attach comments with sticky notes was well received.

Appendix 1 of the Issues and Options Consultation document listed relevant background documents all of which are publicly available. Future documents are being accompanied by a glossary to explain any unusual terms.

Exhibitions were generally programmed where the impact of development would be the greatest and according to staff resources. Interactive tools will be used in future, as they allow people to make immediate comments; the responses have been incorporated into this document where appropriate. Exhibitions will continue to be held, and where appropriate, workshops will be held which will allow more involved discussion about the proposals. Every effort will be made to ensure that local communities are aware of further consultation, including through more local advertising (posters etc.).

It was suggested by some respondents that there was not enough emphasis on rural issues and it was felt that there is no reference made to Parish Plans in relation to areas which are proposed for development. There is no inclusion of crime issues in the document.

There were many comments which did not relate to planning matters, these issues, including in relation to crime, will be taken up, if appropriate, by the Community Strategy. The Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land Preferred Options documents incorporate both urban and rural issues. Parish Plans etc. are an important part of the community involvement process and will be referred to where appropriate.

For further information on how we intend to involve the community in the production of the Horsham Local Development Framework, please refer to the draft Statement of Community Involvement.

Issue 1 – Landscape Character

The majority of respondents supported the approach of landscape character areas with only one respondent stating that it was not considered necessary. Some comments highlighted that any policy would need to be robust in order to be effective.

The Council is proposing to continue to use the landscape character approach as a means to protect and enhance the landscape. The Council is in agreement that any policy will need to be robust and has borne this in mind when developing the Core Policy CP1. The policy has been written to enable appropriate development control policies to be developed which will further protect and enhance landscape character.

Several respondents did, however, raise a concern that the landscape character information set out in the Issues and Options document did not contain enough detail, and it was felt that this could result in small scale but important features being lost as a result of development.

The landscape character details presented in the Issues and Options documentation summarised the results of the full Landscape Character Assessment study. This document, which forms part of the evidence base, contains more detailed information, and development proposals will be expected to take this information into account when drawing up plans. The detail will also, in due course, be incorporated into a supplementary planning document. It is therefore not considered that this level of detail needs to be incorporated into the Preferred Options.

Few specific comments were received about the individual landscape character areas, but the need to protect specific areas of the District was highlighted. One particular landscape that was felt to be under threat was the Low Weald. One final area of concern raised by a few respondents was that fact the Council's aim of protecting and enhancing the landscape did not appear to accord with the allocation of development sites. It was also queried as to how the landscape character areas influenced the selection of development locations.

Whilst the Council wishes to protect and enhance the landscape, a certain level of development needs to be accommodated in the District in the period until 2016, and in these areas the landscape will inevitably be adversely affected. In these cases the landscape character assessment will enable planning and the layout of development to reflect and integrate with the characteristics of the surrounding landscapes. The Council notes that some landscape areas are felt to be under greater threat from development than elsewhere. The landscape character assessment does not, however, identify which areas should or should not be developed, but is being used as a tool to help inform this decision along with other planning considerations.

Issue 2 – Settlement Coalescence, Local and Strategic Gaps

Respondents generally supported the prevention of settlement coalescence. It was suggested that any policy to prevent suburbanisation should extend across the whole District rather than simply to prevent settlements joining together. Some concern was raised that the proposed development to the West of Horsham would however lead to Horsham and Broadbridge Heath merging, and the separate identity of these settlements was highlighted.

The Council wishes to ensure that the separate identities of settlements across the District are retained. The concern about the development to the west of Horsham resulting in the merging of Horsham and Broadbridge Heath is noted. The Council is not however able to alter the broad location of this development which is set out in the West Sussex County Council Structure Plan. It should be noted that the A24 will continue to separate the two settlements and the Council will work with the community when working up the development proposals in more detail to ensure that the separate character of the two settlements is retained.

Most representations considered that local and strategic gaps should be retained rather than being removed or streamlined. It was felt that the loss of these designations would result in the loss of a layer of protection in these areas.

Some respondents did however support the Council's proposals to streamline strategic gaps and remove local gap designations. It was however noted that any policy would need to be robust. Some site specific comments were made about the strategic gap boundaries including various suggestions for inclusion / exclusion of certain areas. It was also suggested that physical features should be used as a boundary. Finally a query was raised as to why the area of search for development west of Crawley did not accord with the proposed boundary for the strategic gap.

A few respondents considered that local and strategic gap designations were not necessary. It was stated that there was already a presumption against development outside built-up area boundaries and that further designation was therefore unnecessary.

Whilst it is noted that most respondents would wish to see the local and strategic gap designations retained in their current form, the Council does not consider that this is possible as government policy is seeking to reduce local designations. It is however considered that there is still a need for some policy protection to help prevent the coalescence of settlements. The Core Landscape and Townscape Character Policy (CP1) has been written to provide the basis for further development control policies to prevent the coalescence of all villages and towns. The Council has not been able to retain the Local Gap designations but has retained the Strategic Gap designations, albeit on a more streamlined basis. The situation in the area west of Crawley was complicated by the uncertainties involved in this area but will be clarified as a result of the more specific proposal now put forward.

Balancing Protection and Continued Evolution through New Development

Issue 3 – Balancing Protection and Continued Evolution

The issue of how protection of the District's environment and character could be balanced against the need for change in rural and built-up areas received a wide ranging response. Many responses focussed on the environment or design issues, and the comments have therefore been grouped under these headings where appropriate.

Environment

Many responses emphasised the need to ensure that the environment is protected and not lost to development. In particular, there was concern that protection of the environment should not be balanced unfavourably against other criteria such as economic and social need for change, and concern not to swamp areas with development. The effect on wildlife during construction was also a concern.

There was support to ensure the retention and protection of conservation areas, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and key landscape characteristics including ancient woodland, hedgerows and Tree Preservation Order's, as well as townscapes. The need to protect biodiversity through policy was also highlighted. There was also a desire to have specific local designations, as blanket protection policies would no longer be required.

The Council is supportive of the need to protect the environment and has sought to maintain the balance between the need for development with protection of the environment as far as possible. The SA/SEA process has been undertaken as part of the process of preparing the Issue and Options and Preferred Options, and this has helped the Council to make informed and balanced policies.

Policy CP1 sets the basis for the protection of the environment, and also provides a basis for appropriate development control policies that will protect and enhance biodiversity. This Council will continue to provide a high level of protection for our most valued landscapes and townscapes, particularly those with local or national designations such as Conservation Areas and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Where development does occur, respondents stated a desire for a policy which specifies that development will only be allowed where it results in benefits to the environment and the local community.

The Council recognises that there is a need to ensure that development minimises its impact on the environment and communities and the Core Strategy makes provision so that, where appropriate, contributions from landowners and developers will be sought. The strategy seeks to maintain and facilitate the improvement of existing facilities wherever appropriate and to seek new provision to meet needs where possible.

Design

Many respondents considered that elements of design could help protect towns and villages as well as rural areas, but at the same time allowing them to grow and change. It was felt that new development should be in keeping with the existing surroundings in terms of size and scale and it was suggested that there be policies to encourage high quality design including materials, landscaping, road layout, signage, lighting and appropriate use of land. It was also felt that the development could contain features to encourage wildlife.

The Council agrees that design issues can help to enhance developments, contribute to quality of life and also help mitigate any effects of development. Policies CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, 'Spatial Strategy and Core Policies' provides a basis for the use of sustainable construction techniques and requiring good design and landscaping. It should also be noted that many issues such as siting, layout, design and landscaping are covered by 'saved' policies in the adopted Horsham District Local Plan, which will be replaced by the General Development Control Policy: Development Plan Document in due course. In addition, site specific requirements for design are set out in the Site Specific Allocations of Land Document.

It was also considered that development should be designed to meet local needs rather than be a large expansion. It was considered that this will help maintain a settlement's viability and character. There was support for the use of Village/ Parish Design Statements to achieve improved quality of development. Concern was however raised about the re-use of agricultural buildings as exceptions to usual planning policy.

The Council acknowledges these comments and is seeking to meet local needs where these have been identified. The Council must, however, accommodate a certain level of development specified in the West Sussex Structure Plan, to help meet the wider housing needs for the Region in addition to these local needs. The Council is also supportive of the use of Village and Parish Design Statements, and has already provided assistance to communities producing such documents, and has adopted them as supplementary planning guidance. This Council shall, therefore, continue to encourage local communities to highlight the features or elements of character most important to them through Village or Parish Design Statements.

It was felt that more could be made of heritage in the District and concern was raised about the effects of development on listed buildings and the need for enhancement opportunities was highlighted. There was also a desire that permitted development rights be removed for Conservation Areas where there would otherwise be harm to the character of the area.

The Council is aware that the District has a rich and varied heritage and is supportive of the need to protect and enhance it. Consideration of the effects of development on listed buildings and conservation areas has taken place as part of the process of site assessment work leading up to the allocation of sites. Consideration of these sites and areas is also necessary as part of the Development Control process. The Council also has a programme of reviewing designated Conservation Areas and if necessary, Permitted Development rights can be removed as part of this process.

Transport

Other responses highlighted the fact that increased traffic can have a negative effect on the environment. There was desire for the effective use of public transport, as well as footpaths and cycling to balance protection and development. It was considered that there needs to be more emphasis on rural infrastructure, although it was also highlighted that it should be recognised that in rural areas there will be a reliance on the motor car.

These comments are noted and although they are not all specifically relevant to the LDF, they are issues that the Council is acutely aware of and it will endeavour to continue to support the work of local communities, and the County Council, on improving services where possible.

Miscellaneous

There was a desire for competent bodies (statutory and non-statutory) to be consulted on all non routine planning applications.

The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 details the process for planning applications and statutory consultees. Every planning application is dealt with individually and development control officers can choose to expand on these and consult other bodies if desired. The intended approach towards more significant planning applications is set out in the draft Statement of Community Involvement.

Issue 4 – Enhancing the Rural Economy versus Protection of the Character

In response to how the Council is trying to address the needs of the rural economy, whilst continuing to protect the countryside's essential character and environment, many respondents focussed on the issues of development in the countryside and the need for caution. Comments have been grouped under headings where appropriate. It should be noted that some of the issues raised in this section have already been covered in Issue 3 of this document.

Existing Businesses

There were representations expressing the desire to encourage appropriate businesses to rural areas and support for the retention of small village schools, shops, pubs and post offices as well as rural industries such as blacksmiths. There was the desire to protect rural industrial estates, including them in the Employment Protection Zones to prevent redevelopment of essential small unit industrial estates and support start-up units.

The Council recognises the need to support local businesses especially in rural areas, however limited by low governmental support and other external support. The Council recognises that it is important to cherish the strong identities of long-established rural communities whilst coping with the dynamics of change.

The Core Strategy seeks to ensure that a range of types and sizes of sites and premises are provided to meet different needs, and that most existing employment areas are retained and renewed to provide improved employment accommodation. The Council seeks to protect and enhance the District's most sustainable and valued 'industrial' areas through their identification as Employment Protection Zones (EPZ) and the application of appropriate policies within these areas, particularly in terms of a sequential approach towards any redevelopment proposals. These EPZs will, however, be in areas with built-up area boundaries as it is considered that redevelopment of industrial land outside a built-up area boundary would in any case be unlikely to meet the Government's sequential approach in the provision of housing

The Council is also supportive of the use of Village and Parish Plans, and has already provided assistance to communities producing such documents. This Council will, therefore, continue to encourage local communities to highlight the features or elements of character, including local businesses, most important to them through Village or Parish Design Statements.

New Businesses

Business plan requirements were strongly supported by respondents, whereby applicants would have to show a demonstrated need for development and ensure the long term future of land and buildings. Business plans for farm diversification, equestrian developments and conversion of agricultural buildings were in particular supported. Farm diversification was also supported, but it was felt it should benefit the local community not outside interests, and also provide protection from change of use and over expansion. There was also encouragement of rural based businesses and home-based businesses.

The Council is supportive of the need to protect existing businesses in rural areas and has sought to maintain the balance between the need for development with protection of the environment as far as possible. The strategy encourages a more diverse rural economy whilst seeking to ensure that the scale of development and level of activity is compatible with a countryside location.

The Council recognises that there is a need to ensure that development minimises its impact on the environment and on communities and the Core Strategy make provision so that, where appropriate, contributions from landowners and developers will be sought. The strategy seeks to maintain and facilitate the improvement of existing facilities wherever appropriate and to seek new provision to meet needs where possible.

Environment

Businesses should be looked at more rigorously in the rural areas. There was also concern about noise from development in rural areas.

The economic and social needs of people who live and work in the countryside are recognised and change must be accommodated. This objective must, however, be weighed against the need to protect and, where possible, enhance the countryside's essential character. The Council, in the Core Strategy, recognises the need for the continuing development and implementation of a rural strategy.

Transport

Respondents stated that sporadic development can have disadvantages in traffic terms. It was also stated that provision also needs to be made for safer crossings of roads. Access worries were also raised.

It is recognised that the needs within the rural parts of the District will remain different from the more urban areas where alternative modes of transport are either more available or can be more easily enhanced. The Council will, however, work to ensure that additional car journeys in rural areas are minimised as far as possible.

Miscellaneous

The rural community and economy has changed and is non-recoverable. It was not considered that traditional farming is any longer viable for the District but it was suggested that leisure use is the only alternative.

This comment is noted. Whilst it is accepted that farming has become more difficult for some in recent years it is considered that this used of the land can be maintained and helped by sensitive diversification schemes, where appropriate, and not replaced completely by leisure uses.

Issue 5 – Heveco Mushrooms and Brinsbury Rural Enterprise Centre

Heveco Mushrooms

Generally the responses to this issue related to the current position of the company, as well as potential development which could occur on the existing site, should the company relocate. There were a large number of objections to any future proposals which may include residential development.

There was some concern that the policy proposals in Issue 4 would not be adequate to deal with this situation and that there should not be specific mention of a company/site. There were a small number of people supporting the site either for major employment or for a limited redevelopment to 'tidy up' the site (only in relation to local employment use or very small scale residential development).

The decision to include the Heveco Mushrooms issue within the Issues and Options document was made on the basis that there was some awareness that the company may be seeking to relocate and early discussion with the community would allow time and consideration for an appropriate way forward to be established. There is not a specific policy which relates to the current site at Thakeham in the Site Specific Allocations of Land Preferred Options document as the set of circumstances surrounding the company have not yet been confirmed.

Most respondents were concerned that Heveco Mushrooms do not need to relocate for several reasons; they make a profit and have invested considerably in the site; the company have become part of the community and do their best to protect the environment and the use fits in with the rural character of the area. It is generally believed that there is sufficient land within the existing sites for the company to expand.

Whilst the company has made investments on the site, it has confirmed that the site no longer provides the opportunities required for it to compete within the modern mushroom market. The nature of the mushroom growing business makes it very sensitive to any building development taking place during operation and redevelopment would not allow all stages of the mushroom growing processes to continue.

Most comments related to the site potentially becoming vacant and that it should not be made available for any other development. Comments related mainly to residential development which would affect road safety and damage the rural character of the area. It was noted that access to the village is poor and the village does not have enough services and facilities to cope with further residential development.

Residential or alternative redevelopment was not included as a specific proposal at this stage as there are significant factors relating to any redevelopment as described above. The main issue is whether the site can or should remain vacant should the company relocate. It was important to gain an early understanding from the community and local residents as to their preferences and concerns and the light of the apparent commercial situation.

Development at Brinsbury

There was some support for this proposal. Many respondents welcomed the recognition of Brinsbury as important and its role as a rural enterprise centre (whether or not Heveco relocated). It was felt that this would help to support growth in the rural economy in the

District, with some respondents also feeling that there should be improved recreational and transport facilities in recognition of this growth.

It is acknowledged that there is support for the College at Brinsbury in its role in the growth of the rural economy. The College has been identified in the Site Specific Allocations of Land Preferred Options document (Policy AL21) to provide further support to this role. The provision allows for general enhancement which reflects the nature of the College as a rural enterprise and also allocates land for a mushroom growing facility. A master plan will be required for the whole site.

There were a small number of comments concerned that development at Brinsbury including relocating Heveco would have the impact of a major industrial development and some concern that the academic nature of the college would not work well with a mushroom growing facility on the site. It was suggested as an alternative site for residential development rather than Thakeham as it is closer to nearby services and facilities in Pulborough and Billingshurst.

There are many potential benefits for the College of this type of operation, including potential vocational training, business experience and to work with rural enterprises to develop further courses and new technology. Any development on the site will need to be sensitively designed and provide sustainable transport solutions. The site is not considered suitable for residential development. Development in this area will only be allowed if it relates to agriculture and the rural economy.

Meeting the Needs of Local Communities and Businesses

Issue 6 – Settlement Sustainability Hierarchy
--

There was a good level of support for the principle of a settlement sustainability hierarchy. It was felt that the approach was straightforward, defensible, gave a clear framework for planning decisions and gave residents some certainty over future scales of development.

There were a limited number of respondents who felt there should be further categories. Amongst the suggestions were;

- the identification of Horsham in a separate category at the top of the hierarchy;
- the identification of the largest villages (Horsham, Billingshurst and Southwater) in a separate category which are able to take major expansion; and,
- the identification of small villages where there is a presumption against development.

There was also a suggestion that those on the rail network should be identified in a distinct category.

The Council wishes to make the settlement sustainability hierarchy clear and simple to use. It is intended to be used as a ‘guide’ to the most appropriate levels of development for a particular location, assisting in concentrating development in those areas with most services and facilities. There has been a good level of support for the categories and it is therefore felt that just two categories should be identified. It is not felt that identifying more categories will be of any significant benefit. The remaining villages will be within the ‘countryside’ where more stringent planning controls apply. However, this need not mean that no further development will be allowed as this would be unsustainable and settlements must be allowed some level of natural development, particularly if needed to provide homes for local people.

The remaining comments were mostly specific to individual villages. There was generally support for the removal of built-up area boundaries from the smallest villages but there was concern that this would not enable them to evolve and expand.

The Council continues to propose the removal of the built-up area boundaries from the smallest villages identified in the Issues and Options consultation as they are unsustainable locations for growth. However, this does not mean a complete embargo on development; there may be occasions where development will be possible through the conversion or subdivision of appropriate buildings. There may also be opportunities for minor infill and exceptions housing schemes for local needs.

The majority of the remaining comments related to the inclusion of Thakeham as a category 2 settlement. Most respondents felt that it fulfilled the criteria of a category 3 settlement, as it has poor infrastructure, a limited range of facilities and could not be compared with other villages in the same category. It was also felt that the facilities the village does have were under threat.

There were further comments particularly on the inclusion of Partridge Green and Broadbridge Heath in Category 1. It was felt that due to the level of services and access to public transport they were more appropriately included within category 2. Respondents felt these villages had more in common with, for example, Cowfold and Ashington.

For clarification no category 3 was identified in the study. It is stated that a category 2 settlement should have one or more of the following: a primary school, post office, general / food store, doctors / branch surgery, community centre / village hall. They should also have an easily definable form giving the impression of being within a 'built-up' area. Thakeham has a primary school, a village hall and an easily definable form, more than the minimum required to fulfil the criteria. In addition, although not a requirement, the village has a church and a pub. It is therefore not accepted that the built-up area boundary should be removed from the village; however, the Council does acknowledge that there are variations in the levels of services and facilities in the villages within the category and Thakeham is one of the smallest.

The comments on Partridge Green and Broadbridge Heath are accepted and they have therefore been moved to category 2.

Finally a limited number of comments were received about potential impacts on the sustainability of settlements in the future. For example, it was noted that improvements to the A24 could result in some areas being able to accommodate additional housing. Conversely it was commented that falling school roles could impact on the hierarchy.

These comments are noted and the hierarchy will be updated as and when there are any changes.

Issue 7 – Planning Obligations

Approach

There was general support for the approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document. It was stated that the approach should be strictly applied to ensure new and existing communities have sufficient provision of infrastructure, facilities and services. Considerable support existed for requiring developers to meet, or contribute to the provision of infrastructure, facilities and services. Furthermore, support was expressed for the inclusion of crime prevention and health care provision measures within the planning obligations process. Considerable support existed for the approach to be formula based, flexible and

transparent. There were also requests for Parish and Neighbourhood Councils to more involved in the Planning Obligation process. Representations indicated support for contributions to be used locally and that obligations should meet identified local needs.

The Council acknowledges the considerable support for developments to provide sufficient infrastructure, facilities and services to meet the needs of the development. Furthermore, the Council recognises the support for the Planning Obligations process to be formula based, flexible and transparent. Consequently, the Council will continue to pursue and develop the approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document to ensure the delivery of sufficient infrastructure, facilities and services. The Council will also continue to incorporate and monitor the implications of changes to the Planning Obligations process as a consequence of emerging Government guidance.

Provision of infrastructure, facilities and services

It was stated that the provision of infrastructure, facilities and services should keep pace with demand. It was suggested that larger developments should deliver on site provision and smaller developments should provide contributions towards local identified need. It was stated that, with regard to utilities, it is essential that sufficient infrastructure is delivered and in place to serve the proposed development. Representations indicated concern that infrastructure, services and facilities will never materialise and it was suggested that such provision should be frontloaded. In terms of healthcare provision it was stated that healthcare planning obligations should meet an identified need and not lose out to other forms of developer contributions.

The Council acknowledges the concerns expressed in terms of the type of infrastructure, facilities and services and the timing of delivery of these requirements. The Council will, through the proposed approach, attempt to ensure the required infrastructure, facilities and services are delivered in conjunction with development.

Supplementary Planning Document

There was general support for the production of a Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It was recommended that an SPD should clearly set out criteria for an adequate level of provision of open space, recreation and sport; however, it should not address affordable housing considerations as these should be addressed through the LDF itself.

The Council acknowledges the support for the production of a Supplementary Planning Document, and is committed to the production of this document in support of adopting the necessary approach towards planning obligations. The document will need to cover the full range of planning obligations, including for affordable housing, but the basic provisions for affordable housing will be set out in the Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land DPD's.

Providing for Community, Leisure and Recreation and Tourism / Cultural Facilities

Issue 8 – Community, Leisure, Recreation and Tourism / Cultural Facilities

Community, Leisure and Recreation Facilities

There was general support for proposals to continue to safeguard open space and other community facilities.

It was suggested that the proposals should be amended to reflect the need to extend and enhance existing provision and that facilities should not be kept 'at all cost' if the quality was poor and opportunities exist to enhance and improve other facilities.

Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy reflects this concern, but retains the ability to protect facilities where necessary. An assessment of open space, sport and recreational facilities (which include community facilities) has been conducted and is a background document to the Preferred Options documents, (Horsham PPG17 Assessment).

There was some concern that small scale and natural green spaces were not protected. Some respondents commented that new developments should incorporate open space and other facilities as standard.

The Horsham PPG17 Assessment identifies a wide range of facilities and highlights where areas should be protected, reviewed or enhanced (including natural green space). It is agreed that the provision of open space and other facilities should be incorporated into new developments (see also Issue 3 – Design).

There were a number of respondents concerned about the lack of facilities for young people in the District with particular communities experiencing the most difficulty (Rudgwick, North Horsham, Broadbridge Heath and Pulborough were highlighted).

This concern is noted; Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy allows provision for specific needs in the community where they have been identified.

Tourism and Hotel Development

There were a small number of comments relating to this subject. The general principle of small scale tourism was supported, particularly if it was sustainable and generated income for the rural economy and in particular, for farmers. There was some concern that the proposals would not be sufficient enough to improve the tourist offer in the District.

The support for the proposal is noted; Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy maintains the balance between the benefits to the local economy of tourism and the impact it can have on the environment.

There was some support for the development of a town centre hotel based on existing business needs and related concerns of the closure of the Kings Head hotel in Horsham Town Centre. It was also, however, suggested that there is no demand for a town centre hotel from hotel operators and that the conversion of an office block to a hotel would be likely to cause parking and access problems and may be costly.

It is agreed that there is little demand at the moment. The Core Strategy does not make specific reference to a Town Centre hotel, but provides for flexibility in allowing for appropriate proposals should they come forward.

Secondary School at Southwater (Land West of Southwater)

Please refer to Issue 16.

Horsham Football Club

Please refer to Issue 17 – Smaller Scale ‘Greenfield’ Site Allocations – Land at Hornbrook Farm/Hilliers, Horsham

Health Care

There were a limited number on comments on this. These mainly related to the proposed care home at Storrington. It was also suggested that not all health care facilities should be protected depending on the circumstances.

The comments relating to the possible new care home on the Glebe Field at Storrington are noted; this particular proposal is no longer being pursued. In relation to the protection of healthcare facilities, Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy allows flexibility according to the identified needs of the community.

The University of Sussex

There were a large number of comments relating to this subject, mainly objecting to the proposal to accommodate a university in this location. It was suggested by most respondents that the University should seek to locate at Crawley.

The University has subsequently taken the decision to locate the proposed new campus at Crawley.

Enhancing the Vitality and Viability of Existing Centres

Issue 9 – Retail, town and village vitality and viability

General

There was general support for the principles and approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document. Considerable support was received for resisting the loss of retail establishments, particularly to residential or office use. It was suggested that town and village centre vitality is broader than just the retail context, and includes the environmental and historic quality of the centre. Furthermore, it was stated that a choice of retail provision is essential in ensuring the vitality and viability of centres. Support was expressed for mixed-use development and the provision of residential development above shops. It was suggested that rural village shops and traditional village centres/shops should be promoted.

The Council acknowledges the general support for the approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document. The Council will continue to promote this approach and philosophy, with particular regard to controlling the change of use of existing retail units, ensuring a mix of retail provision and ensuring the vitality and viability of the District's centres.

Horsham

Considerable support was expressed regarding the approach towards Horsham Town Centre in terms of further retail provision and readdressing the balance of uses throughout the town. The proposal to pursue enhancement of East Street received support, provided the existing retailers are not displaced. There was little support for the Moorhead Drive proposal, although it was acknowledged by some respondents that the proposal would serve the town and disperse shopping trips. However, the requirement for the Moorhead Drive proposal

was questioned by far more respondents and there was considerable opposition to the proposal. Finally, it was suggested that expansion of Tesco should occur, linked to the delivery of the development west of Horsham.

The Council acknowledges the support for the approach and philosophy to be adopted towards Horsham town centre, particularly the desire to control further retail provision and readdress the balance of uses throughout the town. This approach will continue to be promoted through the Local Development Framework process.

The opportunities to address the east west economic orientation of the town as referred to in the document will continued to be examined and explored. However, these opportunities are likely to emerge as identified Council projects as opposed to being progressed through the Local Development Framework process.

It was clear from the representations received that the proposal for Moorhead Drive was a source of considerable concern for local residents. In light of consultation responses and a re-examination of the proposal from an environmental perspective the site will not be carried forward into the 'Preferred Options' stage.

Elsewhere in the District

With regard to Storrington, it was suggested that new retailing establishments should be promoted at the western end of the existing village shops to balance orientation from the Mill Square precinct.

Concern was expressed that the Tesco development at Pulborough will undermine the vitality and viability of the village centre.

These responses are noted are will be taken into account in exploring local initiatives.

Evening Economy

Support was expressed for mixed-use developments. It was indicated that evening economy uses form part of an overall diversity in town centres and, in Horsham, restaurant development should be promoted. Comments were received that further provision of licensed premises is unnecessary. There was generally support for the provision of uses related to the evening economy, but also some comments were received expressing concern over further provision.

The Council will continue to promote a cautious, proactive approach which carefully balances the number of evening economy uses in particular areas and ensures that vitality and viability is not undermined.

Managing Travel Demand and Widening Choice of Transport

Issue 10 - Managing Travel Demand and Widening Choice of Transport

Respondents commented on a wide range of transport related issues. Those relevant to the LDF are discussed below.

Protection of Land for Transport Purposes

There was support for the principle of protecting land for transport purposes including the land required for the A24 improvements and undeveloped former railway track beds. In addition it was suggested that the route of the Wey and Arun Canal within the District be protected from development.

The proposed Development Control Policies Document will include a policy to protect all of these areas of land including the route of the Wey & Arun Canal.

Transport Hierarchy

There was a good level of support for the principle of a transport hierarchy for new development. Conversely it was felt by some that it was too idealistic and was more relevant to commercial development rather than residential. It was also felt by some that commuters and long stay visitors in Horsham Town Centre work in the town and are therefore very important to the local economy.

It is acknowledged that the car will for many remain an essential form of transport in the District; however, it is important that planning policies reflect the need to increase the use of more sustainable methods of travel. The Council wishes to make the hierarchy simple to use; it is intended as a 'guide' and it is considered that it is relevant to all forms of development. For example, in a residential development the needs of pedestrians and those with mobility impairments should be placed first above all other users. The transport hierarchy will be incorporated into a policy within the proposed Development Control Policies Document.

Park & Ride

Many comments were received on the park and ride schemes proposed in Horsham. A number of the comments related to the two sites proposed and are summarised under those sections within this analysis of representations. Only the principle of park & ride is considered within this section.

Although there was considerable opposition to the sites proposed there was a good level of support for the principle of park and ride. Respondents felt it increased the use of public transport, could meet the needs of long stay visitors and relieved congestion from the town and main entrance routes. Some suggested that additional facilities should be provided on the sites such as toilets and areas for small businesses; it was also suggested that the buses should be free. Those opposing the park and ride strategy described it as costly and under-used. It was considered that Horsham was too small for such a scheme, and it was damaging the businesses within the town as shoppers wish to park centrally and not use a park & ride. There was currently considered to be a surplus of parking in the town and more evidence was requested on the need for further sites.

Park & Ride forms part of the long term strategy for relieving pressure on the town centre. It is predicted that the use of the car will continue to rise; therefore the

Council must plan for the long term and ensure that the town does not suffer from a lack of parking and serious congestion. The Park & Ride sites are intended to be used by long-stay users, releasing space in the town for short-stay visitors such as shoppers. Data is currently being collated on the use of the car parks during Christmas 2004, the peak period for use. Although there is currently plenty of parking within the town centre there is no scope for further expansion. Therefore, although a further Park & Ride scheme may not be necessary in the short-term the Council will need to allocate suitable locations and bring them forward as they become necessary and available (for example at Hornbrook Farm / Hilliers).

Parking and Development / Off Street Parking & Demand Management Techniques

There was concern raised over the possibility of restrictions on parking, particularly within the villages in the District. It was felt that it could be damaging to businesses and that rural areas were reliant on the car. Respondents felt that more parking should be provided with residential developments in rural areas and that space was needed in the shopping areas to enable the village shops to prosper.

Rural car parks are currently free, unlike those within Horsham Town Centre, as a result the Council has been examining their usage and if any benefits were to be gained by charging for them. For example, charging could help remove long stay visitors so that the car parks may be used by shoppers and thereby assisting the villages. The work is still underway and at the time of preparing this response, no decision had yet been made. The concern over parking within new developments in rural areas is acknowledged and the impact of any reduction in spaces will be examined if necessary.

Few comments were received on the proposal for no further public off street parking but at present no proposals will be included in the LDF specifically to restrict their development.

Horsham as a Sub Regional Transport Hub

Few commented on this subject and it was given only limited support. There was a suggestion that District transport hubs were also identified; however, others felt it was unnecessary and would attract further development.

At present it is not proposed to progress this policy approach.

Many comments were received on the need for better public transport and improvements in cycle paths across the District. There were also a number of comments made on the need for better integration of public transport although it was felt this was difficult in rural areas. It was also commented that better public transport to health facilities was needed. Finally, it was felt by many that parking for both Horsham and Pulborough stations was particularly poor. .

These comments are noted and although they are not all specifically relevant to the LDF they are issues about which the Council is acutely aware. We will endeavour to continue to support the work of local communities and the County Council on improving services where possible.

Providing for Development Needs

Issue 11 – Built Up Area Boundaries

A detailed analysis of all representations has been undertaken and is attached as Appendix A to this report. As a result of the comments received, a number of built-up area boundaries have been changed and some new amendments made.

Issue 12 – Urban Housing Potential and Housing Delivery Strategy

Previously Developed Land (Urban Housing Potential)

Comments were made on both this issue and the actual Urban Housing Potential Study that accompanied the Issues and Options Consultation Document. As a result of concerns over deliverability of sites the Urban Housing Potential study has been updated and a number of the identified sites have been removed; in addition some further sites have been added.

There were mixed opinions expressed about the study. Although the actual methodology was not significantly challenged there were differing conclusions drawn about the results. Some felt that the study over-estimated the housing potential of previously-developed land (pdl) and as a result respondents proposed additional greenfield sites for development. Others felt that there had been an under-estimate as there had been a considerable number of homes completed on pdl in the last 2 years and that this was set to continue.

There were various site specific comments made; these are analysed in the Urban Housing Potential paper. In addition there were concerns over the development of commercial sites for residential purposes. It could result in the loss of employment sites and increasing travel to work times. It was also suggested that a more flexible approach to the development of pdl in the countryside should be taken, allowing more residential development in some exceptional cases.

The Urban Housing Potential Study has been updated following the consultation exercise and is available on request. It is not accepted that we have over estimated the level of development potential on pdl. There has been a considerable amount of development on pdl in the last couple of years and it is anticipated that this will continue. Due to the nature of the sites, many of which are small infill developments, it is not easy specifically to identify them. Additional development on ‘reserve’ greenfield sites has been identified, should there be a shortfall in the completion of homes on pdl; however, there will be careful monitoring of the situation and they will only be released if a shortfall occurs.

In response to the concern over the development of employment land and premises, the Council acknowledges that this is a matter which requires a careful balance and is preparing policies that seek to protect certain areas, where appropriate.

Finally, it is not considered appropriate as a general rule to release rural previously-developed sites for residential development; however, a flexible approach will be taken in exceptional circumstances particularly if the scheme involves significant environmental or community benefits.

Overall Housing Strategy

Additional comments were submitted on the overall housing strategy for the District. There was no in principle objection to the development of pdl, but it was stressed by many that the

Council must ensure housing delivery is achieved. It was also felt that the plan must have regard to the emerging South East Plan and that housing figures must be flexible. It was suggested by some that further greenfield sites should be allocated to accommodate potential shortfalls resulting from a potential undersupply of pdl and uncertainty over the delivery of the land west of Crawley Strategic Housing Development. Conversely others felt that we must not over-supply housing as the Council has a good track record of housing delivery; allocating further greenfield land will only result in more developers pushing for further housing releases.

Finally, there were further sites suggested that could be a source of varying types of housing.

These comments are noted and the support for the strategy is welcomed. Horsham District has a very good track record in delivering housing during the plan period 1997 - 2004. The Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land documents propose sites for housing development that not only fulfil the requirement set out in the Structure Plan but allow for further greenfield development should deliverability of pdl not be achieved. There are also allowances for further expansion of the strategic housing location west of Horsham if that is deemed necessary, particularly as a result of the work on the South East Plan. Housing delivery will be carefully monitored.

Specific sites suggested for development through the consultation exercise are discussed in Appendix B of this document.

Issue 13 – Land West of Crawley: Strategic Location

Horsham Crawley Strategic Gap

A considerable number of comments were received indicating that development West of Crawley would be detrimental to the Horsham-Crawley Strategic Gap. In addition, there was opposition towards the expansion of Crawley towards Horsham. It was also suggested that indicating a revised Strategic Gap, with the potential of development occurring within it to deliver the Strategic Location, was misleading to the public regarding the future planning of the area

Traffic and Highway Infrastructure

It was suggested that solutions to transport implications should be identified early and sufficient highway and transport infrastructure provided. Indeed, it was suggested that the development would have a significant impact on the M23. Concern was expressed about the likely increase in traffic levels and about access onto the existing road infrastructure as a consequence of the development. With regard to the Structure Plan requirement for a relief road to accompany the development, concerns were raised relating to the archaeological and ecological impact and whether the relief road is required to support the development. It was suggested the development could be delivered without the relief road, or that it could be delivered in conjunction with a second runway at Gatwick. Conversely, it was indicated that the relief road could ease pressure on the existing road network.

Other sites suggested

In terms of sites suggested as alternatives if the feasibility work established that West of Crawley is undeliverable the following sites were suggested: south of Broadbridge Heath; south of Crawley; land East and North East of Crawley; land south east and east of Crawley; and development opportunities within Crawley. Conversely, several comments suggested that the land south east and east of Crawley should not be considered for development.

Gatwick

A considerable proportion of representations stated that the delivery of the Strategic Location is depended on the expansion of Gatwick. However, a significant number of representations indicated that the potential expansion of Gatwick does not preclude development. Concern was expressed that if Gatwick expansion precludes development West of Crawley no contingency options have been identified. It was suggested that if a second runway were to be built a relief road would be essential.

Utilities

It was stated that the water main in the area is of sufficient size to meet demand; however, there is a need to plan for additional need. Furthermore, it was indicated that it would be preferable if the development were serviced by a new sewage treatment works.

General

There was notable support for the approach adopted in the Issues and Options document. Conversely, it was stated the approach adopted within the Issues and Options Document was misleading in terms of the likely delivery of West of Crawley. However, concerns were raised that no contingency options had been identified in the document if West of Crawley was to prove undeliverable. Furthermore, some representations indicated that a surplus of sites should be identified to ensure housing delivery. However, to a lesser degree it was suggested no contingency options should be identified. Furthermore, the Strategic Location allocation should remain West of Crawley and not be transferred to alternative parts of the District.

Several comments were made relating to potential objectives and principles that should be applied when planning for the development including: ensure the protection of environmental and archaeological designations; sustainability should be considered; need to balance economic development and rural protection; loss of greenfield land should be minimised; noise and visual pollution should be considered; and development should include a provision of commercial development. Furthermore, it was suggested inadequate facilities, services and infrastructure exist to support development. In addition, support was stated for further studies to examine the deliverability and feasibility of Land West of Crawley.

Concerns were expressed that the proposed approach is not in conformity with the Structure Plan and some indicated conformity is essential. Furthermore, it was indicated that the focus for development should be land West of Crawley. Indeed, it was suggested the Strategic Location should be brought forward as a priority post-2006. There was also objection to the Strategic Location being developed whatsoever.

Finally, several representations stated that a study should be undertaken to explore the opportunities within the Gatwick Diamond sub-region to accommodate further development.

Site specific

A number of site specific comments were received relating to the West of Crawley including; the southern half of the area of search is not affected by noise contours; West of Bewbush has good road access; West of Bewbush relates well to the existing settlement; West of Bewbush has the ability to accommodate neighbourhood development. Comments were also received indicating that development West of Bewbush is inappropriate and needs to be fully justified. Conversely, it was suggested that development West of Bewbush is inappropriate and that the development should be West of Ifield and phased for 2006

onwards. Objections were raised against the 'rejection' of the development West of Crawley and that West of Bewbush is suitable for accommodating the development.

The numerous comments received regarding the approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document have been invaluable in terms of determining the future approach for planning for West of Crawley and highlighting the social, economic and environmental issues that need to be encapsulated within planning for the Strategic Development Location. Fundamentally, however, in light of consultation responses, particularly from BAA and the Government Office for the South East it is clear that the Council adopting a stance that precludes development West of Crawley until the second runway issue is resolved is unacceptable. Therefore, the Council in the 'Preferred Options' Document is now indicating its preferred location for accommodating the Strategic Development Location West of Crawley for consultation taking into account the social, economic and environmental issues raised through the consultation on the Issues and Options Document. That provision addresses the specific issues about particular locations within the wider area, including west of Ifield and west of Bewbush.

Issue 14 – Land West of Horsham Strategic Location

There were a large number of comments made on the principle of the development, its location, scale and impact. The majority of respondents strongly objected to the proposals. There were also a large number of comments relating to the Sussex University proposal but due to the subsequent decision by the University to locate in Crawley these have not been considered in detail. A smaller number of comments were received on the proposed new railway station, but again due to the decision not to progress development adjacent to the railway these are not analysed in detail here; however they have all been noted should this issue be relevant in the future.

The largest number of concerns related to the impact of any development on Broadbridge Heath, particularly its character and the separate identity it has from Horsham. It was stated that it has a strong sense of community and will be swamped by the development which, will double the size of the village. There was also considerable concern that the character of Horsham is being lost as it expands and that development will result in the coalescence of Horsham with Broadbridge Heath. There were a large number of objections to the scale of the development; most felt that if there must be some development within Broadbridge Heath it should only be in the form of minor infill sites. In addition there were objections to the proposal for 1,250 homes rather than the 1,000 stated in the Structure Plan and the potential for construction to commence before 2011.

In contrast there were more limited numbers who supported or partially supported the development in this location. It fulfils the Structure Plan requirement, is concentrated enough to support good transport links and would result in a mixed-use development providing many services and facilities to the wider community.

The concern over the coalescence of Horsham and Broadbridge Heath and the impact on the character of these areas is acknowledged by the Council. It is acutely aware of the strength of feeling against the development and the impact it may have on existing communities. It acknowledges that the character of particularly Broadbridge Heath will be affected; however, it is hoped that through consultation with the community measures will be put in place to minimise any negative impacts. There will be opportunities for the community to input their ideas into the proposed development for example though suggesting facilities, such as allotments and playing fields, which they would wish to see as part of a scheme.

On the issue of 'over-provision', the figure in the Structure Plan is not a maximum figure and the actual provision must relate to the proper master planning of the area. The Examination in Public Panel did not rule out an increase if it were needed, stating that the assessment of this location should have regard to this possibility so that sufficient flexibility exists and that Horsham District Council also needs to consider beyond 2016. It is felt that this scale of development is necessary in order to secure the required infrastructure as part of the initial development. A new junction on the A24 is essential and we are looking to provide 40% affordable housing, as well as the range of other community facilities.

A large number of respondents stated that the development should be in the form of an urban extension of Horsham and not extend beyond the A24, in line with the Structure Plan Examination in Public Panel's comments.

Many respondents suggested that an alternative site for the strategic housing location should be Rookwood Golf Course. It was felt that the course was underused and loss making and that development of the site would keep the housing within the boundaries of the A24 therefore not impacting on the countryside beyond. There were also those who objected strongly to the idea of developing the course stating that it was a good course and that there would be a significant impact on the nature reserve.

As set out in paragraphs 4.26 – 4.29 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document, due to the requirement for a new junction onto the A24 it is not possible to contain development solely to the inside of the A24. In the interests of proper planning it is therefore more appropriate to plan for development in both locations. In addition the Council has also undertaken a further examination of the potential for the golf course to accommodate the strategic housing location. Details of the work are set out in paragraph 4.32 – 4.40 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document. In summary it is felt that the course would be extremely difficult to access, much of the development would be isolated from Horsham and it would result in the loss of a popular golf course. In addition there would be considerable environmental impacts from a development, including development in part of Warnham Nature Reserve, the loss of a significant number of mature trees and the need to cross a particularly wide flood plain to connect the residents of the new housing with the town. The area has been managed for its biodiversity and development would be very damaging.

Rookwood Golf Course is very popular with well over 40,000 rounds played every year. The financial surplus achieved from golf fees, catering and shop sales when all operating costs have been taken into account averages £35,000 every year. This surplus supports other leisure services, such as the adjacent Warnham Nature Reserve. The Council therefore does not consider the area a suitable alternative to the proposed development west of Horsham.

There was significant concern expressed over the damage to flora and fauna that this development would cause to land within the proposed sites and adjacent land / woodland. There were objections to the loss of the countryside / greenfields and any increase in noise and pollution. Noise reduction measures were requested. It was also stated that the impact on the environment as well as archaeological and industrial heritage must be investigated and that High Wood and the edge of the river be protected. Finally many were concerned that the area was prone to flooding and that this would be worsened by increased runoff due to the development. There was also concern over the capacity of the sewage works, its ability to cope with the development and any resulting pollution. It was suggested that a buffer zone should be established around the wastewater works to avoid sensitive development being located too close.

Throughout the planning of this proposed development we will be working with Southern Water and the Environment Agency. We are aware that some of the land is liable to flooding and as a result will not be suitable for development. In addition the River Arun and surrounding drains have been surveyed and estimates of the extent of the flood plain should global warming result in an increase in the level of water have been made. Again development will not be located in the sensitive locations. Southern Water will also be working with the Council to ensure that the development does not pollute the river, that the wastewater works can cope and that there is sufficient water supply to the development. This may require significant funding from the developers. The wastewater treatment works will need to be extended to accommodate all of the development proposed and improvements are planned to meet the higher standards set by the Environment Agency. The area currently proposed for development is not within the area identified by Southern Water as being significantly affected by smell nuisance from the works.

In addition to this work surveys have and will be undertaken to identify the most sensitive areas in terms of ecology.

There were concerns and comments made in relation to services and facilities provided alongside the new development and key requirements such as the need for many affordable homes and open space. Among the others mentioned was the good access to sporting facilities although additional facilities for the local football and cricket teams were requested. There were queries as to whether there were sufficient employment opportunities for residents and about provision for school places, the police, fire service and care for the elderly. There were concerns over water shortages and the ability to deal with waste. There were also many objections to the development due to the lack of a local hospital and A&E department. It was felt that there were few facilities for residents to the east of the A24 and that promised facilities are not guaranteed. Finally it was commented that all schemes should include crime prevention measures.

There were also many comments received on the transport and highway network. Some felt the development would increase the need to travel and result in greater congestion, there were objections to the proposed highway network and concern that it would lead to increased traffic through Broadbridge Heath and Warnham. It was also felt that the residents of the area would be too car dependent and that building new roads was unsustainable, costly and environmentally damaging. Major changes and improvements are needed to make the development successful; improvements to the A24 and traffic calming measures were requested for a number of areas. It was suggested that land to the east of the A24 would provide the most sustainable option in terms of potential access to public transport networks. Development could also impact on the wider motorway network. Finally, there were a number of requests for improved footpaths and cycle networks to link the development with the surrounding town and the countryside beyond and concern over the impact of the development on existing public rights of way.

There were a number of site specific transport and access issues raised; these will be dealt with on an individual basis should development in this location proceed. As part of the more detailed masterplanning of the proposed development the Council will consider in detail the needs of the communities affected. We have already received information on the need for health, education and potential library provision and further work will be done in conjunction with West Sussex County Council and the Primary Care Trust. It must however, be stressed that the provision of hospitals and A & E departments is outside of the control of the District Council. We will consult with communities further to ensure that any facilities and services are provided where possible.

The Council will also continue to work with the relevant transport and highways providers to ensure that the highway network is efficient and that the use of the private car is kept to a minimum. In preparing the detailed masterplan, work will focus on creating good linkages by foot, bicycle and vehicles including public transport between any new development and the existing built areas. In particular there are opportunities for good links with the existing bus network.

Issue 15 - Land north of Broadbridge Heath

There were also a number of comments relating to the proposed allocation of land to the north of Broadbridge Heath. There were mixed views with some considering the site suitable for development and others feeling it was ad hoc and unrelated to the village. Some felt that the development should be built before the strategic housing location and others felt that in addition to the strategic location developing this additional site would be too much and damage the character of the village. There was concern that the development would be made more unsustainable as many services and facilities would be concentrated to the south of the village in the longer term.

In addition to these more fundamental concerns respondents also commented on potential flooding problems in the area, increased traffic flow on Guildford Road, poor access and the high value of the site ecologically and as open space with well used footpaths.

As a result of the comments received and a decision to concentrate on development to the south of Broadbridge Heath and East of the A24 this site is not being considered further in this round of the Local Development Framework. There would be access issues without the improvements proposed as part other major development and the parallel development of this land would complicate the delivery of appropriate infrastructure as well as social integration.

Finally a number of additional site specific comments were made. Land to the west of Broadbridge Heath was proposed for development in preference to the sites suggested as well as land at Christs Hospital School and land south of the railway to the south of Horsham. It was also suggested that some of the proposed development area could be used for a high tech business park and that Tesco's should be able to expand.

It is not considered that the alternative sites fulfil the Structure Plan definition of the strategic development location. The other comments are noted.

Issue 16 – Secondary School at Southwater

There were a large number of objections to the proposal; however, there were also a limited amount of support providing that the development of the school did not lead to further housing development at Southwater. Other support was given as it was felt that the school would bring long term benefits to the community.

There is no allocation proposed for residential development to the west of Southwater. The support for the principle of the school is noted; it could potentially have benefits to the community in terms of access to sporting and recreational facilities and other community uses. There may also be an opportunity to enhance provision of facilities for young people as a result.

The majority of comments listed key objections to the site. The main concerns related to the understanding that the school would not be viable as there are falling school rolls and the County Council would not be able to support the building of the school in financial terms.

There were a number of respondents concerned that the school would affect choice (in relation to the single sex schools). Broadbridge Heath was referred to as being a more suitable location for the school, rather than Southwater.

It is acknowledged that primary school rolls are falling, whilst there is limited new development. However, the school will be required as the school population grows as a result of development within the north part of the District and the nature of the school will be determined as and when appropriate. The funding for the school would be explored when necessary through the appropriate educational processes. The site in Southwater was identified as there are potentially enough pupils locally to have a substantial local catchment area.

Other comments related to impact on the local environment (ancient woodland, listed building, recreation value, habitat, loss of farmland and flooding,) as well as potentially building in the Strategic Gap. There were a number of people concerned over increase in traffic at school times.

It is acknowledged that there will be some impact on the environment; however, these concerns will be addressed if the requirement to bring forward the school is confirmed. It is intended that the 'streamlining' of the Strategic Gap takes account of the potential requirement for the school in this location.

Issue 17 – Smaller Scale 'Greenfield' Site Allocations

A range of comments were made about the small greenfield sites suggested as possible development locations in the Issues and Options documentation. Most of the comments that were made related to specific sites, but there was also some more general comments relating to the development of small greenfield sites more generally.

General small sites comments

Several comments noted that the proposals for small scale greenfield allocations totalled 813 dwellings, and queried why there was an oversupply from the identified need of 550 homes set out in the West Sussex Structure Plan.

The Council notes this comment. Whilst the County Council stated that there is a need for 550 homes on greenfield land, it also set a target of 4010 homes to be built on previously developed land. The urban housing potential study that was undertaken by this Council identified that there was likely to be a potential shortfall from this target, and in order to meet the total housing requirements that the Council must accommodate, the shortfall may need to be met through making additional provision on small greenfield sites.

There was also a feeling that development should only take place in the most sustainable settlements, specifically the category 1 settlements identified by the Council. Billingshurst and Pulborough were both suggested as locations for development. Development at villages with railway stations was also suggested.

The Council agrees that the vast majority of development that takes place should be in the most sustainable locations possible. There are, however, occasions where smaller settlements need development to help meet an identified local need, for example affordable homes for local people. Development has therefore been proposed outside the category one settlements to help meet these needs, or to allow the continued gradual evolution of settlements.

Some respondents stated that they supported all the proposed locations for development provided that they are what local people want. It was also felt that the developments should not be detrimental to the character of the existing settlement and the surrounding area. The need to provide affordable smaller homes was highlighted. It was also felt that developers should be asked to make contributions to help meet the needs generated by new housing development.

The Council has tried as far as possible to locate development where there is an identified need. Policies in the Local Development Framework documentation aim to ensure that the development protects and enhances landscape character and that contributions are made to local services and facilities.

Windacres and Summerfold – Rudgwick

Most comments made concerning the development proposals in Rudgwick were not site specific, and considered the implications for development in the village more generally. Although some respondents accepted the need for development in the village, it was generally considered that the proposed developments are not sustainable. The village was felt to be too small with limited services and facilities to support the proposed level of development. Specific concerns were raised about development increasing traffic levels, and adversely affecting the village's character. Another major concern was the impact of development on drainage and water supply. The fact that the village has experienced loss of water supply in recent summers was highlighted and it was felt that new development would add to this problem.

Site specific comments received about Windacres included a comment that the elderly accommodation proposed did not provide sufficient justification for development. Conversely, another comment stated that the site should not be limited to a development providing accommodation for the elderly. The need to protect the existing trees on the site as well as the mature hedgerow on the site boundary in the event of development on the site was also highlighted. Specific comments about development at Summerfold also included the need to retain existing tree cover and undertake an ecological survey.

The concerns over the level of development in Rudgwick are noted. The Council considers, however, that the village has some capacity to accommodate further development and the elderly accommodation will help to meet identified need. It is also anticipated that the development will help to maintain the vitality of the village, particularly with the element of mixed use development that is proposed. The concerns with the water supply are also noted and further consultation is being undertaken with Southern Water in relation to these problems.

It is acknowledged that there are concerns about the total amount of housing proposed for the village. This is noted, but as a consequence of the development of land to the south (formerly Churchman's Meadow), it is not thought that the land at Summerfold and Windacres Farm will be defensible from development in the long term. It is therefore considered that a comprehensive planned development will be preferable, and it is intended that the development be phased to ensure that the development at Summerfold is phased for a later part of the period, before 2016.

Land at Hornbrook Farm / Hilliers, Horsham

Respondents commented on the various different aspects of this proposal as well as the principle of development in this location.

i) Park & Ride

Many comments were made on the issue of park & ride in general; these are analysed in the *'Managing Travel Demand and Widening the Choice of Transport'* section of this report. In summary it was considered that there was no justification for the park & ride, that Horsham was too small and that the existing facilities were underused. There was also support for park & ride in the town as it relieves congestion and eases pressure on parking spaces freeing them for shoppers. In relation to the Hornbrook / Hilliers site it was commented that development of this site is being led by a need for Park & Ride sites, overriding other policy considerations; it was the wrong site for such a scheme and will increase traffic on the roads. It was also felt that as there was no bus lane between the site and the town centre there would be no advantage to be gained by using the park & ride.

The Park & Ride strategy is summarised in the *'Managing Travel Demand and Widening the Choice of Transport'* section of this report. The Council continues to feel that this site on a main access route into the town is the most appropriate location available for park & ride. In addition its use for this purpose can also be combined with other uses of the site.

ii) Football Stadium

There was both support and opposition for the proposed football stadium. The identification of a site was welcomed, enabling Horsham Football Club to expand and cater for many different users; it was felt that the impact on neighbours would be limited and that sharing the park & ride would work well. In contrast some felt the club would have a negative impact on for local residents. It was felt that the Club should not have sold its ground and that it should seek to share with other clubs in the area. It was also suggested it could be located within the land west of Horsham development or at the Hop Oast Site. There were objections to the development on a greenfield site in a sensitive location in landscape and environmental terms. The area acts as a buffer between the edge of the town and the AONB.

Horsham Football Club has been unsuccessful in seeking another site for many years and their current site no longer meets their needs. There are no opportunities to share sites locally due to the facilities required and other proposals have been unsuccessful. The club wishes to expand to provide further facilities for both the club and community; it continues to be felt that this site is the most appropriate. It could also be combined with the use of the park and ride and is within walking distance of much of the town. Concerns over floodlighting and noise are acknowledged and will be dealt with in more detail at a later stage in the process. It is not felt that the development would be in a particularly sensitive location in terms of landscape; however, again minimising its impact will be considered in more detail at a later stage.

iii) Residential Development

There were many objections to the proposed residential part of the scheme. It was felt that the site was in a sensitive rural location, exposed and development would impact on the adjacent AONB. The river is considered the natural boundary of the town and development should not extend beyond it; development will affect the character of the area and proposals have been refused there and on the Hilliers site in the past. The land is considered to be at risk from flooding and there were objections to the development on a greenfield site in a sensitive location in landscape and environmental terms.

It is accepted that there are many constraints on development in this location and the layout of the housing will take these into consideration. There will also be further work on the extent of the flood plain and ecological surveys will be undertaken.

In addition to these comments on it was also felt that access was poor and that there will be an increase in traffic on an already dangerous road. There was concern over the impact on neighbouring roads, the lack of safe cycle routes and footpaths and a few objections were raised to the extension of the Riverside Walk. Local residents were particularly concerned about the impact of the scheme on their homes, character of the area, amenity and the safety of the overhead power lines.

Detailed reasoning for the retention of this site in the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options is set out in paragraph 4.48 of that document. In summary it is felt that only a comprehensive approach to development including land both sides of the road is acceptable and will achieve the many community benefits described.

The Plough, Lower Beeding

Relatively few comments were received concerning the proposals for development at this location. Some stated that the development was not in a sustainable location, although others were more supportive as it would help meet an identified need. Other respondents highlighted the need for the development to help fund improvements to the village, notably the traffic and local services. The need to take into account ecological considerations was also highlighted.

The Council notes the comments regarding the sustainability of the settlement, but the development at this location has been proposed to meet an identified local need, and there is local support for this development. The comments regarding traffic and other considerations are noted and this has been reflected in the wording of Policy AL13.

Merios Farm, Ashington

Relatively few comments were received about the proposal for the development of this site. Although a few respondents stated that the development should take place in a more sustainable location either outside or within the village, most comments were concerned with the need to ensure that the development brought about improvements to community facilities or affordable housing. Concern was raised about the impact of the development on Rectory Lane, and the need to consider ecological issues as part of any development was also raised.

Whilst the Council acknowledges the comments relating to the sustainability of Ashington as a settlement, the development of this site is small scale and could help meet affordable housing needs and contribute to the continued vitality of the village, and there is a level of support for this development. The concerns about affordable housing and impact on Rectory Lane and the environment are noted and have been addressed through Policy AL7.

RMC Engineering – Washington

Whilst the number of comments received in relation to this site was relatively limited, those that did comment stated that the site was not a sustainable location for housing as it is too far from services and facilities. It was also felt that if the housing is needed to help bring about the country park, then the housing should be built after 2016 as the sand workings will not be available for this purpose until that time. Concern was also raised about the potential for

contamination. The need to consider ecological issues, particularly the presence of bats and reptiles as part of any development was also raised.

The concerns over the sustainability of the site are noted, but it is emphasised that the proposal for development on this site is solely to enable the bringing forward of the proposed Country Park. It is hoped that by enabling the development of this site prior to 2016 some elements of the Country Park can be developed at an earlier phase. The sensitivity of the site is recognised and as a consequence Policy AL18 recognises the need for the development to be built to a very high standard. In addition, the possibility of contamination on the site has also been noted and is discussed in the Preferred Options documentation.

RAFA – Storrington

Again, relatively few comments were received regarding the proposals for development of this location. Those that did comment considered that it was in an unsustainable location and also raised concern about its sensitive location adjoining a SSSI and next to the Sussex Downs AONB. It was highlighted that English Nature will need to be consulted due to the fact that the site adjoins a SSSI. It was also questioned whether the use of the existing site could be intensified.

Development on this site is required to meet the identified expansion needs of the RAFA site. Although the site is a reasonable distance from the centre of Storrington, the residents of this site will be part of the retirement care home complex and therefore car usage to Storrington village centre is unlikely to be an issue. Concerns about landscape and the stability of the sand pit SSSI to the south are noted and are addressed in Policy AL15.

Forge Way – Billingshurst

The main issue raised in relation to this site was confusion as to why there was consultation taking place on the site when there was already a planning application for development on the site. It was also felt that the current recreation use should be retained on the site.

Although a planning application had been submitted for this site, at the time of the Issues and Options consultation, it was not known whether permission for development on this site would be granted. The consultation was therefore to enable discussion about the site in the longer term if the application was not permitted. The site has now been allocated for development in Policy AL8, in accordance with the decision on the planning application, but pending the outcome of the inquiry about 'village green' status for the site.

School Site, and 1997 Local Plan Allocation I1 – Barns Green

The proposals for redevelopment and amalgamation of the school site received a number of comments. Most respondents were not in favour of amalgamating and relocating the two schools, although subject to further consultation, the County Council stated that it would like to see the infant and junior schools operating on the same site.

Many felt that the proposal to locate the new school on the I1 site would lead to problems with road safety as the site is on the edge of the village, and Two Mile Ash Road is narrow with poor visibility. It was also felt that the school would not be in a central location.

Concerns were also raised about the proposals for housing development on both the sites. A major concern was the unsustainability of the village due to its lack of facilities and lack of

public transport. The scale of development was also thought to be too high. Concerns were also raised about the possibility of flooding on the I1 site due to the proximity of the river, and the need for a flood risk analysis before any development was highlighted. The need to consider ecological issues was also highlighted.

This Council recognises the concerns of the local community in relation to the number of services in the village and the proposals to amalgamate the infant and junior schools. It is however considered that development in the village will help to maintain the existing services and a proposal would be in line with the County Council comments that it would be beneficial to see the schools placed on one site. Although the I1 site is further from the village centre than the infant school it is much closer to the village centre than the existing junior school. The concerns over traffic are noted, however, and the location and access to any primary school will need to be determined prior to any residential development on the site. It also proposed to phase the development by virtue of the need to construct the new school before any development can take place on the existing site and this will enable the village to grow at a more gradual rate and housing to become assimilated into the settlement.

Silverdale or Lodge Hill – Coldwaltham

Relatively few comments were received concerning proposals for development in Coldwaltham. Some concern was raised over the sustainability of the proposals, and whether affordable homes should be built in an area which has no services and facilities. Where a preference was made for development on one of the two sites, it was felt that the Silverdale site would be preferable. The Lodge Hill site was thought to have potential for protected species and it was also queried whether development of this site had more to do with planning gain rather than being in strict accordance with planning policies.

The comments in relation to Lodge Hill and Silverdale are noted. As any development in Coldwaltham would be to meet local needs only, the Council considers that this can be provided through an exception site policy, and consequently the allocation of one of these sites is not needed.

East of the A24 – Horsham

Few objections were raised in response to the proposal to develop this site, although some concern was raised about its relatively isolated location and the impact of road noise on the development. If the site is developed it was considered that contributions should be sought towards the library service. Ecological considerations were also raised as it is possible that the site could have potential for bat species. The line of trees across the site is also considered to be significant and it is considered that they should be protected.

The comments in relation to the issues of noise and the ecological considerations affecting the site have been noted, and requirements to address these issues have been incorporated into Policy AL11.

Buchan Park, Crawley

A large number of comments were received in relation to this site nearly all of which were opposed to development. Included in the responses was a petition against the development. Key concerns raised included the sensitive location of the site in landscape terms (the site adjoins the High Weald AONB). There was also concern that development of the site would erode the gap between Horsham and Crawley. Another key concern regarding the proposal for development on this site was biodiversity. A number of respondents highlighted the

importance of this area for conservation, highlighting its proximity to the SSSI, and it was stated that the site was likely to meet the criteria for SNCI designation in the future.

Other concerns raised in relation to development on the site included the difficulty of accessing the site and the impact of noise and air pollution from the road on any development. The impact of the development on pollution, crime and increased pressure on services and facilities was also raised.

The Council has noted the comments that were submitted in relation to this site. Whilst many of the issues such as the impact of noise and pressure on services and facilities could potentially be overcome as part of any development, the importance of the site for nature conservation, and its potential for designation as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance was of particular concern for this Council. As a consequence of the comments the proposal to develop this site is not being progressed.

Pound House – Upper Beeding

A large response was made to the proposal for development on this site. Most representations opposed the development. This included petitions from nearby residents who opposed the development. The key concerns raised were the possibility of flooding on the site. It was also highlighted that the drainage in Pound Lane is already poor and it was considered that the development of this site could worsen this situation.

It was also felt that development of the site would have an adverse impact on the landscape character of the area, and concern about the impact on the listed building to the south of the site was also raised. Impact on the local road network was also a concern, in particular the narrow Smugglers Lane to the south of the site.

This site was proposed primarily in order to provide housing to meet local needs and any development of this site therefore needs a high level of local support. The high number of responses from local residents opposing this development has demonstrated that the level of public support needed for this type of development is not present, and the Council does not therefore consider that it is appropriate to continue with this development proposal as part of the Preferred Options. It may be capable of coming forward as an ‘exceptions’ scheme.

Moorhead Drive – Horsham

A large number of responses were received in relation to this site. Nearly all, including three petitions, were opposed to development on the site. Development on the site was not believed to be appropriate as it would have a negative impact the surrounding landscape, and damage the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in which the site would be located. Concerns were also raised that development on this site would narrow the strategic gap between Horsham and Crawley.

Respondents also questioned whether there was the need for a park and ride facility at the Moorhead Roundabout location. It was felt that there was already sufficient provision in Horsham, and it was also considered that at this location most traffic would be bound towards Crawley rather than heading into Horsham. It was suggested by some that if it was needed it should be located between the railway line and the A264. The need for a supermarket in the north east part of the town was also questioned, as it was felt that there was already sufficient provision both in terms of local stores and the larger supermarkets in the south of Horsham and at Broadbridge Heath.

In addition to these main comments other concerns raised about the development of the Moorhead Drive site were the effects of an increase in traffic, possible increase in crime levels, increased light pollution and the adverse effect on the ecology of the area.

The Council acknowledges the comments that were submitted in relation to this site. Whilst many of the issues such as the impact of traffic could potentially be overcome the impact of the development on the landscape and in particular the AONB designation has resulted in this proposal not being progressed. The effect on the Strategic Gap is also an important consideration.

In relation to the comments submitted regarding the proposal for a Park and Ride in the North Horsham area, it is considered that a Park and Ride site does not need to be progressed in the North Horsham area at this stage. Notwithstanding this the Council will continue to seek a further park and ride site in the area, if necessary. More detail in response to the Council's Park & Ride strategy is summarised in the '*Managing Travel Demand and Widening the Choice of Transport*' section of this report.

Forest Road – Horsham

Whilst there was some support for the development of this site, others were concerned that development on this site should not take place as it is in the High Weald AONB. Other responses stated that if development on the site does occur there is a need for an ecological survey. It was also suggested that any development should provide funds to help enhance the riverside walk.

Due to the potential for the development to adversely impact the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Strategic Gap, the Council will not be progressing this site in the Preferred Options.

Many other sites have been suggested for development through this consultation exercise. These are summarised in Appendix B; some sites are considered appropriate for development and more details are included in the 'Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options'.

Issue 18 – Affordable Housing

Approach

Considerable support was expressed for affordable housing remaining affordable in perpetuity. Furthermore, support existed for the Policy approach outlined in the Issues and Options document, particularly if need can be demonstrated. It was indicated that affordable housing provision can be delivered with a flexible and enabling planning approach. Extensive support existed for the provision of more affordable housing, and it was acknowledged that there is a current undersupply. Furthermore, representations stated the importance of a variety of housing types under the affordable housing umbrella, particularly key worker housing. Support existed for affordable housing to meet local needs primarily. It was suggested the Council should identify ways which planning can address the shortfall in affordable housing supply. It was stated that affordable housing provision is essential for the area's economic sustainability.

Concern existed regarding mixing private and affordable housing and that the integration of the two housing types does not work.

The Council acknowledges the considerable support for the provision of affordable housing and the support for a mix of affordable housing types, particularly key worker housing. Furthermore, the Council accepts that the planning process is the key mechanism for delivering affordable housing, and consequently, the Council will continue to promote the approach outlined in the Issues and Options Document.

Threshold

Considerable support existed for the introduction of a lower threshold for the requirement of affordable housing, although it was stated any threshold should be justified. It was suggested that the threshold for brownfield land should be higher as costs of development are higher. A considerable number of comments indicated that the lower threshold for the requirement of affordable housing will make development unviable. Consequently, it was suggested that developers will continue to propose developments below the threshold. It is also suggested the proposed policy approach is not in conformity with Government Policy.

The Council acknowledges the balance in the representations made regarding the proposed threshold in terms of some support for the threshold to achieve more affordable housing against concerns it will make development economically unviable. However, the Council believes the proposed threshold is justified in housing needs terms, and that the approach has sufficient flexibility to ensure maximum affordable housing provision from developments without undermining their economic viability. A study into affordable housing viability has recently been commissioned.

Delivery

Support exists for new market housing to subsidise affordable housing. Representations supported commuted payments and emphasis on developers to deliver affordable housing. The provision of affordable housing spread throughout a development was supported. It was stated that the Housing Needs survey should be used to identify housing type need.

Concern existed that affordable housing actually means smaller houses not cheaper. It was suggested a more flexible approach to affordable housing type provision is required. It was indicated that the onus on developers to provide affordable housing is inappropriate.

In terms of the delivery of affordable housing the representations highlight the difficulties of delivery, which to a large degree the Council also acknowledges. However, the Council will continue to pursue the delivery of affordable housing as a proportion of development, or through commuted payments. This approach has to be adopted in light of the limited opportunities that exist more broadly to deliver affordable housing.

Issue 19 – Gypsies and Travellers

General

There was considerable support for the proactive approach for dealing with the Travellers and Gypsies issue, as outlined in the Issues and Options Document. It was suggested that Policy should be harmonised County wide, or a central Sussex coalition should be formed. Furthermore, it was indicated that a clear timetable for action would be beneficial. The undertaking of the need assessment was generally supported, but it was indicated that traveller and gypsy need should be considered separately. The comments acknowledged the difficulty of site identification.

The Council acknowledges the general support for the proactive approach adopted in the Issues and Options Document. The Council will continue to promote and develop this approach in an attempt to meet the District's traveller and gypsy need and give the Council greater ability to take enforcement action against further unauthorised encampments. The Council is satisfied that the need assessment was essential in meeting the objectives of this approach and believes the assessment is a comprehensive and robust study of a challenging issue.

General site

Comments suggested that traveller and gypsy sites should be located well away from residential areas or established settlements. However, some comments indicated that sites should be located close to existing settlements to access infrastructure, facilities and services. A considerable number of comments were received indicating that noise and visual impacts should be kept to a minimum.

The Council acknowledges the comments relating to the provision of traveller and gypsy sites, and will take these into account as the work on identifying needs progresses.

Site Specific

In terms of site specific representations the comments were; make temporary use of land identified within the possible Gatwick second runway safeguarding; expand the Cousin Copse site; consider Shoreham Cement Works as a site; object to a site at Tower Road, Colgate; and that there are no further sites required in Upper Beeding.

With regard to the site specific comments received it remains clear, that if required, site provision identification will be challenging and require extensive site assessment analysis.

Issue 20 – Employment Sites and Employment Protection Zones

Strategy

Considerable support was stated for the introduction of Employment Protection Zones (EPZ). EPZ need to be flexibly implemented it was stated. There was minimal support for not introducing EPZ.

The Council acknowledges the considerable support for the introduction of Employment Protection Zones (EPZ). The Council will continue to promote the introduction of EPZ and develop further the evidence base for their designation.

General

Some representations stated that the introduction of EPZ should balance economic development with the protection of rural character/greenfields, and balance site protection with economic viability and the provision of employment and residential development. It is suggested small and medium sized businesses should be encouraged and that smaller employment sites should be protected. Finally, it was stated that the policy approach needs to outline criteria to establish economic viability.

With regard to the representations received indicating that the introduction of EPZ should be a balance between ensuring economic development and protection of the countryside, the introduction of EPZ seeks to achieve this balance through protecting

the District's most valuable commercial sites and not precluding the redevelopment of others where appropriate.

Site specific

Support was expressed for the inclusion of; Daux Road, Billingshurst; Gillmans Industrial Estate, Billingshurst; Huffwood Trading Estate, Billingshurst; Foundry Lane, Horsham; Mackley Industrial Estate, Small Dole; Station Approach Industrial Estate, Pulborough; and Eagle Industrial Estate Billingshurst. A representation was made that the Eagle Industrial Estate Billingshurst should be excluded as an EPZ. Furthermore, it was suggested Nightingale Road EPZ could be better utilised, perhaps for commuter parking or residential development.

With regard to the comments received relating to those sites, which are proposed to be designated as EPZ the Council considers that only boundary amendments may be required. In addition, after further examination and assessment work the Council intends to include the Eagle Industrial Estate as an EPZ in the Development Control Policies document.

Methodology

The methodology for identifying EPZ was questioned in light of no obvious analysis having been carried out on the amount of employment land required and employment opportunities.

The evidence base for the identification of the EPZ was comprehensive and robust, but is being developed further and refined to ensure that those commercial sites proposed are the most appropriate for designation.

Employment Allocations - General

Representation was made that commercial self-build should be encouraged, and there should be a mix of freehold and leasehold premises. There was support for a mix of commercial premises to meet a range of economic and employment objectives and support for mixed-use commercial and residential development. Concern existed that insufficient consideration had been given to loss of existing employment sites and the need to provide a greater range of employment sites. Opinion was divided regarding economic growth between support for growth and concern that economic growth equates to greater development pressure. Finally, it was stated that additional commercial development is required and clarification is needed regarding how the Council will meet its small site employment provision.

The Council acknowledges the comments received regarding employment land provision and related issues. The Council is seeking to achieve a balance to ensure continued economic prosperity and delivering the Structure Plan employment land allocation against preventing unsustainable economic growth and related development requirements. The Council's approach as outlined in the Issues and Options Document acknowledges the importance of a variety of premises, particularly small and medium business provision.

Site Specific

i) Chantry Industrial Estate, Storrington

The comments relating to the proposal for Chantry Industrial Estate included; development would equate to erosion of the rural character; constitute inappropriate development adjacent

to the AONB; increased traffic levels would occur; result in an inappropriate level of development; and that access arrangements are unlikely to be suitable. There was support for the proposal, provided the site's proximity to the AONB is respected.

The proposal for Chantry Industrial Estate will not be pursued through the Local Development Framework process as a consequence of the consideration of the consultation responses and a re-examination of the planning considerations surrounding the development.

ii) Henfield Business Park, Small Dole

The proposal for Henfield Business Park was subject to notable opposition, on the basis of the particular circumstances and background to the original development of the site.

The proposal for Henfield Business Park will not be pursued through the Local Development Framework process as a consequence of the consideration of the consultation responses and a re-examination of the planning considerations surrounding the development.

iii) Shoreham Cement Works

Representations on Shoreham Cement Works stated; the proposal should include tourism friendly developments; the site could make a contribution to tourism and leisure provision; clear the site and encourage natural growth; regard should be given to proximity to Beeding Hill and Newtimber SSSI; development of site will increase private car use; the site has inadequate access; the impact on A283/A27 junction needs to be considered; the site needs addressing its an eyesore; redevelopment is essential and desirable; and site management will be challenging once development has occurred.

Support was expressed for the policy approach if a need can be demonstrated; however, concern was expressed that additional employment development will increase demand for housing. Furthermore, concern was expressed that development would not support coastal regeneration and does not support the approach outlined in RPG9.

The Council has noted the representations received regarding the proposed policy approach for Shoreham Cement Works. The Council considers that the most appropriate approach for the Shoreham Cement Works site is to continue to pursue the policy provisions as outlined in the Issues and Options Document, through the Local Development Framework process.

iv) Warnham Brickworks Plant

Representations on Warnham Brickworks Plant suggested that; the site should be allocated as B2 and B8 major employment site; the site should be identified as a major employment allocation; and tourism and leisure provision should be considered at the site.

Noted; future redevelopment opportunities that may exist at this site will continue to be examined. It is accepted that an allocation of land for business and warehousing use would be appropriate.

v) Other Sites

Finally, representations were made that Colonnades, Pulborough and Kingsfold Nursery, Kingsfold are appropriate for commercial development.

These comments are noted but no change is proposed.

Improving the Quality of New development

Issue 21 - Improving the Quality of New Development

There was complete support for the principles set out in the Issues and Options consultation document; people wished to see developments of poor design being rejected and care taken over design particularly as densities increase. As may be expected there were differing views on what constitutes good design with support for both traditional and modern innovative approaches. It was suggested that design guides could be written and there was considerable support for Village and Town Design Statements, particularly if reliance is placed on them in the determination of planning applications. There was a wish to see less standard house types proposed by developers and more individuality. It was also felt that there needed to be more detail in the policy and greater definition of terms such as 'quality'. Finally, it was stressed by many that 'affordable housing' must not be bland and should be well integrated into any development.

All these points are accepted by the Council and it will endeavour to ensure good design with all new development. The Council is continuing to encourage the development of Village and Town Design Statements as they are considered to be the best way to set out the characteristics and the local design guidance needed across such a varied District. More detail on what is required in terms of good design will be included in the Development Control Policies document.

In addition to comments on design many respondents also commented on the need to ensure that developments are more environmentally friendly. There was a strong desire for development to respect the environment, particularly in terms of energy efficiency, promoting biodiversity, recycling and minimising waste. It was also felt that building designs should be adaptable to cater for peoples changing needs.

All these points are again accepted and the Council will work to ensure features to help protect the environment are incorporated into developments. Core Policy CP2 has been written to reflect this, and in addition more detail on what is required will be included in the Development Control Policies document.

Appendix A - Built-up Area Boundary Assessment – Summary of proposed amendments

The letters within the following tables refer to the sites as identified in the Issues and Options Consultation Document – Built-up Area Boundaries, Appendix 4.

Overall Summary

- 1.1 There were a very limited number of respondents who **objected to all built-up area boundary** (BUAB) amendments as it was felt that this would result in more development pressure.
- 1.2 The intention of the BUAB assessment work was to ensure that the boundaries were logical, consistent and reflect changing circumstances. In most cases this will not result in further development pressure as there are a limited number of new areas included where this would be possible (excluding the proposed housing allocations). However there is a requirement for further housing across the District and small infill plots contribute a significant number of homes. Through the work undertaken on the settlement sustainability hierarchy it is felt that all the villages and towns included in the BUAB assessment work are capable of accommodating varying levels of development; therefore the definition of BUABs ensures that development occurs in the most sustainable locations. It is not this Council's intention completely to restrict development in the villages and towns with BUABs as this would be an unsustainable position to take.
- 1.3 There was **concern raised by a number of respondents about the inclusion of open space, leisure and recreation grounds / buildings, including school playing fields** within BUABs. These are highly valued areas and there was significant opposition to any development in these locations.
- 1.4 Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (Sport and Recreation) Para 10 states that;
'Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space or the buildings and land to be surplus to requirements. For open space, 'surplus to requirements' should include consideration of all the functions that open space can perform. Not all open space, sport and recreational land and buildings are of equal merit and some may be available for alternative uses. In the absence of a robust and up-to-date assessment by a local authority, an applicant for planning permission may seek to demonstrate through an independent assessment that the land or buildings are surplus to requirements. Developers will need to consult the local community and demonstrate that their proposals are widely supported by them.'

1.5 As indicated above it is only in exceptional circumstances that development of open space and recreation land etc will be considered. There is no intention that all areas with BUABs should be available for development; areas of open space and recreation land are vitally important to the health and well being of the residents of these towns and villages. However, in most cases the areas considered for inclusion relate more to the built area of the town or village than they do to the countryside beyond. It is considered that their inclusion in the built-up area may be of benefit to a number of organisations as it will allow for improvements to be made to facilities, particularly buildings, as the sites are no longer considered to be part of the 'countryside' to which the more stringent countryside policies apply.

1.6 The following analysis of representations relates to the site specific comments beyond those already discussed.

1. AMBERLEY			Council response to consultation
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	
A	Curtilage	Area is very environmentally sensitive and liable to flooding	Agree – boundary to follow existing line of flood plain.
B	Curtilage	Inclusion of land could lead to development which may impact on the AONB	As proposed
C	Curtilage	Inclusion of land could lead to development which may impact on the AONB	As proposed
D	School / playing fields	Land relates more to countryside than the village although northern end more built-up. Development may impact on AONB	As proposed – see 1.3 – 1.5
E	Existing residential area	Should also be aware of applications and development at Drewitts Farm	As proposed
F	Existing residential area and castle grounds	Concerned that any development may impact on AONB. However also support as Vicarage garden felt to be suitable for small development	As proposed

1.7 There was both support and objections raised to every suggested amendment, further site specific responses are summarised above. There was particular concern over area 'A' which is environmentally sensitive and within the flood plain. The land relates to, and is strongly influenced by the countryside beyond. Therefore, although it is unlikely that development would be permitted in this area the Council agrees that to enhance the level of protection this land should remain outside of the built-up area.

1.8 The objections to the remaining amendments are not accepted. It is felt that they are logical and consistent; in the majority of cases involving the inclusion of land within the curtilage of residential properties or land already developed that adjoins the existing village.

Amberley is within the South Downs AONB and in a sensitive location in terms of both the environment and the landscape; however, this should not mean a complete moratorium on development. Any development within the BUAB will need to be aware of these issues and respect the location. There was support for the inclusion of the curtilage of the Vicarage as there is the potential for a small scale housing scheme which will provide smaller homes needed by the community.

2. ASHINGTON			Council response to proposed amendment
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	
A	Field contained by by-pass	The site is intended as part of a landscape buffer but there are no major concerns relating to its inclusion	As proposed
B	Minor	-	As proposed
D	School / playing fields	Consider school area should remain as countryside, however there are no major landscape concerns over its inclusion.	As proposed – see 1.3 – 1.5
E	Site proposed for development and adjoining properties	There has been general support for the proposal, it is seen as logical and there are no serious landscape concerns. (See also responses to site allocations – Merios Farm)	As proposed
Areas proposed to be removed			Reasons
C	Rural woodland	The removal of the site was supported	As proposed
New areas proposed			
Curtilage of 19 – 21 Church Close	Curtilage	-	Agree – boundary amended to include curtilage

2.1 There was generally support for all of the suggested amendments in Ashington, however as discussed before there was some concern over the inclusion of the school playing fields. Following the consultation all the proposed changes and one further minor amendment have been made.

3. BARNS GREEN		
Areas proposed to be removed	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses
A	Residential allocation	See responses to site allocations – Barns Green
		Council response to proposed amendment A scheme is being proposed for this site involving housing and the construction of a new school; as a result the BUAB will not be amended.

4. BILLINGSHURST		
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses
A	Open space contained by the by-pass and the curtilage of a listed house	It was felt that the land relates more to countryside than the village but conversely other respondents felt it was isolated from the countryside and well screened.
B	Curtilage	-
C	Existing residential area	-
		Council response to proposed amendment As proposed – see 1.3 – 1.5
		As proposed
		As proposed

4.1 There was support for all of the proposed amendments and few site specific comments were made, therefore following the consultation all the proposed changes have been made.

5. BRAMBER AND UPPER BEEDING		
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses
A	Individual dwelling	It was felt that the house was distinct and separate from the existing built area and that there were no reasons to include it.
B	Existing employment area	The site is within the AONB and distinct from the existing built area. There was also some support for its inclusion as it could be redeveloped for housing.
C	Curtilage	Inclusion of land may lead to development pressure
D	Mobile Home park	The mobile home park relates more to the countryside than the village, however there was suggestion that further properties could be included within the boundary

5.1 There were a number of concerns over the proposed amendments to the BUAB in this area. It is a sensitive area both in landscape and environmental terms, as a result many of the concerns are accepted and the boundaries will not be amended. The Council also accepts the view that the inclusion of further land could lead to development pressure which would be detrimental to the area particularly the AONB and the extensive flood plain and that the existing boundaries were logical.

6. BROADBRIDGE HEATH		
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses
A	Open space contained by highways and retail park	It was felt that there may be ecological value in the site including bats, reptiles and may trees. These should be surveyed before any development is approved. It was also felt that the site may not be suitable for housing and may be more appropriate for employment and retail uses.
New areas proposed		
Land South of Broadbridge Heath	Strategic housing location	See responses to Strategic housing location – Land West of Horsham

Council response to proposed amendment

As proposed

A scheme is being proposed for housing on this site, as a result the BUAB will be amended in line with the development boundary.

6.1 It was felt that the inclusion of site 'A' was logical although there were issues that needed addressing before any development was permitted. The Council agrees and the boundary will be amended as proposed.

7. BUCKS GREEN			Council response to proposed amendment
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	
A	Curtilage	Consider that BUAB is ambiguous and follows no logical boundary. Land outside boundary is liable to flooding and covenant prevents development, boundary should be extended up to stream.	As proposed
B	Curtilage	-	As proposed
C	Curtilage	-	As proposed
D	Curtilage	-	As proposed
E	Curtilage	-	As proposed
F	Curtilage	The area must be surveyed for ecological value if any development was to take place	As proposed
G	Car Park	-	As proposed
H	Curtilage	-	As proposed
New areas proposed			
Curtilage of Little Pytchely	Curtilage / woodland	It is felt that this piece of land is part of the curtilage of the dwelling and should be included.	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position

7.1 Except for area 'A', all of the BUAB amendments in Bucks Green were supported and they will all be amended as proposed. It was felt that the boundary at 'A' should be amended to follow the stream; however, this land is wooded and liable to flooding. Therefore the Council considers it more logical to follow the line of the built form on the plot to prevent development pressure in a sensitive area.

7.2 In addition to the proposed amendments a new area was suggested, however the Council does not consider that this land forms part of the curtilage of the dwelling and includes a wooded area which relates better to the countryside. Any development in this area would be detrimental to the character of the village and as a result the proposed amendment is not agreed.

8. CHRIST'S HOSPITAL			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
It was proposed to change the Built-up area boundary for Christ's Hospital but there may be a need to alter the BUAB around Home Farm once this development has been completed. (See application no: SQ/150/01)			
New areas proposed			
Curtilage of Station Cottages	Curtilage	Suggested amendment	Agree – boundary amended to include curtilage of properties
Cornerways and adjacent land	Residential property with wooded area	Suggested amendment	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
Northgate and adjacent land	Residential property and open space	Suggested amendment	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position

8.1 Through the consultation process three amendments to the BUAB were suggested. Area 'A' involves an extension to include the curtilage of properties. The Council agrees with this amendment which is consistent with the approach throughout the District, although there a large number of trees to the rear of the gardens which must be considered should any development take place. Areas 'B' and 'C' involve large detached properties with large gardens and some open or undeveloped areas. It is not felt these areas should be incorporated into the built-up area. They are distinctive in character to the existing areas of more dense development and help to provide 'breaks' between areas of development.

9. COLDWALTHAM			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	School / playing fields	Playing field more relates to countryside	As proposed – see 1.3 – 1.5
B	Existing residential area	-	As proposed
C	Curtilage	Garden should remain as countryside	As proposed

9.1 All the BUAB amendments in Coldwaltham received support although there were a couple of minor objections. The inclusion of playing fields has already been discussed. With regard to area 'C' the Council does not agree that a minor amendment to include a small area of garden is inappropriate. This amendment is logical and consistent with the approach taken across the District.

10. COWFOLD			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Existing residential area	It was felt that the area has a rural character distinct from the rest of Cowfold. It was also noted that there may be significant ecological value in the area that would need protection.	As proposed
B	Curtilage	This is a large curtilage that best relates to the countryside	As proposed
C	School/ playing fields	Concern over inclusion of open space	As proposed – see 1.3 – 1.5

10.1 All the BUABs will remain as proposed although it is acknowledged that there were some concerns raised, in particular about area 'A'. It is accepted that area 'A' is of a different character to the surrounding built-up area, but it is felt that it relates more to the village than the countryside beyond. There are a number of houses of different sizes, styles and ages fronting onto the main road, many of which are bounded by hedges and fences with drives giving a more built appearance to this part of the village. The gardens contain many trees and mature landscaping which gives a very 'green' entrance to the village and must be respected should development of any form take place.

10.2 The objection relating to the inclusion of area 'C' is not accepted, although it is a large curtilage, its inclusion is consistent with decisions taken across the District. It is not felt to be in such a sensitive location as to warrant more protection.

11. FAYGATE			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Existing residential and employment area	-	As proposed
B	Café	-	As proposed
Areas proposed to be removed			
C	Not part of built-up area	-	As proposed

11.1 There was support for all of the proposed amendments; therefore following the consultation all the proposed changes have been made.

12. HENFIELD			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Playing fields	The land relates more to the countryside than the village, it would be afforded more protection by remaining in the countryside.	As proposed – see 1.3 – 1.5
B	Guide Hut	The site related more to the countryside, its inclusion in the BUAB would threaten the community use of the area.	Agree – boundary will not be amended
C	Housing allocation and existing housing	See responses to site allocations – Parsonage Farm, Henfield	A scheme is being proposed for housing on this site, as a result the BUAB will be amended in line with the development boundary.

12.1 There was concern raised about all the proposed amendments. The reason for the inclusion of playing fields has been discussed earlier and the boundary will be changed as proposed, however it is accepted that the Guide Hut is in a sensitive location that relates well to the open countryside beyond and is distinct from the existing village, particularly due to its access. As a result the boundary will not be altered at this location.

13. HORSHAM			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Curtilage	-	As proposed
B	Curtilage	-	This site will be included within the amendment required for the strategic housing location.
C	Curtilage	-	This site will be included within the amendment required for the strategic housing location
D	New residential development	It was considered that this site should not be developed and that an ecological survey would be necessary.	As proposed – the site has planning permission
E	Recreation land	There was strong opposition to any development on this site and it was felt it must be protected. A proposal for some limited development was submitted on the site.	As proposed – see 1.3 – 1.5
F	Housing allocation	See responses to site allocations – Forest Road, Horsham	Change not made – boundary will remain in current position

G	Playing fields / open space	There were both support and objections to the amendment	As proposed – see 1.3 – 1.5
H	Curtilage	-	As proposed
New areas proposed			
Dwellings in Forest Road	Existing housing	Suggested amendment	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position

13.1 There were concerns raised over all of the proposed amendments; particularly the inclusion of open space and one respondent felt all BUABs should remain as they are. The concern over the inclusion of open space is acknowledged and the Council is aware of the strength of feeling relating to the Cricket Club; however, as previously discussed it is felt that these areas relate more to the town than the countryside and as a result the boundary will be amended as proposed. Any development proposals will be judged on their individual merits and must fulfil the requirements set out in PPG17 (see Para 1.3. – 1.5).

13.2 Sites 'B' and 'C' will be subsumed by the proposed strategic housing location and as a result will be incorporated into the wider built-up area required for that development.

13.3 Two further areas were suggested for inclusion along Forest Road. The area is within the AONB and consists of large detached homes in a rural setting. With the decision not to continue to propose residential development to the north of Forest Road it is felt that these amendments will not be appropriate. The area continues to have a rural feeling to it, and the inclusion of the sites could lead to infill development creating a ribbon of development along the road.

14. LOWER BEEDING			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Existing residential area	The area is distinct and separate from the village	As proposed
New areas proposed			
The Plough Pub and adjacent houses	Housing allocation and existing housing	See responses to site allocations – The Plough, Lower Beeding	A scheme is proposed for housing on this site, as a result the BUAB will be amended. It will also be extended to include existing housing to the south.

14.1 There were few comments relating to the proposed changes in the BUAB in Lower Beeding. It is not considered that the existing residential area is distinct from the village, although a minor adjustment to the boundary has been made. Therefore, following the consultation all the proposed changes have been made.

15. MANNINGS HEATH	
No amendments were proposed – this position has been supported and the boundary will remain as proposed	

16. PARTRIDGE GREEN		
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses
A	Curtilage	It was felt the area related more to the countryside
Areas proposed to be removed		
B	Housing allocation	-
		Council response to proposed amendment As proposed
		As proposed

16.1 Although there was concern raised about the inclusion of the gardens of a number of properties it is felt that this is consistent with decisions taken across the District. It is not felt to be in such a sensitive location as to warrant more protection.

16.2 It is unlikely that the housing allocation at site 'B' will be implemented and therefore this site and boundary will be removed.

17. PULBOROUGH / CODMORE HILL		
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses
A	Curtilage	There were conflicting views, it was felt the site should remain as countryside where as other raised no objections
B	Curtilage	There were conflicting views, it was felt the site should remain as countryside where as other raised no objections
C	Housing allocation and existing residential area	There was support for both the proposed development and the inclusion of the existing residential area
D	School / playing fields	The site would be better protected by remaining in the countryside
F	Curtilage	The area is unsuitable for development and should remain as countryside
G	Curtilage	There is no benefit to including the land, it is adjacent to open space and should remain countryside.
		Council response to proposed amendment As proposed
		As proposed
		As proposed
		As proposed – see 1.3 – 1.5
		As proposed
		As proposed

H	Curtilage	Area is very environmentally sensitive and liable to flooding, inclusion may lead to development pressure	Agree – boundary to follow existing building line and flood plain.
I	Existing residential area	-	As proposed
J	Existing employment area	-	As proposed
Areas proposed to be removed			
E	Housing allocation	There was support for the removal of the site however its continuing allocation for residential development was also promoted	As proposed

17.1 There was particular concern over area 'H' which is environmentally sensitive and within the flood plain. The land relates to, and is strongly influenced by the countryside beyond. Therefore, although it is unlikely that development would be permitted in this area the Council agrees that to enhance the level of protection this land should remain outside of the built-up area. The boundary will also be amended to more tightly follow the existing building line. Although similar concerns were raised over area 'G' the proposed amendment is only minor and the flood plain does not extend so far into the gardens of the properties as further west.

17.2 The objections to the remaining amendments are not accepted. It is felt that they are logical and consistent, in the majority of cases involving the inclusion of land within the curtilage of residential properties. There was good support for the inclusion of area 'C' and the exclusion of area 'E' from the BUAB. Area 'E' no longer fulfils the Councils vision and strategy for housing development in the District and has been replaced by more suitable sites, particularly concentrating on previously-developed land and the strategic housing locations.

18. RUDGWICK			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Curtilage	-	As proposed
B	Curtilage	-	As proposed
C	Minor	-	As proposed
D	Curtilage	-	As proposed
New areas proposed			
Lynwick Street	Housing allocation and adjacent fields / woodland	Suggested amendment	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position

18.1 No comments were made on any of the proposed amendments; therefore following the consultation all the proposed changes have been made.

18.2 An extension to the BUAB along Lynwick Street is proposed. The southern part of the street is very rural in nature and well wooded. Development is set back from the road and some way from the village centre, it is rural in nature and as a result the proposal is not supported.

19. RUSPER			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Inclusion of hotel complex	-	As proposed
B	Curtilage	-	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
C	Curtilage and small field	-	As proposed
D	Minor	-	As proposed
E	Existing residential area	-	As proposed
F	School / playing fields	-	As proposed - see 1.3 – 1.5
G	Graveyard	Supported	As proposed
H	Existing house	Supported	As proposed

19.1 There is concern that amendment 'B' appears as an anomaly and may lead to development pressure in the wider countryside; as a result it will not be amended. All other amendments were supported therefore following the consultation all the remaining proposed changes have been made.

20. SLINFOLD			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Curtilage	Open area, any intensification of uses will impact on The Street. It adjoins the Conservation Area	Amended
B	Curtilage	Area is within Conservation Area with limited access	As proposed
C	Curtilage	Oppose development in location, others had no objection to inclusion	As proposed
D	Graveyard and curtilage	Graveyard should not be disturbed, others had no objection to inclusion	Extended to include all of graveyard
E	Existing house	Not felt to be the entrance to the village, property largely hidden. One felt the boundary should be extended	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
F	Curtilage	Not the curtilage, belongs to adjacent business	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
G	Minor	No objection	As proposed
H	Tennis Court	Private tennis courts, not part of curtilage, could encourage infilling	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
J	Elec. Sub-station	Object, not visible from road, may encourage infill in sensitive location	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
K	Minor	Not residential property, inclusion detrimental to character of conservation area and central fields	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
L	Curtilage	Inclusion may encourage development which will be detrimental to the character of conservation area and central fields	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
M	Curtilage	Inclusion may encourage development which will be detrimental to the character of conservation area and	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position

	central fields	position
N	Inclusion may encourage development which will be detrimental to the character of conservation area and central fields	Amended – to protect character of central fields
New areas proposed		
Park Street	Suggested amendment	Include area as proposed
The Limes	Suggested amendment	No change – boundary will remain in current position

20.1 Comments were made on every suggested amendment, the site specific responses are summarised above. There was particular concern over the amendments in the 'central fields' area (Areas 'H' – 'N'). The central field's area is a key and distinctive characteristic of the village, it is particularly sensitive in landscape terms. There was significant concern and objection to any proposal that may result in development pressure in this area. Therefore, the Council agrees that, in this particular circumstance, to enhance the level of protection this land should remain outside of the built-up area.

20.2 Objections were also raised to area 'E'. Although this is the first property seen as you enter the village from the east it is agreed that it is detached and has a distinct feeling of separation from the village, therefore the boundary will not be amended. As a consequence it will equally not be extended to include a wider area as has been proposed.

20.3 The boundary at 'A' has been amended to include the curtilage of the property fronting the road rather than a wider area in response to the consultation.

21. SMALL DOLE		
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Curtilage	As proposed
B	Curtilage	As proposed
C	Playing fields	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
D	Curtilage	As proposed, with minor amendment
E	Curtilage / playground	As proposed - see 1.3 – 1.5

F	Curtilage	Both support and objection to inclusion. The area is horse paddocks, will result in development pressure on adjoining plots	As proposed
G	Curtilage	Inclusion will lead to development pressure in adjoining plots.	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position

21.1 There was concern over a number of the proposed amendments, the village has limited facilities and it was felt that many of the amendments may lead to development pressure as a result some amendments have not been made. There was significant concern over the inclusion of the playing fields, particularly as they are privately owned and there are felt to be no alternative locations for such uses in the village. Therefore in this exceptional circumstance and due to the important role the site plays in separating much of the residential area from the employment area, it is felt that the site should remain as countryside.

22. SOUTHWATER			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Existing residential area	The inclusion of this area should not be justified due to its proximity to the industrial area, it is well screened, tranquil and quite separate in nature. The area has a distinct character. The boundary is illogical and inconsistent; it should not include the nursery and will result in infill development. Reclassification removes development restrictions, damaging to Strategic Gap.	As proposed with minor amendment
B	Existing residential area	See area 'A'	As proposed
C	Open space contained by the by-pass	Object due to inclusion of open space	As proposed - see 1.3 – 1.5
D	Minor	-	As proposed
E	Existing residential area	-	As proposed
F	Curtilage	-	As proposed
New areas proposed			
Curtilage of 27 Millfield	Curtilage	Suggested amendment	Include area as proposed, see also proposed allocation at Millfield, Southwater

- 22.1 Some respondents supported all the proposed amendments, further site specific responses are summarised above.
- 22.2 There were a number of objections raised about the inclusion of the New Road area (areas 'A' & 'B'). The Council does not accept many of the views. The area is clearly of an 'urban' nature distinct from the countryside beyond and forms part of Southwater. The boundary has been drawn tightly along the back of some properties to protect the Strategic Gap from development pressure. The nursery within the site has been derelict for some years and redevelopment would be considered.
- 22.3 The majority of the other amendments were supported therefore following the consultation all the remaining proposed changes have been made.

23. STEYNING		
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses
A	Formal recreation area	-
B	Curtilage	-
C	Existing residential area	-Site is within Bramber Parish
E	Curtilage	-
Areas proposed to be removed		
D	Minor	-
		Council response to proposed amendment
		As proposed
		As proposed
		Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
		As proposed
		As proposed

- 23.1 Few comments were made on the BUAB amendments within the Steyning area, however one respondent objected to all due to the impact on the AONB. The Council does not accept this view, most the proposed amendments are not within the AONB and even if near to the area they are not felt to impact on it. However, area 'C' within the AONB has been reconsidered and due to its rural nature it will not be included within the BUAB.

24. STORRINGTON / SULLINGTON / HEATH COMMON		
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses
A	Curtilage	-
B	Disused pit	Area has good tree cover, sensitive, may require Tree Preservation Order. Inclusion supported
		Council response to proposed amendment
		As proposed
		Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position

C	School playing fields	Site is within Thakeham parish. Area better protected as countryside, concern over inclusion of playing fields. May impact on adjacent Sullington Warren.	As proposed - see 1.3 – 1.5
E	Open space	Contains many trees, may result in development pressure	As proposed - see 1.3 – 1.5
F	Curtilage / Housing allocation	See policy AL15 of the 'Site specific allocations of land – Preferred Options'	BUAB extended to include proposed allocation
G	Formal recreation	-	As proposed
H	Curtilage	-	As proposed
J	Curtilage	-	As proposed
K	Curtilage	Object, inclusion will encourage further housing. Another respondent suggested the inclusion of further land	Minor amendment to boundary
Areas proposed to be removed			
D	Quarrying	Wish to see included as small development needed to assist in funding the cleaning up of site.	Agree – boundary will remain in current position
New areas proposed			
Highcroft	Dwelling	Suggested amendment	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
Georges Lane	Existing residential area	Suggested amendment	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position

24.1 The majority of the proposed amendments were not commented upon; however, there was concern over the inclusion of area 'B'. Following further consideration it was felt that this site was particularly sensitive and contained many trees and a variety of flora and fauna. It is of a rural nature and it surrounded by low density housing, much of which is accessed from private roads in a wooded setting. In order to protect this particularly sensitive area from development pressure it will not be included within the BUAB.

24.2 There have been two areas where extensions to the BUAB are suggested, both in Heath Common. Heath Common is a sensitive area in landscape and ecology terms and has a distinctive character. In the case of both sites it is felt that the inclusion of the land will lead to development pressure, to the detriment of the area. In addition Georges Lane is an unmade road which has a particularly rural feel to it.

24.3 Following the consultation, all the remaining proposed changes have been made.

25. THAKEHAM (The Street & High Bar Lane)			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Existing residential / playing fields	Unnecessary, not of urban appearance, may be archaeologically sensitive, includes important open space, requires strong protection, many trees in area.	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
B	Dwelling	Support	As proposed
C	Existing residential area	Support	As proposed

25.1 There was strong objection to the inclusion of area 'A' which is felt to be environmentally sensitive including important open space. It was also felt that any development resulting from the inclusion of the land would be detrimental to the village. The Council feels that the land relates to the village but agrees it is different in character. The properties do not front directly onto the main road and are well wooded. The area is part of Thakeham Conservation Area, therefore any development would have to protect and enhance the character of the village. However, due to the level of public concern and the need to protect the character of the village, so important to the local residents, this land will remain outside of the built-up area.

25.2 No objections were made to the other proposals therefore following the consultation all the remaining proposed changes have been made.

26. WARNHAM			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Curtilage	Delete, illogical	As proposed
B	Curtilage	Delete, illogical	As proposed
C	New residential development	-	As proposed
D	Curtilage	-	As proposed
E	Graveyard	-	As proposed
F	Curtilage	Delete, illogical	As proposed
G	Curtilage	-	As proposed
H	Existing residential area	Inclusion serves no purpose, illogical boundary	Proposed change not made – boundary will remain in current position
J	Curtilage	Delete, illogical	As proposed

26.1 There were few comments made about the BUAB amendments although concern was raised over the inclusion of area 'H'. This is an area of housing arranged around the village green that is an intrinsic part of the village, however it is a particularly sensitive area and any infill development could be damaging to its character. As a result the Council accepts the concern and the area will remain outside of the BUAB.

26.2 The objections to the remaining amendments are not accepted. It is felt that they are logical and consistent; involving the inclusion of land within the curtilage of residential properties in line with amendments made across the District.

27. WASHINGTON			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Existing residential area	Consider there are no good reasons to include area	As proposed
B	School and playing field	Playing fields have open character, object to inclusion	As proposed see 1.3 – 1.5

27.1 Concern was raised over the inclusion of both areas; however, these are not accepted by the Council. Area 'A' is an area of existing housing that has the same character as the remainder of the village. Although it is within the AONB (as is the whole village) it is not felt that its inclusion is to the detriment of this designation. If any development proposals of any scale result from the inclusion of this land they must consider the impact on the AONB as well as a variety of other policies. Any scheme that is detrimental to the AONB will be refused.

28. WEST CHILTINGTON VILLAGE			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Existing residential area	-	As proposed
B	Existing residential area	-	As proposed
C	Existing residential area	-	As proposed
D	Community facilities	-	As proposed

29. WEST CHILTINGTON COMMON			
Areas proposed for inclusion	Amendment Type	Consultation Responses	Council response to proposed amendment
A	Existing residential area	Object, area north of road does not form part of village built frontage.	Boundary amended
B	Small holding	Object, inclusion will encourage development which may be environmentally damaging and increase the feeling of	Proposed change not made - boundary will remain in current

		coalescence between the villages. Area relates more to countryside.	position
C	Existing residential area	-	As proposed
D	Community facilities	-	As proposed
E	Minor	-	As proposed
F	Curtilage	-	As proposed
G	Curtilage	Inclusion may impact on Hurston Warren SSSI	As proposed
H	Curtilage	Inclusion may impact on Hurston Warren SSSI	As proposed

29.1 There were few comments made on the proposed boundaries, as a result most the changes have been made. A minor amendment has been made to exclude land north of the road in area 'A' as, although it does front the main road it is accepted that it does not form part of the 'village'. It is also agreed that area 'B' be removed as it relates well to the countryside and inclusion may result in development pressure. Access to the area is also difficult.

30. CRAWLEY

A number of roads adjoining Crawley Borough boundary have been suggested for inclusion in the built-up area. The 'Site Specific Allocations of Land – Preferred Options' Policy AL5 show a potential strategic housing location to the west of these roads. The built-up area boundary in this location will therefore be assessed once the location of the new development has been more firmly determined.

Appendix B: Sites submitted during the Issues and Options Consultation Period for Residential Development

A map showing the approximate location of these sites is included in the pocket at the back of this document

Ashington

AS1 - Land East of Penn Gardens

Residential development of the site would alter the form of the settlement and generate pressure for development on surrounding land. Residential development of the site would extend the village boundary in the form of ribbon development thought to be unsuitable.

AS2 - West of Ashington

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village

AS3 - North of Foster Road (Old Community Centre)

Land is affected by a Section 106 agreement and remains part of open space/ recreation provision for the expanded community.

AS4 - Land North of Rectory Lane

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, the residential development of this site would open up the whole area to the north of Rectory Lane to the pressure of development, which could result in development far beyond the scale of the village.

AS5 - Luckista Caravan Site

Not adjacent to the Built-up Area of Ashington. Would result in an isolated residential development and would open up the whole area to the north of Rectory Lane to the pressure of development, which could result in development far beyond the scale of the village.

AS6 - Land North of Oast House Farm

Site is outside the Built-up Area Boundary and would result in ribbon development along Billingshurst Road.

AS7 - Land at Chanctonbury Nurseries

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, the site is large and residential development would alter the form of the settlement. Residential development of the site would extend the village boundary in the form of ribbon development thought to be unsuitable.

AS8 - Land North of Ashington

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village.

Billingshurst

BL1 - Eastern Billingshurst (land off Daux Road)

The Core Strategy does not propose any further large scale development at Billingshurst. The development of this site would open up the eastern side of Billingshurst to development.

BL2 - Land East of Billingshurst

The Core Strategy does not propose any further large scale development at Billingshurst. The development of this site would open up the eastern side of Billingshurst to development.

BL3 - Land North East of Billingshurst

The Core Strategy does not propose any further large scale development at Billingshurst. The development of this site would open up the eastern side of Billingshurst to development. The section between Hilland Farm Roundabout and New Road is a further section which would not be considered for development as it would extend Billingshurst to the north past a logical boundary.

BL4 - General Combustion Site, Brookers Road

Not appropriate for independent residential redevelopment; however, if an appropriate scheme came forward it would be judged on its own merits.

BL5 - Nyewood Court, Brookers Road

Not appropriate for independent residential redevelopment; however, if an appropriate scheme came forward it would be judged on its own merits.

BL6 - Eagle Estate

This Council supports continued employment use on this site by the allocation of Employment Protection Zones in the Issues and Options Consultation Documentation and the Core Strategy, see Policy CP6.

Hammonds, East Street

Site now identified in Policy AL9 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document.

BL7 - Island Site, West of Billingshurst

Development should not go west of the by-pass; the road is a logical boundary to the development on the western side of Billingshurst.

BL8 - Gas Works, Natts Lane

Not appropriate for independent residential redevelopment. This has not been proposed as a comprehensive site and has an inappropriate site area and shape for residential development. There are also concerns about contamination on the site.

BL9 - Kingsmead Farm, Marringdean Road

Not adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary; residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village.

Bramber

BM1 - Land at Kingsmead Close

Outside the Built-up Area Boundary, lying within the AONB. Residential development would not relate well to the existing character of the village; it would also create a linear development away from the village and would create development pressure on the south of Steyning, as well as pressure for infilling along Annington Road.

BM2 - Land South of Bramber

The site is situated in the Sussex Downs Area of Outstanding National Beauty and as such it is not considered an appropriate location for development given its environmental sensitivity.

Broadbridge Heath

BB1 - Gardens at Field Place

Residential development of the site is considered to be inappropriate. The Planning Inspector's conclusions in 1996 (Local Plan Inquiry) highlighted that this is a sensitive location and residential development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the Field Place Estate. It would be a further incongruous feature within an attractive rural landscape.

BB2 - Land at Broadbridge Heath

Residential development of the site is considered to be inappropriate as the western sites lack of integration with the community and are divorced from the Built-up Area Boundary. There are also potential environmental constraints, the site is highly visible and there are amenity issues at these sites. The third section proposed is included in the allocation West of Horsham in Policy AL6 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document.

Stevens Garage

Site identified in the Urban Housing Potential document, and Policy AL4 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document.

Coldwaltham

CW1 - 3 sites to the North of Coldwaltham

Sites are adjacent to the Conservation Area; residential development of the sites would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village. It would be inappropriate ribbon development along the A29. The residential development of these sites would be out of character of the area and would adversely impact upon the adjacent Conservation Area and listed buildings.

CW2 - Glebe Land West of Church Lane

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village. This is a sensitive location and residential development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. Residential development would result in a large extension to the Built-up Area Boundary.

Cowfold

CF1 - South Leas Farm (Field)

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, residential development of this site would open up the whole area to the south to the pressure of development.

CF2 - Swains Farm, Littleworth

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village, altering the form of the settlement. Unsustainable location, as no Built-up Area Boundary defined. It is not considered appropriate to allocate new residential development in these settlements because they are considered to be unsustainable locations for growth – see Page 11 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document.

CF3 - Land South of Cowfold

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, residential development of this site would open up the whole area to the south to the pressure of development. Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village

CF4 - Land East of Cowfold

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village, altering the form of the settlement.

CF5 - Land North East of Cowfold

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village, altering the form of the settlement.

CF6 - Land North of Cowfold

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, local need for housing not identified at this time in Cowfold.

Henfield

HF1 - Land at Sandgate Nurseries

Residential development of the site would be inappropriate in this area due to its detrimental impact on countryside and setting of the village.

HF2 - West of New Hall Lane, Small Dole

Residential development of the site would suburbanise an otherwise more rural site that links more to the adjoining countryside rather than the residential development to the east. It would create pressure on land between the site and New Hall Farm, which is currently not well related to the village of Small Dole. Would harm the landscape character of the area.

HF3 - Land at Backsettown House

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, this part of Henfield is known for its rural character and tranquillity. Any residential development on land surrounding the house would have an adverse impact on the listed building 'Backsettown House'.

HF4 - Land at Henfield

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village, adversely affecting the character of the area. Residential development of the site would be prominent in the landscape east of the village boundary.

HF5 - Land off Hollands Lane

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, the residential development of this site would be intrusive to the open rural area. There are also concerns about contamination on the brownfield part of the site.

HF6 - Land South of Chanctonbury View

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, this section of land fulfils an important role in alleviating impact of development. Further development would undermine the visual contribution of the field.

Land at Parsonage Farm

Site identified in Policy AL19 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document.

HF7 - The Field at Little Orchard

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, residential development of this site would increase pressure on the adjacent land. The site is open and residential development would adversely impact upon the adjacent Conservation Area and listed buildings.

Horsham

Woodland Chase Nr Hornbrook Farm

Forms part of the Hornbrook/ Hilliers site, Policy AL10 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document.

H1 - Land at Forest Road

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, the site is located in the AONB and residential development of the site would result in an erosion of character of the area. It would also open up potential for further linear development in the area.

H2 - Horsham Goods Yard

Please refer to Urban Housing Potential Document.

H3 - Land South of Larchwood, Kerves Lane

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, residential development of this site would open potential for further linear development in the area.

H4 - Holbrook Sports Ground (Holbrook Club), North Heath Lane

Any development proposals for part of this site would have to be justified on the basis of investment required for improving/enhancing the remaining recreation facilities. Generally, if proposals came forward on this site it would be in the form of an enabling development rather than a development for its own sake.

H5 - Horsham Cricket Ground

Only in exceptional circumstances will development of open space be considered. It is considered that the inclusion of the land within in the built-up area, although generally protected from significant development, may be of benefit as it will allow for improvements to be made to facilities, particularly buildings, as the site is no longer considered as 'countryside' to which the more stringent countryside policies apply. Any 'enabling' development would need to be justified against the resulting improvements accordingly.

H6 - Land South of Athlestone Way

Residential development of the site is considered to be inappropriate. Planning Inspector's conclusions in 1996 (Local Plan Inquiry) highlighted this is a sensitive site in visual terms, located in the Strategic Gap. Residential development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area.

H7 - Rookwood Golf Course

Please see Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document Paragraph 4.32 to 4.40.

H8 - Nightingale Road Industrial Estate

This Council supports employment on this site by the allocation of Employment Protection Zones in the Issues and Options Consultation Documentation and the Core Strategy, see policy CP6.

H9 - Old Holbrook Road, North Horsham

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the area, as well as extending development on the northern side of the bypass. Would result in an isolated residential development.

H10 - Blatchford Road

This Council supports employment on this site by the allocation of Employment Protection Zones in the Issues and Options Consultation Documentation and the Core Strategy, see Policy CP6.

Lower Beeding

LB1 - Howards Nursery

Residential development of the site would be inappropriate in this area, would result in an isolated residential development and would open up the whole area to the pressure of development, which could result in development far beyond the scale of the village.

LB2 - Land at Church Farm

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, the residential development of this site would extend northwards from the village, which could result in development at a scale which would be out of character of the village. Development of this site would not contribute to local objectives.

LB3 - Lower Beeding Garage

Residential development of the site would be inappropriate in this area, would result in an isolated residential development and would open up the whole area to the pressure of development, which could result in development far beyond the scale of the village.

LB4 - Land West of Plough/ Sandy Gate

See paragraph 4.51 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document.

LB5 - Church Lane Estate, Plummers Plain

Residential development of the site would be inappropriate in this area, and would result in an isolated residential development.

Nuthurst

N1 - Land at Swallowfield Nursery, Mannings Heath

The sites in this location are not considered suitable for residential development at this stage. The Council is not seeking development at Mannings Heath at this time. This is a category 2 settlement which could only accommodate small scale development or extensions for local need, which has not been identified at this stage. There are also potential environmental constraints at this site.

N2 - Land at Sadlers Farm, Mannings Heath

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, local need for housing not identified at this time in this area. There are also potential environmental constraints at this site.

N3 - Land at Nuthurst Road, Monks Gate

See Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document paragraph 2.15. There are limited facilities in this location and it is covered by countryside protection policies.

N4 - Land South of Swallowfield Close, Mannings Heath

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, local need has not been identified at this stage.

Pulborough

PL1 - Land at Manor Farm, the Street/ Stream Lane

This is a sensitive location and residential development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. Residential development of the site would result in further ribbon development which would not be appropriate in this area.

PL2 - Land at Stopham Road

Residential development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. Residential development would be a further extension of the Built-up Area Boundary with ribbon development which would set a precedent of further development of the village west of the railway line.

PL3 - Land North of Hill Farm Lane

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, residential development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. With further development to the north of the village on the rural fringing of Pulborough.

PL4 - Land at Old Valentines Barn

Site is outside the Built-up Area Boundary and would result in inappropriate development along the A29, and would open up land north of the railway line to development pressure. Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village.

PL5 - North of Glebelands & Land North of Glebelands (New Place Farm)

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, the site is unsuitable for residential development as the site is remote from the main part of the village, there are no natural boundaries, the ground is rising and the Council is not looking to identify greenfield land in this area at this stage.

PL6 - Land at West Glebe Place

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, residential development could have a detrimental effect on the character of the Conservation Area. There are particular access constraints at this site; however, if these can be overcome satisfactorily, development may be achievable with a suitable scheme.

PL7 - Land West of Stane Street

Not considered appropriate for development at this stage. Not considering further development, particularly 'greenfield', in Pulborough at this stage.

PL8 - North Heath Garage

Site is outside the Built-up Area Boundary. Would result in an isolated residential development and would open up the whole area to development pressure. Residential development of the site would be inappropriate.

PL9 - Land at Oddstones

Not considered appropriate for development at this stage. Not considering further development in Pulborough at this stage, particularly as the major part of the site is 'greenfield'.

PL10 - Toat Café, Stane Street

Would result in an isolated residential development and would open up the whole area to development pressure. Residential development of the site would be inappropriate.

PL11 - Cousins Way Recreation Field

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, the site is unsuitable for residential development and as existing recreation space, it has been identified in the Horsham PPG17 Assessment to be protected and enhanced.

PL12 - Coppice Hanger, Church Hill

Whilst the site is within the Built-up Area Boundary, residential development could have a detrimental effect on the character of the Conservation Area. There are particular access constraints at this site; however, if these can be overcome satisfactorily development on this site may be achievable with a suitable scheme.

Rudgwick

RW1 - Land South of Forge Cottage/ East of Toll House, Bucks Green

Majority within new BUAB (see Map 15 of Site Specific Allocations of Land Preferred Options Document)

RW2 - Land North of Furze Road

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, the site is considered unsuitable for residential development at this stage. The site is sloping and there are potential environmental constraints at this site.

RW3 - Pennthrope School, Rudgwick

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate, merging two settlements (Rudgwick and Bucks Green). Residential development of this site would increase pressure on the adjacent land, there also being access constraints at the site.

RW4 - Land South of Lynwick Street

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village, and have an adverse effect on the character of the area. Development would create pressure for infilling and form ribbon development.

Rusper

RS1 - Agates Yard/ Durrants Copse, Faygate

Site is outside the Built-up Area Boundary. Residential development of the site would result in detached enclave of a scale that is considered to be inappropriate relative to the site and the village, particularly in sustainability terms.

RS2 - Horsham Road

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, a local need for housing is not identified at this time in Rusper. Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village.

RS3 - Glebe Land

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village, and have a detrimental effect on the character of the conservation area.

Shipley

SP1 - Brooks Green

Static mobile homes represent residential development and this would be in a relatively isolated location and a form and scale of development that is considered to have an adverse effect on the character of the area.

Slinfold

SF1 - Land West of Spring Lane

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village, and have an adverse effect on the character of the area. There is also no identified local need for housing at this time in the area.

SF2 - Bridge Farm Riding School, Five Oaks Road

Residential development of the site would result in detached development of a scale that is considered to be inappropriate for the village.

SF3 - Land South of Lyons Road

Residential development of the site would result in an isolated development of a scale that is considered to be inappropriate for the village.

SF4 - Land South of the Street, land East of Spring Lane

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, the residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village. Residential development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. There is also no identified local need for housing at this time in the area.

SF5 - Land Adjoining Nowhurst Lane

Residential development of the site would result in an isolated development of a scale that is considered to be inappropriate for the village.

SF6 - Land at Lyons Farm, North of Lyons Road

Residential development of the site would be of a scale that is considered to be inappropriate and detrimental to the character of the area. The site is not considered close enough to be included in land West of Horsham allocation.

Southwater

Millfield

See Policy AL20 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document.

SQ1 - Christs Hospital Various Sites

The Council is not seeking further development at Christ's Hospital beyond the Station Yard/ King Edward Close land which is allocated in the adopted Local Plan and is included in the Built-up Area Boundary. Land North of the complex is an open field and residential development would have a detrimental effect on the character and environment.

SQ2 - Land West of Southwater

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village at this stage.

The Examination in Public report recommended that Southwater should not be part of the Strategic Development Location for west and/ or south-west of Horsham.

Steyning

ST1 - Mouse Lane

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, residential development of the site is considered to be inappropriate in the light of rural character and access constraints.

Storrington

SR1 - St Josephs Hall

Site is outside the Built-up Area Boundary and lying adjacent to the AONB. Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village. Site is too large to be considered infill development and not considered appropriate in the area. Residential development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. Development would create further pressure on facilities and services in Storrington at this time.

SR2 - Storrington Glebe

Whilst the site is within the Built-up Area Boundary, comprehensive residential development of the area would have a detrimental effect on the character and local environment of the area. Residential development of the whole site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village. Development would create further pressure on facilities and services in Storrington at this time. Retention of open space is also necessary in this location.

SR3 - Rear of Hurston Grove

Minor amendments have been made to the Built-up Area Boundary at this location but they do not include the gardens as suggested. The site is not considered suitable for residential development. Development would create further pressure on facilities and services in Storrington at this time.

Thakeham

T1 - Former Pig Units, Crays Farm

Site is outside the Built-up Area Boundary, Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village. It would result in an isolated residential development, visually intrusive and detrimental to the character of the area.

T2 - Rushfield Nurseries, High Bar Lane

Not appropriate for residential redevelopment as would result in significant residential development off High Bar Lane which would be too much for this locality in access and layout/ design terms.

T3 - Land at Wilmers Farm

Site is outside the Built-up Area Boundary and would result in an isolated residential development.

T4 - Land at the Orchard, Storrington Road

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary there are potential environmental constraints at this site, with the site being of rural character.

T5 - Land at Goffsland Farm, Coolham Road

It would result in an isolated residential development, in an area which is rural in character and is considered to be unsuitable for residential development.

T6 - Thakeham/ Abingworth Nursery

Site is dependent on the future of existing businesses and cannot be considered in isolation from other issues.

T7 - Land East of Water Lane, Storrington

Whilst the site is adjacent to the Built-up Area Boundary, residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village. Residential development would have a detrimental effect on the character and environment. Development would create further pressure on facilities and services in Storrington at this time.

Upper Beeding

UB1 - Greenfield Depot

Site is outside the Built-up Area Boundary and located within the AONB.

Warnham

WN1 - Tickfold Farm, Kingsfold

Residential development would be isolated, and considered unsuitable.

WN2 - Land Near Furze Lane, Kingsfold

Residential development would be isolated and the site is considered unsuitable for residential development.

WN3 - Graylands Site

Residential development would be isolated and the site is considered unsuitable for residential development.

Washington

WS1 - Yard of the Street

Although a brownfield site, it is too small to be considered in the Urban Housing Potential Document; any applications will be considered on their merits.

WS2 - Luckings Depot

Although a rural brownfield site residential development would be isolated, and the site is now considered unsuitable for residential development.

West Chiltington

WC1 - Land North of Finches Lane

Residential development of the site would suburbanise an otherwise more rural site that links more to the adjoining countryside rather than the residential development to the south and east.

WC2 - Smock Alley

Residential development of the site would suburbanise an otherwise more rural site that links more to the adjoining countryside rather than the residential development to the west and north. It would create pressure on land between the site and Threals Farm to the south.

West Grinstead

WG1 - Land rear of the Beeches, Littleworth

Unsustainable location as no Built-up Area Boundary defined. It is not considered appropriate to allocate new residential development in these settlements because they are considered to be unsustainable locations for growth – see Page 11 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document.

WG2 - Land South of Dial Post

Unsustainable location as no Built-up Area Boundary defined. It is not considered appropriate to allocate new residential development in these settlements because they are considered to be unsustainable locations for growth – see Page 11 of the Site Specific Allocations of Land: Preferred Options document.

WG3 - Land North of Forrester Road

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village. The Council is not seeking development at Partridge Green at this time. This is a category 2 settlement which could only accommodate small scale development or extensions for local need, which has not been identified at this stage.

WG4 - Land East and North East of Blanches Farm House

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village. Would result in an isolated residential development and would open up the whole area to the pressure of development.

WG5 - Land Off Star Road, Partridge Green

Residential development of the site would result in scale of development that is considered to be inappropriate for the village. The Council is not seeking development at Partridge Green at this time. This is a category 2 settlement which could only accommodate small scale development or extensions for local need, which has not been identified at this stage.

Woodmancote

WK1 - Land West of Bramlands Lane

Would result in an isolated residential development; the sites are rural in character and would open up the whole area to the pressure of development.

Other

Other1 - Lower Barn Copse, just north of Little Haven thought to be better for a 500 space Park and Ride scheme.

Inappropriate site, recreational value for Horsham Town identified in Horsham PPG17 Assessment.

Other2 - Rugby Club, Hammerpond Road – Park and Ride Site.

Site is detached from major roadways and located in the AONB.

Other3 - Alongside A24, Nr Washington

Suggested for roadside facilities; there are other more potential more suitable sites.