

Q8 Given that no housing is not an option if you do not agree with the sites chosen, where would you locate the housing? Please make sure you read the Site Assessment Reports before replying as there may be policy reasons for not selecting a site

Answered: 119 Skipped: 558

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Less detrimental sites which have come forward such as Furzefield near Crossways which lies inside a built up area, within the village boundary and Southmill site that is very close to amenities, bus stops and not on narrow roads. It has a good capacity for houses again within the village boundary.	9/21/2021 4:32 PM
2	I suggest the siting of the 25 houses be in the Common area where the roads are not so narrow or congested. I suggest land bordering the recreation ground.	9/21/2021 2:44 PM
3	Furzefield, Crossways The Winery Southmill House	9/20/2021 8:43 PM
4	There are three alternative sites: 1. The Winery which is a brownfield site. 2. Furzefield, Crossways, a 4 acre site in the BUAB which could accommodate 12 houses. 3. Southmill House which could accommodate 15 dwellings.	9/20/2021 8:34 PM
5	Sites are realistically best choice and Smock Alley will probably be developed anyway regardless of Village Plan.	9/20/2021 4:42 PM
6	Why is 'no housing' not an option? There are almost certainly going to be 25 houses built in West Chiltington over the next 10 years, with land regularly being made available for development. For example, recently Nyetimber Lane with 10 flats, Chilton Gate with 5 houses. This should be counted as our allocation. A key question for me is why does the WCPC believe that HDC will impose building on these 2 sites whether we agree to them or not? How do HDC have this authority to override the wishes of the parish? Surely they have bigger issues to deal with?	9/19/2021 4:08 PM
7	This Neighbourhood Plan should agree to provide rural exception sites for a local community led land trust to develop housing for local residents and workers with median incomes of c. £25,000 pa to remain available for local people in perpetuity	9/19/2021 11:24 AM
8	N/A	9/18/2021 10:31 PM
9	1.As the targets are meeting Horsham's needs not West Chiltington's then I suggest that all Brownfield sites and bad housing in the Horsham District should be targeted to provide people with decent homes, before destroying greenfield. 2.This is a greenfield site and I understand important for wildlife, it should not be destroyed. 3. We are in a climate crisis, there needs to be a rethink and perhaps the New Minister for Housing will start the ball rolling.	9/17/2021 8:27 PM
10	Due to the relatively small number of houses required there is ample opportunity for the continued development within some of the larger plots within the village, the development down Common Hill is a prime example of utilising the existing space and land to provide additional dwellings within the existing village boundaries	9/17/2021 1:39 PM
11	Allocate the current infill development to the Horsham requirements and reduce the need for developments of this size.	9/17/2021 8:30 AM
12	Brownfield sites should be considered first and now re-evaluated as others have become available. Putting 25 houses up just to meet a quota rather than an absolute need is absurd and comes down to politics. This is something we can fight against and doesn't have to be done because HDC have put something in a plan. Plans change and agreeing to something now will only be manipulated in the future under the guise of the village having seemingly agreed to development now.	9/17/2021 8:08 AM
13	I would suggest the strip of land opposite the Di Marino Garage/NISA shop adjacent to the Car	9/17/2021 12:42 AM

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan

Park/Allotments. Alternatively a suitable Brownfield site within the Village and not situate in the settlement separation zone as is proposed at Smock Alley.

14	I think the sites are workable and the proposals seem reasonable.	9/16/2021 8:55 AM
15	Surely houses are being built in this village that could be included in this plan already - the houses down Common Hill, I realise that houses do need to be built - Furzefields appears a good option	9/15/2021 8:21 PM
16	I support Hatchers Estate	9/15/2021 7:37 PM
17	They should be located on Brownfield land similar to that offered at the outdoor meeting of the Parish Council where one owner has been trying to sell his land but has been stopped by the specious argument that the land is providing employment for him! When he does not want it!!Regardless of Policy EE12 this opportunity should be explored as the owner stated that he wished to sell the land when Covid commenced early in 2020	9/15/2021 11:30 AM
18	These seem to be the best options available as opposed to scattering properties around the village. The policy statement is strong enough for a country village community.	9/14/2021 7:22 PM
19	I do not object to small developments with houses reserved for local first time buyers but roads at the Common end of the village are wider and there is a better bus service for older residents who may occupy bungalows.	9/14/2021 12:41 PM
20	The Winery - Brown field site	9/14/2021 11:58 AM
21	I do not agree with Parish Council scoring of sites from the recommendations in the Site Assessment Reports. These are weighted towards Hatches Estate when many of the same criteria scoring for Site 3, SA014, SA500 regarding additional street signage; access onto busy roads; additional traffic; pedestrian safety and environmental issues are similar but scored differently.	9/14/2021 11:54 AM
22	n/a	9/13/2021 9:26 PM
23	The Hatches development and the inevitable infilling which is happening all the time, should provide the 25 units required of West Chiltington over the period of the plan. If both the Hatches and Smock Alley developments went ahead and provided the 25 units (more) required of West Chiltington, it is highly unlikely that other infilling would stop. Regardless, there should be a policy to control infilling both in terms of type and the total number of such developments.	9/13/2021 6:55 PM
24	n/a	9/13/2021 1:48 PM
25	I think some of the smaller sites need to be looked at more carefully with the view to building small retirement bungalows for local people. Some of the information given in the site assessment report is inaccurate and misleading, so all sites should be revisited.	9/13/2021 9:02 AM
26	Satisfied with the proposals.	9/13/2021 8:55 AM
27	DO not require additional development. The allowance of housing encroaching the countryside started many years ago in Kent for example ,a county that has been totally ruined	9/12/2021 9:48 PM
28	Smock Alley is not relevant but Hatches Estate is a better fit and site.	9/12/2021 6:30 PM
29	Shared more equally round the village rather than concentrated around the the narrower lanes	9/12/2021 4:06 PM
30	I think that the Adversane site is most appropriate. It is an area where a larger number of houses can be built without causing harm to so many people. It has much better road links and could be expanded in similar fashion as the need arises. Much better a new town than ruining the character of all the small villages by squeezing developments in inappropriately.	9/11/2021 4:51 PM
31	The field bordered by Juggs Lane & The Sinnocks looks ripe for development, never been used for anything for as long as i can remember.	9/11/2021 12:42 PM
32	Worried about sewage/drainage locations, very small lane for piping etc. and implementing.	9/10/2021 4:02 PM
33	Assuming Land at Hatches Estate is possible, we are looking at 14 additional units. The problem with site proposals is often that too many houses are suggested, which would preclude them. If you look at the AECOM report this is not the case when a lower density is looked at. So first site - SouthMill House as per the AECOM Report, so say 5/6 there. Furzefield - As per AECOM Report 5 dwellings there. Land East of Hatches House - As Per AECOM Report 5 houses only. The above covers the requirement but as we know the owner of	9/10/2021 3:45 PM

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan

the industrial site opposite Southlands Farm in Southlands lane want to develop and this should also be considered. The Chairman of the Paroish Council told the owner at an open meeting that as it was commercial and the rules are that if people still working on the site it could not be considered. As I understand it Thakeham Tiles was also still operational when it was under consideration so that may not be the case. Indeed if the owner can demonstrate that the site will be vacant in the near future common sense dictates that it is considered.

34	The Site Assessment Reports have resulted in the above two "Masterplans" (which are anything but!) so what is the point of reading these (waste of money) "Site Assessments"? The obvious option is to spread the load & stress upon infrastructure / traffic loading etc of these "10 year plan" houses around West Chiltington in ones & two's.	9/9/2021 7:50 PM
35	I WOULD WANT TO HAVE THE RESIDENTS POINT OF VIEW BEFORE I CAN COMMENT ON OTHER SITES	9/9/2021 5:49 PM
36	we need to take into consideration recent dwellings that have been built. smaller number of dwellings ,less impact on roads . use dilapidated sites in the surrounding areas	9/9/2021 4:29 PM
37	The site near to Adversane makes more sense from a local road infrastructure point of view.	9/9/2021 12:17 PM
38	As the NP has to suggest sites for 25 houses I would support 15 houses at Hatches but would then look within the built up area or to brownfield sites for two smaller developments. The village is in need of smaller 2/3 bedroom properties for sale or rent and they need to be located in sustainable areas. The Furzeffield site (Site 1) would be suitable for this type of development and a smaller number of properties would have less impact on the surrounding area. This site is within the built up area therefore complying with most of H1 . Three large houses were constructed near-by quite recently. The brownfield site at The Winery could also be looked at for a small development of 4/5 houses. If there has to be development lets keep it small to lessen the impact and site it where it will be sustainable.	9/9/2021 11:59 AM
39	I understand a proposed site owned by Positive Images in Southlands Lane RH20 2LU was not included by the PC as development cannot be considered if there is an occupied commercial business on the site. This conjecture may not be entirely correct as a site at Thakeham Tiles (an operational business) had the same scenario. The owner of land at Positive Images wants to sell for development - this would be perfect for inclusion being a small brownfield/industrial site and NOT Greenfield. Southmill is preferable with a property already there and wider road as opposed to the Smock Alley site.	9/9/2021 11:23 AM
40	There are already infill sites, both small estates and several smaller houses on the same site, around the village which increase the number of residencies. Why do we need more when the Smock Alley development has already been turned down several times by WCPC and HDC.	9/8/2021 4:45 PM
41	I don't know West Chiltington well enough to suggest another location but consider my objection is governed by safety and infrastructure.	9/6/2021 1:15 PM
42	Given The Common has, over the last half century, been extensively developed either through complete new estates or in-fill so is it not the case that more land north of the Village be considered for future development.	9/4/2021 3:00 PM
43	The AECOM Report (Site Options and Assessment) identifies a number of other viable options, including the Winery (Large), Nestledown Nursery and Furzeffield. It is regrettable that the Winery in particular, a brownfield site with no insoluble impediments to development, has been discounted in favour of a new greenfield site, on the spurious grounds that its development would erode the gap between settlements, when it has been used commercially for years already, and the Smock Alley greenfield site is just down the road and also between settlements. The NP's lack of thorough effort to use existing brownfield sites, and instead to select a greenfield site that a known developer has been pushing to develop, so far unsuccessfully, looks lazy, unethical and shameful. It is no surprise that developer would prefer a greenfield site to build on, but the Parish Council and HDC have a duty to protect this green space, which they are both not fulfilling by offering it for development. Instead the NP should make a brownfield site available for development, even if that is less attractive to developers.	9/4/2021 12:06 AM
44	Consider relocating allotments at the Haglands Lane crossroads	9/2/2021 7:26 PM
45	I understand that houses are needed, however the site on Smock Alley is not suitable, this is greed - pure and simple. The fact that there are plans to widen Smock Alley is proof that the site is not suitable. Having spent a considerable amount time looking at the AECOM Site	9/2/2021 11:29 AM

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan

Selection report SA597 and VS14 both look like suitable alternatives with far less impact on the nearby communities and local road network.

46	I agree with the sites chosen	8/30/2021 8:01 PM
47	agree - under protest and due to pressure of from HDC and central government to impose new development on us no matter what we say.	8/30/2021 2:07 PM
48	This is Hobson's choice. What about other developments - Pig Farm Threal's Lane, Threal's Lane farm, Well's Place to name but a few - can they not be included in the housing numbers? If land banks currently owned by developers cannot be used for this purpose, this could mean more housing. When we first came to live here, owls hooting in the evenings was a common occurrence, Now it is a rarity. I fail to see how continued development of green field sites will aid biodiversity, which according to the Woodland Trust is facing a catastrophic collapse.	8/30/2021 1:51 PM
49	Policy 26 HDPF Way too much housing already in this area, especially with the Threals Lane development approved	8/30/2021 11:23 AM
50	Way too much housing already in this area of west chiltington, what with new houses already approved on Threals Lane. More flooding and traffic and noise to an already over crowded area	8/30/2021 11:15 AM
51	Hatches Estate, Broadford Bridge Road	8/30/2021 11:08 AM
52	At Broadford Bridge road site, where the area is not as built up	8/30/2021 11:02 AM
53	I understand that the Parish Council have proposed brown fill sites, why have these not been considered?	8/29/2021 5:22 PM
54	Any Brownfield sites should be thoroughly explored before making any site selection. The only sites on your Site Selection I would consider appropriate would be Furzefield inside the built up area, and SouthMill partly in the built up area, and hidden behind current housing.	8/25/2021 4:42 PM
55	I think West Chiltington should takes its share of housing by having small plots throughout the village where they will fit in without imposing on the footprint of the village. Instead of having estates of more than 5 houses which change the area completely, a couple of houses throughout the village is a much better idea.	8/18/2021 2:13 PM
56	I do not believe that no housing is not an option. Parish Council should be fighting imposed targets, not implementing them.	8/17/2021 1:58 PM
57	Brown field sites available, also other suitable sites seem to have been dismissed without proper analysis & considerations	8/17/2021 12:53 PM
58	Hatches paddock East Street Brown field site on Southlands lane (Positive Image site) Brown field sites should be used first	8/17/2021 12:25 PM
59	Plenty of additional housing has been and already is being provided in the village. No additional housing IS an option! If it is not we will be moving on.	8/17/2021 11:30 AM
60	No housing should be an option and the only way to make sure of this is to tip the conservative councillors out of office by replacing them with resident association candidates as we did very successfully with Tandridge District Council	8/16/2021 9:34 PM
61	25 new homes is a feebly low allocation in the plan time period, given the size of the Parish, the continuing scope for in fill and the available land on south & east side of the Village the north east side of The Common.	8/16/2021 9:10 PM
62	If no housing is not an option I think this is probably the best it will get but would look to move if it's confirmed, I chose to live in a green village not an over developed village we don't have the facilities to accommodate this .	8/13/2021 7:34 PM
63	Then find more suitable less damaging sights rather than expand the village not using agricultural land.	8/13/2021 10:34 AM
64	There are numerous architecturally undistinguished dwellings in the parish sitting in dispropotionately large plots of land whose owners might welcome the opportunity to realise all or part of their assets.	8/12/2021 3:37 PM
65	Further up Broadford Bridge Road.	8/11/2021 2:06 PM
66	Other plots are available	8/11/2021 1:02 PM

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan

67	The Brownfield land at Sinnocks West Chiltington that has been offered for sale for development should be considered	8/11/2021 10:29 AM
68	The brownfield land at Sinnocks, West Chiltington, that has been offered for sale for development should be considered.	8/11/2021 10:24 AM
69	The 10 units at Rambledown House on Common Hill, together with those planned for The Hatches, provide sufficient to meet the declared need for 25 units.	8/10/2021 4:03 PM
70	The plan should encourage the use of rural exception sites specifically for the the provision of community led housing	8/10/2021 1:05 PM
71	No is an option for me, the Parish Councillors should listen and act on the views of the people who elected them	8/9/2021 4:12 PM
72	Broadbridge Heath sitre seems a good option.	8/9/2021 1:10 PM
73	Other sites listed on the selection table I believe are less harmful would include Furzeffield (inside village boundary) Southmill House (partly inside boundary and access onto main village road) Hatches House (selected as most suitable site but AECOM)	8/8/2021 7:25 PM
74	Adequate locations west of Nutbourne Road	8/8/2021 3:35 PM
75	Brownfield sites within the village	8/8/2021 2:59 PM
76	Not sure given that given 3500 houses planned at Adversane, and continual development at Thakeham, I would have thought that there was more than enough revenue generating developments for County Council to benefit from. However before any further suggestions are made for the Parish, please do the research and understand that previously refused sites should not be in the housing plan.	8/7/2021 2:11 PM
77	It is not my place to burden another neighbourhood with this development just to move it away from my immediate vicinity, West Chiltington used to be woodland, but is becoming less of a Village & more an urbanisation.	8/6/2021 3:39 PM
78	I do not agree that any greenfield development is necessary. 25 brownfield or windfall sites over a ten year period should be easily attainable.	8/6/2021 3:00 PM
79	I do not understand why all the proposed sites for development have not been put into the Neighbourhood Plan. i.e Furzeffield, Crossways. The Paddocks, Land north of Finches Lane. South Mill House, Mill Lane. So it becomes a level playing field for everyone. May the best one win.	8/5/2021 6:20 PM
80	I cannot see where any other land is available, properties must be in keeping with those nearby. This has to be better than in fill housing	8/5/2021 1:52 PM
81	There is no where else to date. No point at all replying to the question as any development in this place is inappropriate but sure will go ahead. You have no policy. You know that but will endorse. Understand planners jobs but don't subscribe to the but importantly when that farm land gets pp. a precedent is made -you lot know that. You are endorsing it . We have seen Thakehams estate , you allow it, So sensible parish plans vyou ask, mock us. You are quite happy to allow all the land surrounding West Chiltington to be developed. Just be honest. You allow HDC to be overruled by the govt, Inspectorate. You've never challenged them back representing your Council tax payers. Those invited on line opinions/objections.,when the govt. inspector decision to overule the council tax payers, the people you represent, and agree with-Smock Alley has adjacent farmland - developers exploit and HDC always aids	8/3/2021 8:31 PM
82	I am not clear if brown field sites further up Broadford bridge road have been considered. Smaller development could also be done near Adversane if the town is not built.	8/2/2021 8:08 PM
83	I agree with the two sites	8/2/2021 7:54 PM
84	Brown field site next to Sussex Roses.	8/2/2021 3:54 PM
85	Seem ok	8/2/2021 2:50 PM
86	There are numerous sites available and in fairness and openness All sites should be chosen with the limit of 25 houses being built in the Area . There are enough sites being proposed that can limit the number being built on each development thus minimising the affect on the 'character ' of the village as the PC have on many occasions said they are trying to avoid .	8/2/2021 2:17 PM

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan

The argument given by the PC is that it is not economically viable. What has that got to do with the PC or HDC ? , that surely is the problem of the developer and not either Council , unless they have a vested interest. There are many small plots in the community that should be used first to build a small number of units first which will ultimately improve the layout of the village . By building large numbers on the edge of the village is only the beginning . The precedent will have been set and contrary to the PC argument , it won't stop there . Developers will no doubt be queuing up on the ' next ' field that comes up. Ultimately West Chiltington will form with Thakeham , Pulborough and Storrington

87	Land east of Hatches Cottages. This site has been put forward before and rejected - not sure why as it also backs onto WSCC owned land which, with negotiation and planning between WSCC and the landowners of Hatches East land, a car park for the school could be built to accommodate the horrendous traffic problem the old village has around school pick up and drop off. The car park could also be used outside of these hours as hard standing for village activities. if designed appropriately. Houses could also be built on the WSCC land - rather than at the Broadford Bridge end, where access is potentially worse.	8/2/2021 7:10 AM
88	N/A	8/1/2021 2:06 PM
89	na	8/1/2021 9:42 AM
90	Hatches Estate is the only viable option, the already poor infrastructure of Smock Alley could not and would not be able to handle more than it currently does.	7/30/2021 11:42 AM
91	SA066 Hatches Estate: Land to the east of that already proposed. Moto di Marino Garage (In due course)	7/29/2021 7:30 PM
92	Brown fill sites and infill sites	7/28/2021 6:08 PM
93	PS02 and PS03 The winery	7/28/2021 9:16 AM
94	Far too difficult to read all of this (is this why developers always win?). Suggest you look at the site of the old pick your own fruit farm between Mill Road and Holly Close. Better to accept we have to have new housing and have it central to the village rather than stick it on the edge where it's of no use, especially to the elderly	7/27/2021 7:30 PM
95	Adversane Development 3000 houses!!!!	7/27/2021 6:19 PM
96	Yes but conditional upon traffic calming measures and improved pedestrian and cycle safe routes in and around the village.	7/27/2021 12:46 PM
97	At the beginning of this document it states 25 homes are allocated. You are proposing 29. (15+14) What is the logic here?	7/27/2021 11:41 AM
98	Firstly, "no housing" should be an option. This is a democracy and those who make such demands should be voted out. That aside, the assessments of both sites seem correct and both have equal validity.	7/27/2021 9:18 AM
99	Hatches paddock 6 homes Site opposite Southlands farm where camaraderie and photo places where. These businesses are no longer operating so could be developed for several homes	7/26/2021 1:16 PM
100	Agree with chosen sites.	7/26/2021 10:32 AM
101	N/A	7/26/2021 10:28 AM
102	I agree with sites chosen.	7/26/2021 8:06 AM
103	I don't see any additional sites within the built up area that are suitable that would pass the assessment report tests - mainly because they are commercial sites.	7/25/2021 8:07 PM
104	I do not accept that no housing is not an option. You should challenge Horsham on their policy - remember, you can take back control.	7/25/2021 4:37 PM
105	Utilise and area of the old West Chiltington Golf Course, previously the 9-hole course, now owned by Nyetimber Vineyards. Another potential site is the field at back of the Church car park which will also deliver benefit of the demolition of the old youth club building which is unsightly & unsafe	7/25/2021 11:27 AM
106	Land opposite green hurst lane	7/25/2021 10:11 AM
107	It is not the location that I object to strongly: it is the type of development that does not meet	7/24/2021 6:35 PM

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan

the needs of the current and future inhabitants of our village.

108	N/A	7/24/2021 2:36 PM
109	Brownfield sites one of which you did not want to listen to at the recent parish meeting or infill sites from larger properties which often happens	7/24/2021 12:26 PM
110	Brown field sites as offered to you at the parish meeting In fill sites which you do not seem interested in or areas that are not so DETREMENTAL to the village	7/24/2021 12:10 PM
111	I have no issue with the developments but am very conserved about speeding traffic using village/ church as a rat run. This has increased massively over last 10 years with developments and i fear this will only make it worse. I am amazed no one has been injured by a car yet.	7/24/2021 11:40 AM
112	If suitable sites are not available, then we can't develop without figuring out how to make them suitable, or finding other sites. Other sites may come up in the future. Pressure from the Council to develop on unsuitable sites should not be acceptable.	7/24/2021 10:59 AM
113	There is not the infrastructure for more houses in the village itself	7/23/2021 9:07 PM
114	Not near the single track roads	7/23/2021 6:51 PM
115	Ideally, cottages/ affordable flats should be built near to the crossroads at Nisa, or along the axis of the Stagecoach bus route that runs daily, but I cannot think of a suitable exact site	7/23/2021 5:01 PM
116	West Chiltington has very few places left to develop but these 2 suggestions seem non invasive on nearby housing	7/23/2021 2:52 PM
117	Spread the houses over all off the possible sites, the odd house here and there will only have a minimal impact	7/23/2021 2:26 PM
118	No option; hands tied; dictated to by HDC rather than argue the case with Central & National Govt. No one as far as I know has ever explained in detail why we need the number of houses built & planned in this part of West Sussex & their prices. What is the driver?	7/23/2021 1:58 PM
119	The land at the back of Holly Close, and linking to Martlets and Mill Lane - Churchfield Farm, would link the old and newer parts of the village together, there is the river bed at the bottom which could be turned into a feature. Houses built on the slope would have less of a visual impact.	7/23/2021 11:07 AM