

Summary of the Main Issues Raised in the Representations on the Alternative Development Sites and Boundary Changes document

ADS1 Luckista Caravan Site

Support was expressed for this site. Objection also expressed that it is outside the Built-Up Area Boundary, seen as overdevelopment in the village and that services could not cope, as well as additional traffic on Billingshurst Road.

ADS 2 North of Rectory Lane

An objection was expressed that it is outside the Built-Up Area Boundary, seen as overdevelopment in the village and that services could not cope, as well as additional traffic on Rectory Lane which is not wide enough to cope with extra volume.

ADS 3 Land North of Rectory Lane - Smaller Site A

An objection was expressed that it is outside the Built-Up Area Boundary, seen as overdevelopment in the village and that services could not cope, as well as additional traffic on Rectory Lane which is not wide enough to cope with extra volume.

ADS 4 Land North of Rectory Lane - Smaller Site B

An objection was expressed that it is outside the Built-Up Area Boundary, seen as overdevelopment in the village and that services could not cope, as well as additional traffic on Rectory Lane which is not wide enough to cope with extra volume.

ADS 5 Land North of Ashington

An objection was expressed that it is outside the Built-Up Area Boundary, seen as overdevelopment in the village and that services would conflict with some already present, as well as additional traffic at the north of the village causing problems on Billingshurst Road.

ADS 6 Land North East of Billingshurst

Support expressed for this site on grounds of sustainability and deliverability. Objection was expressed as the site is important to the landscape setting of the village, bypass seen as an excuse for development, further development is unsustainable as little employment opportunities and pressure on local infrastructure. Need for further housing was questioned, it was also expressed that Billingshurst needs time to consolidate development, and that the site is inconsistent with Structure Plan policy.

ADS 7 Land East of Billingshurst

There was limited support expressed for this site on grounds of sustainability and deliverability. Objection was expressed to this site due to the loss of green amenity land and its wildlife. Seen as overdevelopment and that services could not cope. Additional traffic would result in greater congestion in Daux Road and others, a situation made worse by commuter parking in residential roads around the station. The site is inconsistent with Structure Plan policy.

ADS 8 Eastern Billingshurst (Land off Daux Road)

There was limited support expressed for this site on grounds of sustainability and deliverability. Objection was expressed to this site due to the potential loss of ancient woodland and its associated wildlife. Flooding in the Brookfield Way area could affect development. Seen as overdevelopment and that services could not cope. Additional traffic would result in greater congestion in Daux Road and others, a situation made worse by commuter parking in residential roads around the station. The site is inconsistent with Structure Plan policy.

ADS 9 Eastern Billingshurst (Allotment Gardens)

Objection was expressed as the site is an important 'green lung' space to the village. Further development is unsustainable, due to little local employment and increased pressure on infrastructure. Billingshurst needs time to consolidate new development.

ADS 10 Nyewood Court and General Combustion Site

There was limited support expressed for this site on grounds of sustainability and deliverability. Objection was expressed to this site due to the potential loss of ancient woodland and its associated wildlife. Flooding could affect the site. Seen as overdevelopment and that services could not cope.

Development would be piecemeal and its release premature.

ADS 11 Land at Dauxwood

There was limited support expressed for this site on grounds of sustainability and deliverability. Objection was expressed to this site due to the potential loss of ancient woodland and its associated wildlife. Further development is unsustainable, due to little local employment and increased pressure on infrastructure. Billingshurst needs time to consolidate new development.

ADS 12 Land at Marringdean Lane

No representations received.

ADS 13 Land South of Gillmans Estate

Objection was expressed due to potential loss of green and open space. Further development is unsustainable, due to little local employment and increased pressure on infrastructure. Billingshurst needs time to consolidate new development. The site does not relate well to Billingshurst and performs poorly in a sequential test.

ADS 14 Five Oaks Built-up Area Boundary

No representations received.

ADS 15 Grainingfold Farm, Five Oaks

Objection was expressed due to potential loss of playing field land.

ADS 16 Land South of Bramber

Support was expressed for the site as it could help meet the affordable housing targets and key worker housing of the District. It is in close proximity to existing shops and local services. The site backs onto the

main road, avoiding any substantial traffic problems within the existing village. Objection was raised as the site is located within a major floodplain. There are better sites identified in the WSSP that are available to the Council to meet housing requirements. Doubling Bramber Village would destroy its rural character, although there is a need for 30 affordable houses in the area, which has already been identified. Concerns have been raised over the background of UPA as a company and their suitability to undertake development.

ADS 17 Land at Kingsmead Close

Objection was expressed due to potential detrimental impact and influence on the AONB and the proposed South Downs National Park.

ADS 18 Land at Sopers Lane

Objection was expressed due to potential detrimental impact and influence on the AONB and the proposed South Downs National Park.

ADS 19 Possible Development Areas A to the North of Broadbridge Heath - Strategic Location

Objection was raised due to site reducing strategic gap between Broadbridge Heath and Warnham. The site is unsuitable location for major development due to its negative impact on historic parks, gardens and listed buildings. It would also require significant new highway infrastructure and is less well related to retail & leisure facilities. Site is inappropriate and unnecessary in view of CP7.

ADS 20 High Wood Hill

Objection was expressed as the site is open countryside and ancient woodland. There could be access restrictions due to surrounding geography. This site could not be contemplated in isolation and it's not necessary for it to be released together with land at CP7.

ADS 21 Land at Old Wickhurst Lane

Objection was raised as the site is in the flood plain of the River Arun and tributaries. This site could not be contemplated in isolation and it's not necessary for it to be released together with land at CP7.

ADS 22 Land on the South-Western side of Coldwaltham

Objection was expressed due to the potential detrimental impact and influence on the AONB, SSSIs, SPA, Ramsar site and the proposed South Downs National Park. Appropriate assessment would be required under the Habitats Regulations. Additional traffic would impact on rural road network.

ADS 23 Glebe Land West of Church Lane

Objection was expressed due to the potential detrimental impact and influence on the proposed South Downs National Park. The site is unsuitable location for major development due to its negative impact on woodland, gardens and listed buildings. Additional traffic would impact on Church Lane and access direct off the A29 would be very dangerous.

ADS 24 Land North of London Road

Objection was expressed because it is an isolated site with no easy access out to the A29. Inclusion in the BUAB would create a riband effect of the built up area along the A29. Potential detrimental impact and influence on the setting of the proposed South Downs National Park.

ADS 25 Land South of London Road

Objection was expressed due to inclusion in the BUAB would create a riband effect of the built up area along the A29. Potential detrimental impact and influence on Conservation Area and the setting of the proposed South Downs National Park. Low quality of life/amenity when housing located adjacent to A29.

ADS 26 Land South of Chanctonbury View

Objection was expressed due to existing and potential congestion and parking difficulties in Nep Town Road, Dropping Holmes and Sandy Lane. Existing infrastructure cannot support further development and there are more suitable sites allocated. The site allows views to the River Adur and the South Downs and also supports a diverse wildlife population. Development would result in a loss of village identity and community feel.

ADS 27 Furners Lane Site A

Objection was expressed as the greenfield site provides a vital gap between the built up area of Henfield and the rural surroundings of Backsettown House. The only access is from Furners Lane, which is narrow and already congested with parking difficulties. There would be a negative impact on an important Listed Building and its environment, on water tables and the adequacy of drainage. Existing services are already under strain with electricity and water cuts.

ADS 28 Furners Lane Site B

Objection was expressed as the greenfield site provides a vital gap between the built up area of Henfield and the rural surroundings of Backsettown House. The only access is from Furners Lane, which is narrow and already congested with parking difficulties. There would be a negative impact on an important Listed Building and its environment, on water tables and the adequacy of drainage. Existing services are already under strain with electricity and water cuts.

ADS 29 Nep Town Road

There was limited support expressed for this site on grounds of sustainability and affordable small residential units. Objection was expressed due to it being seen as overdevelopment in the village, that services could not cope, and the creation of additional traffic (made worse by lack of public transport).

ADS 30 Henfield Business Park

Objection was expressed due to no identified need for extending industrial area into surrounding countryside. Creation of additional traffic would worsen accident black spot at Furners Lane/High Street. The site is Greenfield agricultural land, outside boundary of Henfield. Development

would have negative impact on existing wildlife. Site is susceptible to flooding. Right of Way FP 2548 passes through site.

ADS 31 Rookwood Golf Course

There was limited support expressed for this site as no objective evidence to show development could not take place there, and it is more of a natural urban extension to Horsham. Objection was expressed due to development will lead to loss of amenity and threat to wildlife in the golf course and Warnham Nature Reserve. Site should be safeguarded from development.

ADS 32 Picts Hill, South West of Horsham

Support was raised as it is more of a natural urban extension to Horsham than the strategic location proposed west of the A24. Site has little function as a strategic gap. Objection was expressed due to the site being outside the BUAB and within the Strategic Gap. The railway line forms a logical boundary to the town; any development would constitute further erosion of the Horsham-Southwater gap in conflict with the Structure Plan.

ADS 33 Denne Parade

Support was expressed. Objection was raised as site does not promote sustainable development. The release of the site in advance or in favour of wider releases at East Billingshurst would be inconsistent with the objectives of the core strategy.

ADS 34 Horsham Football Club

Support was expressed. Objection was raised due to loss of land currently used as a playing pitch. Incompatible with the aims and statutory requirement to promote sustainable development. Not been based upon robust and credible evidence. The release of the site in advance or in favour of wider releases at East Billingshurst would be inconsistent with the objectives of the core strategy.

ADS 35 Horsham Goods Yard

Support was expressed with the need for satisfactory access to the site itself, improvements to the roundabout outside the station and the station access. Consider employment provision on site can be enhanced in conjunction with residential development.

ADS 36 Parsonage Farm

Objection was expressed due to the site being incompatible with the aims and statutory requirement to promote sustainable development. Not been based upon robust and credible evidence. Not the most appropriate allocation, and does not comply with the Structure Plan. The release of the site in advance or in favour of wider releases at East Billingshurst would be inconsistent with the objectives of the core strategy.

ADS 37 Land at Forest Road

Support was expressed for allocating this site to community use for religious worship. Objection was expressed due to potential detrimental impact and influence on an AONB. Site within Strategic Gap, any

development would constitute further erosion of the Horsham-Crawley gap.

ADS 38 Land North of Moorhead Drive, Crawley Road

Objection was expressed due to potential detrimental impact and influence on an AONB. Site within Strategic Gap, any development would constitute further erosion of the Horsham-Crawley gap. The site is distant from town centre, and alternative sustainable potential development sites exist.

ADS 39 Hornbrook Farm

Limited support was expressed as the site has the advantage of being east of the A24 and thus more of a natural urban extension to Horsham than the strategic location. Objection was expressed due to effects of the building work on the levels of the Hornbrook stream are unclear resulting in concern about flooding. Development and the additional volumes of traffic would place greater strain on local road network and safety. The open land forms a natural boundary to the built up area of Horsham. Potential detrimental impact and influence on an AONB.

ADS 40 Hilliers

There was limited support expressed for this site to be included within the BUAB. Objection was expressed due as natural features assume the natural boundaries of the town and potential detrimental impact and influence on an AONB and Strategic Gap. No proven need for further industrial development.

Overload of road infrastructure and supporting services, also creation of additional traffic would worsen around A281.

ADS 41 Warnham and Wealden Brickworks

Objection was expressed due to intensification of planned development would lead to additional traffic generation. Significant upgrading of the road network would be required before the site could be redeveloped.

ADS 42 Graylands

There was limited support expressed for this site to be a mixed use development and public access country park. Objection was expressed due to intensification of planned development would lead to additional traffic generation. Intensification of residential development in this location would potentially create an undesirable node for future growth.

ADS 43 Broadlands Business Campus

Objection was expressed due to intensification of planned development would lead to additional traffic generation. Intensification of residential development in this location would potentially create an undesirable node for future growth.

ADS 44 Land at Home Farm and School, Barns Green

There was limited support expressed for this site as it could support the provision of a new single site school in the area. Objection was expressed due to loss of land currently used or last used as playing pitches.

ADS 45 Land at Monks Gate

Objection was expressed due as the site fails to meet the objectives of the sustainability appraisal. It is not within a settlement boundary, the current settlement is small and lacking in facilities which would encourage unsustainable travel patterns. Potential detrimental impact and influence on an AONB.

ADS 46 Swallowfield Nursery, Mannings Heath

Objection was expressed due as the site fails to meet the objectives of the sustainability appraisal. Development will result in loss of rural land outside the BUAB, with the necessary road improvements leading to the loss of TPO trees. Potential detrimental impact and influence on an AONB. Development would lead to additional traffic generation and unsustainable travel patterns.

ADS 47 Sadlers Farm, Mannings Heath

Objection was expressed due to potential detrimental impact and influence on an AONB. Development would harm the form of the village and overload existing services. Development would lead to additional traffic generation, unsustainable travel patterns and affect roadside safety.

ADS 48 Land at Stopham Road

Objection was expressed due to its open countryside location and it should be protected.

ADS 49 Land at West Glebe Place

Objection was expressed due to the site being part of the Conservation Area, site of archaeological interest and a local amenity of great value. Development would harm over 40 rare or protected species of flora & fauna detected. The road access to site and A29 is poor and dangerous & Church Place is narrow, and would affect historic buildings. It was considered there were more suitable sites and concern expressed over water and sewage supply. Support was also expressed, as it could provide a modest mixed use development for residential, church, community and open space use.

ADS 50 Land North of Glebelands

Limited support was expressed for the site as it meets the objectives of sustainable development. Objection was expressed due to the site, relative to other omitted Pulborough sites, is unsustainable and is intrusion into open countryside.

ADS 51 Land West of Stane Street

Objection was expressed as access would require the destruction of important habitat, houses on Stane Street and significant earthworks along the A29.

ADS 52 Oddstones

Support was expressed as joining the site together would make it sustainable, deliverable, accessible and well contained. Limited objection

was expressed as site is an isolated landholding on the outskirts of Pulborough.

ADS 53 Land North of Hill Farm Lane

Objection was expressed as the site is remote from the facilities in the village and not sustainable. It should be kept as countryside as there are better options available.

ADS 54 Toat Café

Objection was expressed due to the site being a potentially isolated and sporadic development in the countryside, geographically separated from the main settlement and being in an unsustainable location. A recreational use, compatible with its location should be sought.

ADS 55 Nutbourne A

No representations received.

ADS 56 Nutbourne B

No representations received.

ADS 57 Nutbourne C

No representations received.

ADS 58 Small Site North of Guildford Road, Bucks Green

Objection was expressed as the site would not promote sustainable development. Not been based upon robust and credible evidence for local need. The release of the site in advance or in favour of wider releases at East Billingshurst would be inconsistent with the objectives of the core strategy to establish a spatial approach that will endure. The release of the site in advance or in favour of wider releases at East Billingshurst would be inconsistent with the objectives of the core strategy.

ADS 59 Land North of Guildford Road, Bucks Green

Objection was expressed as development should be strongly justified by both need and sustainability criteria. Identifying a local site would require careful consideration and sustainability will be an essential consideration.

ADS 60 Station Garage Church Street, Rudgwick

Objection was expressed due to incompatibility with the aims and statutory requirement to promote sustainable development. Not been based upon robust and credible evidence. The release of the site in advance or in favour of wider releases at East Billingshurst would be inconsistent with the objectives of the core strategy.

ADS 61 Land South of Summerfold - Site A, Rudgwick

Objection was expressed due as development should be strongly justified by both need and sustainability criteria. This is part of an application already withdrawn by Horsham District Council.

ADS 62 Land South of Summerfold - Site B Rudgwick

Objection was expressed due as development should be strongly justified by both need and sustainability criteria. This is part of an application already withdrawn by Horsham District Council.

ADS 63 Little Pytchley, Bucks Green

Objection was expressed due as development should be strongly justified by both need and sustainability criteria.

ADS 64 Land North of Faygate

Objection was expressed as development is an erosion of the Horsham-Crawley strategic gap. The site is not suitable as development will harm the limited existing infrastructure and services,, character of parish and increase traffic with further pressure on the narrow lanes around Faygate.

ADS 65 The Timber Yard and Surrounding Area, Faygate

There was limited support as it is a commercial site at present.

Objection was expressed as development is an erosion of the Horsham-Crawley strategic gap. The site is not suitable as development will harm the limited existing infrastructure and services, character of parish and increase traffic. The local road network away from the A264 is incapable of supporting any further growth in traffic.

ADS 66 West of Crawley Area of Study

There was limited support as it removes the existing golf course from possible development and provides a more suitable alternative to development in Ifield.

Objection was expressed as development is an erosion of the Horsham-Crawley strategic gap. Not suitable as development will harm the limited existing infrastructure and services, character of parish and increase traffic.

Objection was expressed because of the need to protect designated wildlife areas.

ADS 67 Ghyll Manor

Objection was expressed due as Sussex Border path runs through the field to which villagers of Rusper were granted open access. Further expansion would be detrimental to the character of Rusper and its rural setting, impact on village facilities and amenities, erosion the strategic gap and increased traffic.

ADS 68 Land South of Puck Croft Cottage

Objection was expressed as development is an erosion of the strategic gap. Development will harm the limited existing infrastructure and services; character of parish, the local school is full and an increase traffic. This site affects an area of Ancient Semi-natural Woodland. Incompatible with the aims and statutory requirement to promote sustainable development.

ADS 69 Rusper Road, Crawley

There was limited support expressed as it is previously-developed land, which should be released first as an intensification of existing residential

areas. Objection was expressed as development would erode the strategic gap, harm the limited existing infrastructure and services, the character of parish and increase traffic.

ADS 70 Coolham Built-up Area Boundary

Objection was expressed as development would erode the strategic gap, harm the limited existing infrastructure and services, the character of parish and increase traffic. The site is liable to partial flooding. There is no local need for what is proposed

ADS 71 St Cuthmans School, Coolham

There was limited support expressed for this site allocation. Objection was expressed as development would erode the strategic gap, harm the limited existing infrastructure and services (with no local need increased provision), the character of parish and increase traffic. The site is liable to partial flooding. There is no local need for what is proposed. Incompatible with the aims and statutory requirement to promote sustainable development.

ADS 72 Land between Spring Lane and Hayes Lane

Objection was expressed as development would erode the preservation of the rural nature and character of the village. Access for the proposed development would create pressure on the village infrastructure. The site forms part of the central fields of the parish, formed from common land and is a unique and valued characteristic of this parish.

ADS 73 Gatefield Cottages

Objection was expressed as the land forms part of the central fields of the parish. It is a conservation area, surrounded by listed buildings. Any development here would totally change the entire nature of Slinfold village.

ADS 74 Spring Lane Built-up Area Boundary

Objection was expressed as the land forms part of the central fields of the parish.

ADS 75 Land South of Southwater

Objection was expressed due to Southwater already grown to its limits, traffic concerns at site and within village becoming dangerous & bottle necks at ends of the village. The site is at the entrance to village, and at the furthest point from facilities and services, as well as the utilities already being over stretched. It was also expressed that the woodlands should be preserved and made conservation areas.

ADS 76 Millfield

There was limited support expressed for this site allocation as it is seen as a logical and feasible final extension to the built-up area. Objection was expressed as the village has expanded to its capacity and it would lose its village identity. Development would erode the strategic gap, damage woodland, and result in traffic problems. More suitable sites in Southwater exist.

ADS 77- 27 Millfield

Objection was expressed as the village has expanded to its capacity and it would lose its village identity. Development would erode the strategic gap, damage woodland, and result in traffic problems. The site does not promote sustainable development and a sustainable pattern of development would not result.

ADS 78 Land West of Southwater

Objection was expressed due as the Worthing Road creates a definitive boundary to the settlement. The village has expanded to its capacity and it would lose its village identity. Development would erode the strategic gap, damage woodland, and result in traffic problems.

ADS 79 Land at Trosslands

Objection was expressed as there is no need to identify site as a site specific allocation specifically to meet housing requirements. The village has expanded to its capacity and it would lose its village identity. Development would erode the strategic gap, damage woodland, and result in traffic problems.

ADS 80 Gardens on Worthing Road

Objection was expressed as the village has expanded to its capacity and it would lose its village identity. Development would erode the strategic gap, damage woodland, and result in traffic problems. The site is outside the BUAB and is not in keeping with countryside policies. Incompatible with the aims and statutory requirement to promote sustainable development.

ADS 81 West of Tower Hill

Support was expressed as the site is east of the A24 and more of a natural urban extension to Horsham than the strategic location. Objection was expressed due to erosion of the strategic gap. The railway line forms a natural, defensible southern boundary to the town. Not in keeping with countryside policies and fragmented development/ownership creates uncertainty over deliverability.

ADS 82 Land between Tower Hill and Worthing Road

Support was expressed as the site is east of the A24 and more of a natural urban extension to Horsham than the strategic location. Also the site could provide hotel accommodation in a sustainable location. Objection was expressed due to erosion of the strategic gap. The railway line forms a natural, defensible southern boundary to the town. Not in keeping with countryside policies and fragmented development/ownership creates uncertainty over deliverability.

ADS 83 Previous Allocation SQ5, Christ's Hospital

Support was expressed for the site to be included as a 'stand-alone' specific development where no road requirements are required. Objection was expressed but with no reason given.

ADS 84 The Warren, Christ's Hospital

Objection was expressed as development would be outside of the BUAB and erode the strategic gap, affect an area of Ancient Semi-natural

Woodland, and result in traffic problems. The area is poorly serviced by access and work opportunities.

ADS 85 Triangle by Christ's Hospital Road, Christ's Hospital

Objection was expressed as there is no need for this extension of the BUAB, as planning applications for sites within the Schools boundary have invariably succeeded.

ADS 86 Stammerham and its Curtilage, Christ's Hospital

Objection was expressed as it allows further erosion of the countryside without any proven need or exceptional circumstance.

ADS 87 Horsham Road, Steyning

Objection was expressed as Horsham Road provides a clear and long standing boundary between the built up area of Steyning to the east, and countryside to the west. Development would detract from the natural beauty of the AONB. Incompatible with the statutory requirement to promote sustainable development.

ADS 88 Mouse Lane

Objection was expressed due to major concerns over greenfield sites situated in AONBs being put forward. The impact & influence of development located outside but near to an AONB must be considered.

ADS 89 Land North of Kings Barn Lane

Objection was expressed because the Steyning bypass provides a clear and long standing boundary between the built up area of Steyning to the west, and countryside to the east. The site is poorly related to urban area of Steyning and is against the economic growth within Crawley/Gatwick area strategy of WSSC.

ADS 90 The Studio, Manleys Hill

Objection was expressed as the site is an important and prominent building within the Storrington Conservation Area and highly visible when entering the village from the east. The building forms part of the historic character of Storrington. There is no certainty that this site is available for development within the LDF timeframe.

ADS 91 Allotments, Browns Lane

Support was expressed because the site has direct, and level, road access from Ravenscroft, a publicly maintainable highway. It is considered suitable for 'extra care' and affordable homes due to its proximity to the village centre.

Objection was expressed as development is unsuitable as it is outside BUAB, adjacent to a Conservation Area and AONB and part of floodplain. Its current use of allotments gives enjoyment. There is a lack of road and service infrastructure.

ADS 92 Land West of New Town Road

Support was expressed as the reason for not including the site is misinformed and the site would fulfil an identified need for additional affordable housing within Storrington. Objection was expressed because

the site is outside the BUAB and is an incursion into open countryside. Development would damage the setting of the village.

ADS 93 Storrington Glebe

Objection was expressed because the site is one of the few remaining open spaces within the curtilage of the village. There is uncertainty that the site is available for development.

ADS 94 North of St Joseph's Hall

Objection was expressed due to unsuitable access and development would lead to major traffic congestion within the village. Development would be damaging to the setting of the village and the area of countryside between the village and AONB.

ADS 95 Land South of Kithurst Lane

Objection was expressed as the site is outside the BUAB. Access is single track and development of this area would cause major traffic congestion within the village. Development would be damaging to the setting of the village and the area of countryside between the village and AONB.

ADS 96 Gerston Farm

Partial support was expressed as the site is a brownfield site, which may be suitable for some development, although access and traffic issues need to be resolved. Objection was expressed as the site lies within the Sussex Downs AONB. It is isolated from the village and only accessible by a narrow lane with no footpath. Loss of employment land would be contrary to policy.

ADS 97 Angells Sandpit

Objection was expressed because the Council has already rejected including this land in the BUAB. Planning permission has been granted for residential development and the owners are looking to implement the permission. There is no justification for the allocation.

ADS 98 Land at Chantry Lane

Limited support was expressed as Chantry Lane could be used to absorb some of the 750 homes from West of Horsham. Objection was expressed due to the AONB at its eastern end and Chantry Mill SSSI. Access via Chantry Lane would be dangerous. Proposals would result in loss of employment floorspace and would not accord with strategy of development to support economic growth of Gatwick.

ADS 99 Pit Area of Thakeham Tiles

Objection was expressed as development would be in conflict with the local design statement and there is no proven local need. The site's remaining trees are an important feature and it is important for flora and fauna. Access to development would be via single track road. This land should be outside the built up area boundary as it is rural in character.

ADS 100 Land at Abingworth Farm

Limited support was expressed that Chesswoods should be actively encouraged to relocate to Brinsbury. The site should be sensibly

redeveloped for housing and commercial activities and thereby meet the overall needs of this part of the District. Objection was expressed as the site is Greenfield and in an unsustainable location outside of the BUAB. There is not a local need for extensive development and there is negligible public transport with high dependency on cars. Significant development will put services/facilities in Storrington under greater pressure in a dormitory development.

ADS 101 Chesswood and Abingworth Farm

Limited support was expressed that Chesswoods should be actively encouraged to relocate to Brinsbury. The site should be sensibly redeveloped for housing and commercial activities and thereby meet the overall needs of this part of the District. Objection was expressed as the site is Greenfield and in an unsustainable location outside of the BUAB. There is not a local need for extensive development and there is negligible public transport with high dependency on cars. Significant development will put services/facilities in Storrington under greater pressure in a dormitory development.

ADS 102 Rushfield Nurseries

Objection was expressed as the site is Greenfield and in an unsustainable location outside of the BUAB. There is not a local need for extensive development and there is negligible public transport with high dependency on cars. Significant development will put services/facilities in Storrington under greater pressure in a dormitory development.

ADS 103 North Thakeham Built-up Area Boundary

Objection was expressed because development would affect the integrity of the conservation area. The Glebe Field is an important amenity and must be preserved for continued use. No proven need for this number of houses which would be built on an unsustainable Greenfield site. Development would be unsuitable and out of character for a rural village. Increased traffic volume would increase pressure on B2139. Knock-on effect in Storrington would be increased difficulty to park and more road congestion.

ADS 104 Land at Water Lane

Objection was expressed because it is a Greenfield site, outside the BUAB in an unsustainable location. There is no local need for extensive development which would create dormitory areas. Significant development will put the already stretched services and facilities in nearby Storrington under even greater pressure. More housing would lead to the closing of the gap between the village and Sullington / Storrington. The B2139 road is dangerous.

ADS 105 New Settlement at Kingsfold

Support was expressed as an enlarged Kingsfold could, with other small existing villages form a pattern of sensible, sustainable developments and the site could provide some of the 750 additional homes proposed for West of Horsham at the submission stage. Objection was expressed as there are adequate sites identified without Kingsfold. WSSP identified Kingsfold as a last resort as there is no supporting infrastructure in place

and there would be a long lead in period, therefore unlikely to deliver within the plan period. This site affects an area of Ancient Semi-natural Woodland.

ADS 106 Yard off the Street

Objection was expressed as the site was considered unsuitable.

ADS 107 North Farm

Objection was expressed as the site lies within the Sussex Downs AONB. The site is incompatible with the aims and statutory requirement to promote sustainable development. The Parish Council asks for close involvement in any future planning considerations.

ADS 108 West Side of St Georges Lane - Site A, Storrington

Objection was expressed as the site is considered unsuitable because it is Unsustainable in transport terms and does not hold relevance with the Village Design Statement. There is a need to maintain the balance between development and nature.

ADS 109 West Side of St Georges Lane - Site B, Storrington

Objection was expressed as the site is considered unsuitable because it is Unsustainable in transport terms and does not hold relevance with the Village Design Statement. There is a need to maintain the balance between development and nature.

ADS 110 Rear of Finches Lane, West Chiltington Common

No representations received.

ADS 111 South of Star Road, Partridge Green

Objection was expressed due to the loss of wildlife and woodland habitat and impact on residents. It is an unsustainable scale of development which would result in a lack of facilities, with flooding, sewage and electricity issues. The site is in an unsuitable physical location divorced from the village. The surrounding road network and infrastructure could not support such development. The demand does not exist for more units.

ADS 112 Land North of Blanches Road, Partridge Green

Objection was expressed as the site is Greenfield site of ancient meadowland. Floods at times of heavy rain. It is an unsustainable scale of development, dangerous access and traffic levels, not enough facilities to support community, sewage, flooding and run-off issues. Development would create coalescence between Littleworth and Partridge Green and would be premature in the light of the proposed Village Action Plan. Incompatible with the aims and statutory requirement to promote sustainable development.

ADS 113 Brinsbury Centre of Excellence

Support was expressed with concerns. If the site was used for buildings rather than a paddock, there would be a direct impact on drainage and the biodiversity of the area.

Contact officers: Caroline Tyler, Senior Planning Officer, extension 5181 and Oliver Boulter, Planning Assistant, extension 5276.