

Q9 Do you have any further comments about the Housing section? If yes please state the policy number that you are referring to and then your comments.

Answered: 73 Skipped: 604

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Increased residential and commercial traffic from recent development makes the lanes dangerous. Gain assurances re new speeds and restrictions are required. Do not ignore those living outside the boundary with families and dogs where drivers ignore their responsibilities or are enabled by weak rules. Protect all villagers!	9/21/2021 12:54 PM
2	We should ask developers to incur in the cost of taking fibre cabling to West Chiltington as part of the scheme. Additional housing relying on copper broadband delivery means additional pressure on what is already a well below average internet access speed for all inhabitants of the Parish	9/21/2021 8:14 AM
3	No	9/20/2021 4:42 PM
4	To carry out a door survey in West Chiltington of all residents to establish support levels for setting up a local community led housing trust.	9/19/2021 11:24 AM
5	It is dissappointing to see thatthe Parish Council are Presenting these two options almost with a threat that if you don't agree it will go ahead anyway and will be much worse!!! Not a very pleasant attitude for a Parish Council to have to its own villagers.	9/17/2021 1:39 PM
6	More flats,more cheaper houses	9/16/2021 7:18 PM
7	We have lived in West Chiltington Parish for the last 20 years, and prior to that I was born and brought up in Pulborough Parish. As a resident in northern part of the parish, where we farm cattle and sheep, I am particularly concerned about the proposed new town of 2,850 homes at "Kingswood", the vast bulk of which falls within West Chiltington Parish (WCP). If Kingswood were ever to become a reality, it will completely alter WCP and the surrounding area forever. I have read the WC neighbourhood plan submission and I wish to note the following in relation to it: The plan notes the relative tranquility, rural feel and abundance of wildlife in the WCP. The plan, if adopted, will be taken into account by HDC when determining planning applications in the Parish. The plan gives local people the power to decide where new housing should go and how the parish should change. 3.1. The plan acknowledges the poor network of local roads with no pavements, and that local lanes are used as 'rat runs'. 3.3. The current population of West Chiltington Parish is 3,377 in 1,579 dwellings. If Kingswood were to become a reality the population of the Parish would increase to more than 9,000 and the number of dwellings would increase from 1,579 to 4,429. 3.4. The plan states that WCP lies between the South Downs National Park and the High Weald AONB, both considered to be of international importance. The plan also acknowledges that one of the special features of the WCP is its broad range of wildlife habitats, connected by a network of corridors. 3.4.2. The plan notes that many parts of the parish are subject to flooding after heavy rain or snow. 3.5. The AECOM unconstrained housing need assessment indicated that 363 dwellings will be required to the end of the plan period in 2031. HDC published its Draft Local Plan in February 2020 in which it cited that it required a contribution from WCP of 25 dwellings towards its housing numbers over the 15 year period of the plan. 3.6. The plan notes that WCP suffers from use as a 'rat run' for drivers trying to avoid delays on surrounding trunk roads. The narrow roads and lanes cannot cope with this additional traffic even now. 4. The plan sets out the vision for WCP to ensure that the rural feel of the Parish is retained and core objectives are to protect agricultural land, protect and enhance existing green spaces, and protect and enhance the Parish's biodiversity and rural setting. EH7.1. Light pollution is currently minimal. The WCT location next to the South Downs National Park, an international dark sky reserve, justifies attempts to keep light pollution to a minimum. I support the plan submission, but if we are to avoid changing West Chiltington Parish beyond all recognition, it is imperative that we as a parish make our objections to Kingswood new town known to HDC, and to every District Councillor, in the strongest possible terms.	9/15/2021 5:40 PM

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan

8	Policy H2, Hatches Estate-This is Green Belt land and part of a two field unit rented by a Farmer and in use.A statement was made by the PC Chair that the Farmer was only operating part time and thus was not considered to be employed. This statement is disputed by HMRC who consider his earnings from this venture to be taxable and thus in self employment. By definition,the land is therefore not available for housing (See EH4.2 also)	9/15/2021 11:30 AM
9	Any new development will add to the congestion of the narrow entrances to the village from Pulborough near Panners Drive and from Storrington at the bottom of Common Hill between Monkmead Lane and Roundabout Lane. Both these roads are too narrow for the existing traffic let alone any increase. Given the location of the sites chosen, however, the extra burden on these pinch points is liable to be less than from other sites.	9/13/2021 2:11 PM
10	Nocturnal pollution through light and noise must be prevented at all junctures - the night time quiet, stillness, and dark, of West Chilt was one of the key reasons for us relocating here.	9/13/2021 1:48 PM
11	In terms of "transparency" within a Public Consultation, why has the previous "Smock Alley" site history of Planning Applications, Appeal(s) & Government Inspector multiple rejections, not been openly and transparently declared?. Similarly there is another fundamental omission in that there is no mention that this site would be an encroachment into the "Map B - Separation Zone/Local Gap - Policy - H1" (page 55 of the Neighbourhood Plan - "Draft") The "Smock Alley" Masterplan falls apart at the very first issues i.e. of a single site access, according to the "artistic" drawing that "site access" is enshrouded by trees yet there is no mention of public safety visibility splays and control of land over which those sight-lines (through all the trees!!) are claimed (and the legal rights to maintenance of those sight-lines). Yet again Waffle about "parking" but nothing about vehicle manouvering & turning circles space within the site (refuse trucks, lwb vans & HGV's delivering goods and what about Fire Truck access?). As soon as you start to look at that the whole site layout becomes unworkable and the public consultation is based on a false picture. This site also slopes considerably, so why isn't there a section/elevation to show the "stacking & massing effect" and visual impact of building in tiers up such a slope?	9/9/2021 8:48 PM
12	The expectations of this survey appear to differ very significantly from the WCPC 26 July 2021 circular, advised "20 minutes of your time"	9/9/2021 7:50 PM
13	H1 states that sustainable development is at the heart of National Planning Policy. If this is so the site at Smock alley should not be put forward for development as it is unsustainable.	9/9/2021 11:59 AM
14	DO NOT DESTROY OUR PRECIOUS COUNTRYSIDE -SMOCK ALLEY IS THE MOST BIODIVERSE SITE IN THE VILLAGE - A DEVELOPMENT WOULD DESTROY THOUSANDS OF CREATURES. ONCE CONCRETED, IT IS LOST FOR ALL GENERATIONS.	9/9/2021 11:23 AM
15	if the housing is to go ahead then the roads in the area will have increased useage and therefore will need upgrading in terms of surface as there has been significant degredation over the past few years. Additional traffic will only increase the erosion and the very dangerous and costly potholes	9/6/2021 3:27 PM
16	Why is no housing not an option? Vast swathes of countryside outside of Horsham are being destroyed, and this seems to extend to the surrounding villages. Thakeham as an example. Separation of the villages and being able to adequately retain the character of the village should surely have some bearing. Are there not areas that can be re-developped?	9/6/2021 2:53 PM
17	The NP should not select the greenfield site of Smock Alley in preference to existing brownfield sites. The NP should re-examine the brownfield sites such as The Winery and Nestledown Nursery, the development of which for housing, would have a much more benign impact on the semi-rural nature of West Chiltington than the greenfield site of Smock Alley. If the NP can find solutions to the housing requirement using these brownfield sites, that would restore confidence in the Parish Council and the NP, which as it stands is not transparent on the reasons for selecting a greenfield site in contravention of its own NP principles. The NP must follow its own Core Objectives and principles when choosing a site or sites for housing development, which means Smock Alley is not suitable, whilst other brownfield sites should be. I would only support a NP that makes use of under-utilised or unused brownfield sites in the village for housing development.	9/4/2021 12:06 AM
18	I feel very strongly that the quiet lanes, old trees and natural beauty of WC should be preserved and protected. We have chosen to live in this village for precisely these reason and destroying the narrow lanes and trees is simply a short sighted quick solution to a housing problem that could, with care and consideration be solved on another site with less destructive	9/2/2021 11:29 AM

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan

consequences. This is a financially driven decision, not an environmental, community lead decision. This is in direct conflict with your own policy EH3 regarding the protection of trees and hedgerows.

19	in addition to the 25 houses imposed on us there are sites not mentioned which contain several more eg east of Threals Lane (8-11) and at Threals Farm (5) and more at at 'Wells Place' on Common Hill.	8/30/2021 2:07 PM
20	Policy 26 HDPF Way too much housing already in this area, especially with the Threals Lane development approved	8/30/2021 11:23 AM
21	Policy 26 HDPF, 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
22	H1 2B states you will not build outside of the built up area if so why has Smock Alley been selected? H1 3C states you will not diminish the Separation Zone, if so why have you selected Smock Alley?	8/25/2021 4:42 PM
23	There is also a planning application for east of Threals Lane, West Chiltington for 8 units (6 detached, 2 affordable) - if completed, this would be bring the number of new houses to 39. Other new houses have appeared off Common Hill and also there is the new Wells Place development. Supplying bungalows for older people and affordable housing for all BUT must go to local people. Huge concern for the huge housing developments being proposed nearby which will affect West Chiltington negatively.	8/24/2021 5:47 PM
24	I would rather see controlled development on a dedicated site than patchy backland development.	8/20/2021 6:18 PM
25	EH10 Tit is a travesty that houses that have recently been built have not been included in the plan already. I can count 12 straightaway that should come off the plan now.	8/18/2021 2:13 PM
26	The latest iteration of the Plan has diverged significantly from previous versions, with no intermediate consultation. The change can only be attributed to pressure and lobbying by developers to the exclusion of villagers.	8/17/2021 1:58 PM
27	Yes. I'm totally sick of the Conservative plan to concrete over Sussex. IT HAS TO STOP.	8/17/2021 11:30 AM
28	One interesting aspect of housing schemes is the subsequent naming of the roads. It has a lot to do with the ego of councillors. I developed a starter scheme close by the Romney Hythe and Dymchurch narrow gauge railway and wanted to name the roads after the three founders of the railway. Only Greenly way was accepted the other two being named after councillors I believe.	8/16/2021 9:34 PM
29	The approach taken to our Neighbourhood Plan is one of NIMBYism. It is an exercise in resistance rather than identification of suitable sites to address a housing crisis. During the moratorium on development provided to West Chiltington by Horsham planning policy, from the year 2000 to 2015 there were over 65 new build dwelling planning approvals. Yet over the next 15 years the Parish plan seeks to limit development to 25, when other rural Parishes of a similar size in the South East are allocating over 100 dwellings each.	8/16/2021 9:10 PM
30	There are a number of options to infill which seem to happen organically - I'm not sure I see a case for mini estates which have a far greater impact because they are concentrated onto small parcels of land	8/13/2021 8:31 PM
31	no comments	8/13/2021 10:34 AM
32	Comments re reasonable bus service are not true as buses are rare.	8/11/2021 2:06 PM
33	no	8/11/2021 10:29 AM
34	No	8/11/2021 10:24 AM
35	The measure of affordability show be clearly defined as based on housing costs up to 30% of household income rather than as a discount to open market housing	8/10/2021 1:05 PM
36	See above	8/9/2021 4:12 PM
37	26HDFP	8/9/2021 1:10 PM
38	1/ There is need for our village to have single bed flats in order to give the jounger generation	8/8/2021 9:29 PM

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan

an opportunity to stay in the Village(Steel Close three were provided and these single bed flats went like hot cakes" proving there is a need. 2/ My dream would be to have a small complex of SHELTERED HOUSING BUNGALOWS bearing in mind that West Chiltington has a very large portion of retired ageing residents!!!.

39	Policy H1.2b contradicts selection of Smock Alley as policy states developments are located within the built up area boundary. Policy H1.3c contradicts selection of Smock Alley as it states that development should not diminish the Settlement Separation Zone. Policy H1.8h contradicts selection of Smock Alley as it states hedgerow must be retained. Site 2 Land at Smock Alley 3. Dwellings must be no more than 2 storeys. Why is it not limited to single story only? No development has to include 2 story homes. 5. Why are only the Western and Eastern boundaries named as being retained?	8/8/2021 7:25 PM
40	Just poorly thoughtout.	8/8/2021 2:59 PM
41	Policy H2. Rather than just suggesting bungalows for the elderly, an alternative is apartments in a two-storey block, as in Morris Way, West Chiltington. These fit in very well with adjacent detached properties and use less land than bungalows. Many older folk do not wish to continue maintaining their own gardens and prefer communal outdoor space.	8/7/2021 10:00 PM
42	In an age where climate change action is now required, why does the Housing document contain the word 'should' rather than 'must' when any limitations or controls are to be placed on building, infrastructure or site choice. See sections H2, H3, H4, H6, EH1 EH2 EH3 EH4 EH6 EH7, and similarly why use subjective terms for example 'significantly reducing' in EH7? All of the document wording, because it is written in this way, would allow any development to ignore any specific point.	8/6/2021 3:00 PM
43	I donot believe there has been enough consultation with local people as to which sites to include in plan. I was told theonly meeting held in Church Field, was an absolute nonsense. Hardly anyone could speak and it was a closed unit. To me it all seems to be decided without hearing the local opinion.	8/5/2021 6:20 PM
44	I feel Smock Alley is a better site as has been an eyesore for years and the plan is sympathetic and I feel it would improve the area	8/3/2021 10:01 PM
45	No Realise that HDC has always taken full advantage of the incentives that govt. policy pays to enhance the councils budgets for new housing..	8/3/2021 8:31 PM
46	No	8/2/2021 7:54 PM
47	Are commercial developments, EG. Wells Grange (Common Hill) included in the total housing requirement?	8/2/2021 3:54 PM
48	Smock Ally . Why is permission all but been agreed between HDC and the PC to develop on an agricultural green field site which hardly fulfils any of the policy for allocation of land for housing to include walk ways , cycle paths , bus routes , local amenities, but will require new drainage , power , telecommunications,lighting and according to the independent report removal of hedge rows and widening of roads just to accommodate 14 houses . The justification seems more of convenience to both PC and HDC to rail road through in order to get their 'tick in the box'.	8/2/2021 2:17 PM
49	N/A	8/1/2021 2:06 PM
50	na	8/1/2021 9:42 AM
51	Lack of appropriate infrastructure makes this proposal unacceptable. The current roads are difficult to navigate given the current traffic volumes. There is a safety issue with the proposed building development as a result.	7/30/2021 2:35 PM
52	Policy H2. I do not agree that there should be any additional large scale housing developments in West Chiltington but have reluctantly acquiesced to the 2 proposed developments as any opposition would appear to generate even more development in the area forced on us by HDC. So much for democracy, which does not exist when housing developments are concerned.	7/30/2021 10:39 AM
53	AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE PAST HAS NOT BEEN AFFORDABLE TO THOSE WHO NEED IT. WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE AFFORDABLE?	7/29/2021 12:53 PM
54	There must be associated area infrastructure to support development. Doctors, schools, parking etc etc	7/28/2021 10:50 AM

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan

55	Policy 3 identifies West Chiltington Village and Common as one settlement. In reality they are two settlements with distinct differences in the housing type and density.	7/28/2021 9:16 AM
56	Whatever is agreed/imposed, this village needs affordable housing and small bungalows for the elderly. We have enough exec houses and big bungalows	7/27/2021 7:30 PM
57	The Paddocks-Tested at Secretary of State level and waterlogged and not in character of the area.	7/27/2021 6:19 PM
58	No	7/27/2021 4:10 PM
59	Haglands Lane need widening	7/27/2021 3:54 PM
60	During my 28 years residency within West Chiltington I am firmly convinced that there should be NO MORE housing development within West Chiltington as all of the recognised beneficial requisites that this village has to offer will be destroyed for good.	7/27/2021 3:19 PM
61	It is vital that developers are forced to provide the necessary infrastructure to permit pedestrians and cyclists to move safely in and around the village and access Storrington and Pulborough. More frequent affordable bus services for those with limited mobility should also be made. All too often developers seem to manage to renege on these undertakings without penalty.	7/27/2021 12:46 PM
62	Can the allocation be reduced by consideration of the recent and current additional house building? e.g. Wells Place- Common Hill, Grove Lane etc.	7/27/2021 11:41 AM
63	I cannot locate a suitable policy number, but there is no provision for self build plots. There is a National requirement for councils to provide suitable plots, but Horsham DC are woefully lacking in putting any effort into this.	7/26/2021 7:44 PM
64	no	7/26/2021 11:35 AM
65	No	7/26/2021 10:28 AM
66	No.	7/25/2021 8:07 PM
67	Correct locations selected	7/25/2021 7:49 PM
68	Who is the additional housing in West Chiltington for? Where is the population growth coming from? What job opportunities are there in the village? How are the additional services, health, schools etc funded?	7/25/2021 4:37 PM
69	Policy H1. Any development in Smock Alley will create material harm to the character and appearance of the individual settlement characteristics of the area. This proposed site conflicts with HDPF spatial strategy and specifically Policy 2,3,4,25 & 26.	7/25/2021 11:27 AM
70	The local authority - HDC in this case - should be empowered to act pro-actively and encourage the right and proper means to satisfy the needs of its democratic, tax-paying, residents.	7/24/2021 6:35 PM
71	NNo	7/24/2021 2:36 PM
72	I think you are doing your best in preventing new housing, so I'm happy to defer decisions to you to act in this manner as far as possible within the HDC enforcements.	7/24/2021 12:29 PM
73	All the houses in all the plans have allocated parking spaces. There is no mention of enhancing public transport, eg a bus that gets you to Worthing / Horsham or even Storrington in time for work, or links with the trains at Pulborough. How does this sit with the need to reduce CO2 emissions & reduce car dependency	7/23/2021 5:01 PM