

**Consultation under Paragraph 13a of Schedule 4B of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act Slinfold
Neighbourhood Plan - Summary of Representations**

Stakeholder Reference	Policy No. Paragraph	Summary
Ref #1	Oppose Modification Spring Lane Development	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Goes into some planning history of the area. 2. <i>'Spring Lane as name indicates has water on west side of lane for most of the year. The water lays from lane to about 150 feet into field.'</i> 3. <i>'The lane is only one vehicle width and is to narrow for normal refuse lorry to use.'</i> 4. <i>'The east side of lane is much drier and original plans of West Way road allows for access to this area'</i> 5. <i>'The field to the West of Spring Lane is usually flooded with spring water (hence name) and is unsuitable for building. Access to area would be via single width lane which is so narrow that council refuse collection requires smaller vehicle'.</i>
Ref #2	Support All three modifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'Re-word the term 'at least' on all the sites. As this would be deemed unlimited housing numbers on all sites.' 2. 'Regards the inclusion of the area at the end of West Way being developed, there is one argument which supports building here to 'share the pain' of new development and stop extra houses being built on the country lane of Hayes Lane in lieu of these houses. I support this, but even as a resident of Hayes Lane, I think there is a stronger argument in support of this development. That is that the developer involved in this area of land is offering the village access to land which is currently inaccessible and they are offering to secure a parcel of this land for the village to enjoy. This is a huge positive for the village, in my view.' 3. 'Regards the Scout Hut, I support any plan for the scouts to be treated fairly by developers and it is very decent of a developer to offer to provide the scout hut. '
Ref #3	Support Modifications PM2, PM4, PM5 & PM6.	<p>Representation comes in two Parts.</p> <p>Part 1 (Letter Dated 11 April)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'The modifications are supported provided the definition of "at least" is clearly defined as +/- 10%'</i> 2. Objects to the re-instatement of land at the end of West Way. 3. Objections to this site are contained in four responses: Reg 14 (31 May 2016), application DC/16/2556 (2 December 2016), Regulation 16 (6 July 2017) and modified draft plan (18 October 2017). 4. Considers the Sustainability Appraisal for the draft plan contained 'significant misjudgements' in regards to West Way. 5. Notes Examiner site visit on the site and the Examiner's findings from the visit, with it being judged to be unsustainable. 6. Notes Slinfold Parish Council's initial agreement to delete West Way before announcing a modified reinstatement of the site with little parishioners being in knowledge of this. 7. <i>'Slinfold Parish Council's response to HDC contains controversial statements</i>

1. *It says residents will be aware of on-going discussions between Slinfold Parish Council and HDC – I am certainly not aware of any such conversations.*
2. *It says “End of Westway – The Examiner and HDC want to see all housing and public space omitted from the Central Fields and the surplus housing put on land East of Hayes Lane”.*
- That is not correct. Neither the Examiner nor HDC made that suggestion.
-In fact, the Examiner noted 172 homes had been built between 2001 and 2011 (implying many more houses will be built through 2031 – beyond the Neighbourhood Plan allocations)’.
8. *‘report refers to “much needed homes in sustainable locations” but the Examiner declared end of West Way as a non-sustainable site!’.*
9. The parish council states that if the plan fails, then there be up to 800 homes. It is argue this statement is contradicted by the Parish’s desire to reinstate West Way.
10. Asks why the plan hasn’t accepted the Examiner’s and HDC’s recommendations and show so much support to the developer of end of West Way.
11. Is concerned of the potential consequences if the Parish Council go-ahead with West Way.
12. The *Slinfold Parish Council Response to HDC Decision Statement* is attached.

Part 2 (Email dated 13 April 2018).

1. Feels that 2000 Slinfold Parishioners will not know of the reinstatement of West Way site and feels that HDC should send information to all notifying them of this and that they have an opportunity to respond.
2. *‘The site would ruin the character and views of the village and lead to inevitable development from the Pub Field to the Downs Link.’*
3. *‘There are two persons on Slinfold Parish Council (backed by other councillors) who appear to have a strong sympathy for Millwood Homes.* This is followed by 9 points given as examples as to why this is felt.
4. The site would ruin the character and views of the village and lead to inevitable development from the Pub Field to the Downs Link. The site has always been turned down by HDC in the past and can only be developed if it is included in the Neighbourhood Plan.
5. *‘There are two persons on Slinfold Parish Council (backed by other councillors) who appear to have a strong sympathy for Millwood Homes.’* This sympathy goes back a long way.
6. *‘The Examiner found Slinfold’s Sustainability Appraisal seriously understated the negatives of the site. He declared the site to be non-sustainable and recommended its deletion (January 29th 2018). Horsham District Council agreed (March 5th). HDC has set up a focussed consultation period from March 16th to May 4th in respect of modifications to the Examiner’s Report policies 8; 10; 11; and 12 (Hayes Lane; Crosby Farm; Spring Lane; and The Cobblers). Despite this focussed consultation, Slinfold Parish Council wishes to submit an unsolicited response to Policy 9 to reintroduce Millwood Homes. Their motive is unclear - though they mentioned “spreading the burden” of development – but without spreading it to other sites that were proposed for the Neighbourhood Plan and are still keen to be involved.’*

		7. <i>'Even though Policy 9 is "ultra vires", Slinfold Parish Council has arranged a meeting with Mr Chris Lyons, Director of Planning, Economic Development and Property for HDC, on 16th April. Residents have not been invited to attend or submit their views.'</i>
Ref #4	Have comments. Modification West way Option 3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'We were pleased to see that HDC, after a thorough consideration by experts in their field rejected the proposal to build 15 houses at the end of Westway. I understand that this has now been appealed by Slinfold Parish Council.'</i> 2. <i>'I strongly reject the Parish Council's appeal.'</i> 3. <i>'the plan was rejected on the advice of seasoned experts in their field'.</i> 4. <i>'It appears the Parish Council; believe the houses initially planned here will now be added to the Hayes Lane development, despite the report making no mention of this'.</i> 5. <i>'Most importantly, my consistent reason for rejecting the end of West Way development is</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>because it would destroy the structure of the village, building over the "Central Fields" around which the village is built, changing and ruining forever its character and.</i> b. <i>Hayes Lane, being a very narrow road, is already struggling to cope with traffic volumes to which this would add. We have recently had one child knocked down in the Street, which is noticeably much busier thanks to local additional housing using the village as a cut through. Yet more building will exacerbate the problem'.</i>
Ref #5	Have comments Removal of End of West Way	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the Examiner's modification to delete land End of West Way 2. The reinstatement of the site was done without any consultation with local residents and those most affected were unaware of its reinstatement. 3. <i>'it was "suggested" by the SPC that as a result of this possible decision, additional housing would be forced onto Hayes Lane site, taking from 15 to 30. These are two separate proposals and were treated accordingly by the examiner. Should the land at West Way be released it does not follow that the additional housing won't still be placed on Hayes Lane. That should have been made clear by the SPC but wasn't'.</i> 4. Examiner gave 'several valid reasons why PDS9 should be removed from the plan – including a major concern regarding Highway safety'.
Ref #6	Objection Modifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'As i understand the council have advised that the village plan is not going to be taken into account with changes being made with plans for hayes lane and westway i wish to register my objection to the fact that hdc prefer the site by the downs link this will add to the already busy lane that regularly floods and is not wide enough for lorries to pass except on the pavement this has been proved with the building of hayeswood as for westway this has to be the less obtrusive of the two you have ruind bb heath billingshurst and southwater dont ruin slinfold and take into account what the villagers want .'</i>
Ref #7	Support Removal of West Way	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I would like object to the planning application, submitted by Millwood Homes, to build in the "central fields", at the end of West Way. This idea has been thrown out by generations of planners and S.P.C's and as you know, by your own, recent, Examiner's report. Why then is this question being re-introduced? Will we only be able to move on once the bullies have won, against your decision to protect the centre of Slinfold from "unsustainable" development? Are you going to allow this minority, with a vested interest, to defy HDC's decision, without any transparent consultation with the whole of Slinfold parishioners'</i>

Ref #8	Support with modifications. PM5 Policy 11	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'The modification suggests that there should be at least 10 units. I oppose this.'</i> 2. <i>'The development to the West of Spring Lane is not appropriate. This is a green buffer for the village separating the village from the A29. Spring Lane itself is not capable of absorbing the traffic created by a new development, being a small (up until now quiet rural lane of charm and wildlife) narrow lane. The lane is connected to the village road on a dangerous bend by the existing house 'Oaklands', further traffic here is likely to cause accidents'.</i> 3. <i>'There should be no building on the Spring Lane site. Certainly not 'at least 10 units' The rural character of Spring Lane is of great value to current residents at the Southern end and of great amenity to the whole village. Development here would simply suburbanise the precious area with loss to wildlife, as well as those who cycle walk along it regularly to access the Downs Link path'.</i> 4. <i>'The land is frequently wet and flooded'.</i> 5. <i>'The examiner suggests up to 10 units and low density. This should be upheld. Low density is vital and fewer houses would reduce the impact environmentally on the special area. I urge the council to insist that only a very few houses are included'.</i> <p>Part 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>At this crucial time I am writing to you to assure you of the support that exists for the Examiner's Report and HDC's Decision to be upheld and not be overturned.</i> 2. <i>spoke to the Slinfold Parish Council on 26.4.18. A statement was made at the 26/4/18 meeting that, "HDC definitely instructed that the houses at the End of West Way should be relocated to East of Hayes Lane", but the Examiner's Report did not say this at all.</i> 3. <i>Despite my comments pointing out that the examiner and HDC had confirmed that building on West Way is not sustainable and will lead to urban sprawl over all the central fields, it was clear SPC could not acknowledge the overwhelming objections to West Way. They are supposed to represent the village not Millwood Homes. 73% of the villagers do not want building on the central fields in Slinfold.</i>
Ref #9	Support Removal of End of West Way.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'Very concerned that the Slinfold Parish Council has, without proper community discussion, submitted a modification to the HDC decision statement on any development housing at the end of West Way.'</i> 2. <i>'These fields form a non-sustainable integral part of the village and are immediately abutting the Conservation Area – the heart of the village'.</i>
Ref #10	Support Removal of End of West Way.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'Whole heartedly supports the Examiner's recommendation that the site be deleted from the plan.'</i> 2. <i>'The Examiner considered this site to be unsustainable.'</i>
Ref #11	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I support the modifications as presented. My comments below relate to a further modification proposed by Slinfold Parish Council'.</i>

	Removal of End of West Way.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Fails to see how the reinstatement of End of West Way reflects the views of local residents. They proceeded with this despite: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. recommended that the site be preserved by Slinfold Design Statement 2006, Slinfold Conservation Area Advice Leaflet 2007 b. 70% of village were against the site in 2015 survey c. Examiner assessed the site as unsustainable
Ref #12	Objection to Hayes Lane	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I am against additional houses up Hayes Lane, as apart from further impacting the green area in this part of the village I'm also concerned about the increased traffic. Every time I leave my driveway I am extra cautious, as cars go down the lane, often quite fast and with many of the houses not having enough off street parking I cannot see what's coming due to car's parked in the Lane. On a couple of occasions I have been nearly hit. I prefer the Slinfold Parish Council's proposal, where housing is not just all lumped at the end of Hayes Lane, but is more interspersed in other areas.'</i>
Ref #13	Support Removal of End of West Way.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'agree with the Examiner's recommendation to remove this site from the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan'.</i> 2. <i>'These fields are at the heart of the village, abutting the conservation area and forming part of many views across the village from a number of vantage points. In previous Horsham Local Plans they have never been considered suitable for development despite being proposed by the landowner'.</i> 3. <i>'the alterations have not had adequate publicity and public support has not been tested. Nor does it appear to mitigate the issues raised by the Examiner in any way. In fact, it exacerbates the highways issue by generating additional traffic to and from the proposed scout hut'.</i> 4. <i>'The negative environmental impact the Examiner has concerns about should not be dismissed by HDC simply because it does not fit with the Parish Council's aspirations for that land. The Parish Council's fear that their NP will fail on the vote due to lack of popularity if they remove a site allocation to the detriment of an alternative site (Hayes Lane) cannot be a valid consideration in planning terms. It should not override site specific expert planning advice'.</i> 5. <i>'The threat of the developer to legally challenge the removal of the site from the NP should in no way influence the decision of HDC nor should it be steering the site allocation within the NP'.</i>
Ref #14	Oppose Modification East of Hayes Lane	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'Any building in Hayes Lane needs to include improved drainage to ensure the surface water flooding issues are addressed'.</i> 2. <i>'Improve drainage to Hayes Lane'.</i>
Ref #15	Objection to Hayes Lane	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is concerned at the length of time it has taken for the plan to reach this stage after having been told that the process would take 'approximately a year'. 2. After mentioning the Examiner's removal of LGS from Hayes Lane, feels that the numbers on the Hayes Lane site could be increased and asks what the implications of the Examiner's findings are. 3. Mentions removal of brownfield sites during process and the housing range given to the plan.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The Examiner's report has no mention that West Way site is closer to the village centre than Hayes Lane 5. The argument of negative impact could be said about Crosby Farm (Policy 10) as well. <i>'Had the Examiner visited the Village on a summer weekend and a seen cricket match against the backdrop of the field to the North he might well have taken a different view!'</i>. 6. Traffic on Hayes Lane has increased recently 7. <i>'strongly oppose the proposal to increase the number of houses up to "at least 30"'</i>. 8. Asks for planning terminology to be replaced by more understandable language 9. Suggests that the plan is to <i>'keep to the 15 houses shown for the East of Hayes Lane Site rather the "at least 30" in the current proposal'</i>.
Ref #16	Objection modifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to the modifications made by HDC. 2. Examiner's recommendations are made based on a brief visit. 3. <i>'Para 1.2d of the design Statement refers to 'what modifications, if any, they are to make to the draft plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by section 38A of the 2004 Act) or paragraph 14(6) of Schedule A2 to the 2004 Act'. Since HDC submitted the SPNP to the Examiner unaltered I question the right of HDC to then make major deletions to the plan after it's return from the Examiner without specific reference and discussion with the SPC. Where is the principle of Localism and Democracy in that(?) if HDC make major modification based on what might be inconsistent and illogical recommendations from the Examiner.'</i> 4. <i>'Para3.3 II refers to the appraisal of the End of West Way under just 2 main aspects:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>A slight "negative impact on the nearby Conservation Area" – the Slinfold Conservation Area is primarily to preserve the village aspect of 'The Street' in Slinfold and the buildings thereon. It is hard to give validity to the Examiner's statement "that given its semi-rural nature considers that the impact of development is greater than assessed" when there is a "lack of written evidence". The proposed West Way development IS FURTHER AWAY FROM THE CONSERVATION AREA than the 3 buildings being completed at Niblet's yard. Any building in a "Semi-Rural" area could have a negative impact and it is a weak argument to say that "the (slight negative) impact is greater than assessed" without any supporting argument.</i> b) <i>"The impact on highways safety is assessed as neutral". Why then do HDC refer to the "narrow access to the site together with the on-street parking" in the statement – "the Council agrees with the Examiner that the impact of development on this objective would not be neutral as assessed." This is not what the Examiner said – HE assessed is as NEUTRAL! To state "This would again be consistent with the slight negative assessment of Hayes Lane on highways safety which identified on street parking as an issue" – Yes – On-Street parking is a very serious issue on Hayes Lane due to lack of house front gardens not providing adequate parking space, - but all West Way houses have good parking areas and on-street parking is negligible in this context. The wording used is clearly trying to twist the words of the Examiner and bolster the HDC case for unilaterally deleting the West Way part of the plan. The entrance access to West Way has wide visibility splays over grassed verges and is not narrow and "it is recognised that WSCC did not object to the plan on highways ground based"</i>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. <i>'In view of the weakness of the arguments shown in a" & b) above it is difficult to understand how "the (HDC) Council made such a decision to concur with the Examiner's Assessment.'</i> 6. <i>'The whole action in withdrawing West Way and thereby making a Major Modification to the Slinfold PNP appears to be HDC decision which has materially altered the whole game plan by attempting to force a greater number of house to be developed on Hayes Lane – a lane that is narrow, full of pot-holes and flooding problems and be-devilled by excessive on-street parking to the extent that it cannot, at present, be considered fit for purpose, let alone with the prospect of the traffic generated from Brick Lane and the proposed housing site to the east of the Hayes Lane.'</i> 7. <i>'Added to this the action of deleting West Way from the 'mix' seriously risks the SPNP failing to be accepted at the next referendum stage.</i> 8. <i>'Para 5.4 (incorrectly labelled as 4.4 – one of several HDC typos in the document) states "the SNDP with further modifications will be subject to further consultation for a period of seven weeks to take account of the Easter break". I consider this 7 week consultation is invalid as it has not permitted proper consultation and discussion on the HDC unilateral decision to delete the End of Hayes Lane proposal and request that you consider re-instating the proposal in its original form.'</i>
Ref #17	Modification Residential development at PDS8: East of Hayes Lane Reference: PM2, Policy 8.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I wish to support the Examiner's policy of no houses on the above site.</i> 2. <i>'This site has always been considered to be a unique feature of Slinfold, retaining the ancient feel and allowing for views across the fields to the Church, any infilling would destroy this unique feature.'</i>
Ref #18	Modification Residential development at PDS8: East of Hayes Lane Reference: PM2, Policy 8.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'The Examiner has the right idea and has reached the same conclusion that many Parish and District Councils have reached in the past. Namely this area represents a clear central space in the community and to infill or partially infill it with housing would destroy one of the few open areas within the centre of the Parish'.</i> 2. <i>'the Examiner has the traffic considerations too so all in all he is right from the point of view of the Village community; sightlines have been in existence for ever - some should be saved'.</i>
Ref #19	Support modifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'Please could you make a note that my wife and I both support the HDC plan for the Slinfold Neighbourhood'</i>
Ref #20	Oppose modification C	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'My understanding is that the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan has a version C which is described as "The Examiner's Plan across 4 sites with unlimited accounts of homes". If that is the case, I object to version C on the grounds that a number of new homes</i>

		<i>greater than 77 as specified in versions A and B of the Plan will place an unacceptable burden on the infrastructure of the village, primarily the roads which are already extremely too busy, unacceptably so on the bend by the church’.</i>
Ref #21	Oppose modifications	1. <i>‘I support the Slinfold Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2031, effectively showing FIVE locations, and spreading out the proposed maximum of 77 dwelling Additional comment, that Hayes Lane is a quiet rural Lane, as detailed GREEN on your map, and the proposed 30 dwellings East of Hayes Lane, is an ABSOLUTE maximum, as the Lane is already VERY busy, for its size.’</i>
Ref #22	Support modifications	1. <i>‘I support the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan together with the modifications as put forward by HDC.’</i>
Ref #23	Support	1. <i>‘PM2 – I am concerned that residential development for “at least 30 dwellings” will lead to an excessively high density of housing for the area and have a detrimental effect on the Downs Link.’</i> 2. <i>‘PM4 – In view of the location, which is very sensitive adjacent to the Conservation Area and backing onto countryside, allowing more than 24 dwellings could lead to a high density development with little or no green space which would be out of keeping with its surroundings.’</i> 3. <i>‘PM6 – strongly support a replacement Scout Hut on this site.’</i>
Ref #24	Support modifications	1. <i>‘We support the deletion of the site at the End of West Way.’</i> 2. <i>‘The current assessment that this site is not sustainable is correct, there is sufficient development already proposed under the four sites; PDS08; PDS10; PDS11 & PDS12.’</i> 3. <i>‘I see no valid argument in SPC’s decision to request the re-instatement of the End of West Way, and would support HDC in its initial assessment that this is totally unsustainable, and to the detriment of the fragile historic fabric of Slinfold.’</i>
Ref #25	Oppose modifications PM2 – Policy 8 Para 5.28	1. <i>We believe the HD examiner should listen to the opinion of SPC, who have spent many voluntary hours agreeing a fair plan for the village, with not one particular area taking a huge influx of houses. SPC have taken into account the suitability and accessibility and the opinion of the local people.</i> 2. <i>We think building another 30+ houses on Hayes lane is going to be to the detriment of the character of that end of the village, this part of Hayes Lane is not suitable for the increase in traffic and parking demand, many older people will not be able to walk to village amenities, like the shop or bus stop from the land East of Hayes Lane, it’s not very accessible which was a big concern of HD, and the reason may alternative building plots were rejected! The road and field regularly flood. We have protected species, nightingales, nesting in the trees in the field, as well as many other creatures that deserve to keep their habitat and not be encroached on any further.</i> 3. <i>We have just had 23 houses build behind Hayes lane already, and more to come on Eileen Blunden`s land on Hayes Lane, we don’t know if those houses can go towards the neighbourhood planning allocation too, maybe that would help ease the burden.</i> 4. <i>Another 30 + houses will be madness. Based on just one visit to our village, the examiner whilst no doubt experienced, should not have the authority to change the proposed plan and the villages future forever.</i>

Ref #26	Objection to the removal of Land at West Way	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'The changes proposed to the Neighbourhood Plan results in a Plan which is dramatically different to that envisaged by the Parish Council, and the local community, and is not endorsed by the Examiner.'</i> 2. <i>'The Plan, as amended, would result in a development strategy which would direct the majority of its housing to a site which is the least sustainably located of all the allocations, and would have a detrimental impact on the landscape.'</i> 3. <i>'It is understood the Examiner made an unaccompanied site visit to the NP area on the 15th December 2017. This would have required a review of all 5 of the allocated sites, and the areas of Local Green Space. It is our view that a single day, especially during mid-winter, does not allow for sufficient time to fully assess all of the sites.'</i> 4. <i>'We have concerns regarding the Examiner's judgment on the West Way site and the contents of the Examiners report. The District Council were aware that there were a suite of expert and technical documents relating to this site as a result of the previous applications submitted, and therefore are aware that the Examiner's views and conclusions are flawed.'</i> 5. <i>'The comments made by the Examiner regarding West Way were based on opinion only and were not supported by any technical or expert evidence. It is therefore considered that the removal of the site allocation at West Way is unjustified as there is a lack of any evidential foundation for the Examiner's conclusion.'</i> 6. <i>'As the Council will be aware, a lack of evidential foundation was an issue raised by the court judgement on the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan, and was one of the reasons that this Neighbourhood Plan was quashed.'</i> 7. <i>The Council have proceeded to remove a valid site allocation based solely on the Examiner's opinions and not on matters of fact, despite such facts being available. This approach is flawed, it is based on an inadequate evidence base, and it should be noted that this results in a potential reason for the plan to be challenged.'</i> 8. <i>'extremely disappointed to note that one of the modifications which the Council supports is the deletion of policy 9 – the allocation of Land at West Way for development'.</i> 9. <i>'Given the benefits of the site and the considerable work undertaken to tailor the proposed development scheme to suit the needs of the Parish, we consider that this site should be allocated for development within the Neighbourhood Plan in preference to, or in addition to a number of the other sites which are currently proposed for allocation.'</i> 10. <i>It is the view of the representation that the plan is unsustainable and puts the plan at threat of not meeting the basic conditions. (1.8-9)</i> 11. <i>'paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires Local Planning Authorities to plan positively to significantly boost housing in their areas'. The Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) was drafted with this in mind, allocating 1500 homes to Neighbourhood Plans. Paragraph 184 of the NPPF requires Neighbourhood plans to reflect the district's strategic policies and support the district's housing provision. Whilst Slinfold NP was within in the range given to it, 60-100 homes, with 77 homes over the life of the plan, the plan does not explain how they came to this figure in the context of the strategic provision of at least 1500 homes. This should be an important issues for the Examiner to consider and was noted in the recent failure of Storrington and Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan at its examination'.</i> 12. <i>With the NPPF in mind, the plan needs to provide housing in the upper end of its range as the representative is concerned that the plan will not provide a sufficient amount of housing. After all, the Examiner noted that the area saw an increase in housing of 172 homes between 2001 and 2011.</i>
---------	--	--

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>13. <i>'are concerned that the housing numbers contained in the NP will not provide sufficient housing to meet the need of Slinfold and Horsham District over the Plan period. The Examiner notes in his report that "from 2001 to 2011, there was an increase of 172 homes in the Parish and therefore, if the NP housing allocations came to fruition, the building rate for the plan period would be lower." We consider that the number of new dwellings created in the Parish should form the basis of the forward projections calculations which would establish the number of new dwellings that should be provided in the Parish over the 20-year plan period'.</i></p> <p>14. <i>'The Examiner considers the issue of housing numbers and acknowledges that the HDPF requires at least 1500 dwellings be provided through Neighbourhood Plans, and this figure will be shared across the 22 settlements in the District. The Examiner suggests that this would result in an average of 70 dwellings per settlement, but considers that as one of the eight medium villages Slinfold would be expected to accept more housing than the smaller villages. The Examiner does not consider this issue further, only focusing on one representation which considered that the housing need is likely to be between 176 and 320, and states that in his view this figure would be disproportionate - despite this being a range. The Examiner considers that "the overall allocation of housing in the NP is in proportion to the scale and size of the village and its function as described in the HDPF." We consider that the Examiner's approach is flawed in that he only considers the figure contained in this one representation and the size / function of the village, and does not seem to consider the wider issue of whether the number of units will address the housing need of the Parish.'</i></p> <p>15. <i>'As mentioned previously, there had been an increase of 172 homes in the Parish from 2001 to 2011, the fact that these developments have occurred over this time is a matter of fact and are, therefore, indicative and typical of the growth of Parish. Therefore, to reduce the number of units over the plan period to lower than this figure is flawed, and is therefore contrary to the basic requirements that the Parish Plan must comply with.'</i></p> <p>16. <i>'NPPG states that "Neighbourhood plans are not obliged to contain policies addressing all types of development. However, where they do contain policies relevant to housing supply, these policies should take account of latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need." Paragraph 040 Reference ID: 41-040-20160211.'</i></p> <p>17. <i>'Paragraph 184 of the NPPF states that Neighbourhood Plans should not promote less development and repeats the argument that the plan should allocate more housing.....In order to be in compliance with national policy and guidance, it is our view that the NP should allocate additional housing, this can be achieved by allocating the site at West Way. This would ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan is meeting the full housing need of the Parish'.</i></p> <p>18. Paragraph 5.11 states that additional housing is likely to come from windfall sites, it is argued that the plan should not include windfall sites. <i>'The NP should be providing site allocations which are able to meet its identified housing needs and should not be looking to windfall developments to rectify any shortfall. Relying on windfall development to make up the shortfall in numbers is not positive planning'.</i></p> <p>19. Repeats Neighbourhood Plans' required strategic allocation before arguing that to <i>'include windfall development as part of the housing number provided through the Neighbourhood Plan is incorrect, this number cannot be used to contribute to any shortfall in the level of housing provided in the NP.'</i></p> <p>20. <i>'Rather than looking to windfall development to meet any outstanding need, it is our view that in order to facilitate the delivery of at least 77 dwellings in the Parish, the NP should be looking to allocate additional sites to ensure the</i></p> |
|--|--|--|

housing needs of the Parish and the District are met. As previously stated, it is our view that in order to address this the West Way site should be included for such an allocation.'

21. **Amendments to the plan.** *'It is considered that the changes proposed by the LPA to the site allocations policies will result in schemes which will not achieve sustainable development, and will therefore not be in accordance with the basic conditions to allow the plan to proceed to referendum. Our representations will set this out in further detail.'*
22. Notes that that the Examiner took deleted Land at West Way and suggested that sites be allocated onto other sites.
23. *'The Council have however modified this recommendation by reintroducing the guide to dwelling numbers, but have stated that this is a minimum rather than the originally proposed ceiling. We consider that this approach is not well thought-out, and is actually a very rudimentary suggestion by the District Council. Furthermore it goes against the aims of the NP steering group and the wishes of the local community. The figures set out in these site allocations were originally designated with a ceiling to cap development on these sites in order to ensure that the developments would be in keeping with the generally low-density character of Slinfold.'* (5.2)
24. Argues that HDC's 'at least' wording to housing sites policies, which sees a viability buffer of +/- 10% applied to the 'at least' number, could potentially see a housing number as low as 67, thus making it *'unsure how this viability buffer would marry with the 'at least' requirement of the policy'* (5.3). This could result in the plan not meeting the Parishes need or development 'which are wholly inappropriate for the area'.
25. As a result of this the plan will not be 'positively produced'. This could see larger scale developments coming forward to sites 'which are wholly inappropriate in this area'.
26. *'We consider that the proposed changes to the Plan have resulted in policies which are unclear. Firstly, we consider that the inclusion of 'at least' in terms of dwelling numbers is too broad. In addition, the explanation that there is an inclusion of a buffer of +/- 10% is at odds with the approach to provide at least 74 units. The whole approach is confusing, and lacks clarification. It is considered that in reality, due to both the buffer and the inclusion of the phrase 'at least', there is the potential for inappropriate higher-density schemes to come forward on the sites. This is not what the Steering Group or community had envisioned'*.
27. *'It is our opinion that the amendments to the site allocation policies will result in policies which are not in general conformity with the advice contained in Paragraph 041 of the NPPG which states that "A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications."* (Reference ID: 41-041-20140306)'.
28. Policy 8: East of Hayes Lane. Notes that the change to East of Hayes Lane to increase density from 15 homes to 30 homes, which was made by HDC not the Examiner.
29. It's important to note that the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) completed by the Steering Group was in consideration of there being 15 dwellings, with an increase to 30 this will need to be re-visited, especially given that the Examiner agreed to the Steering Groups assessment.
30. 30 homes on East of Hayes Lane will result in visual intrusion on the South Downs Link to the north of the site, resulting in an urban development out of keeping with this part of the Parish. *'It is therefore considered that the SA should be re-visited in*

order to assess a scheme for at least 30 units, and this will likely result in an assessment which indicates that the proposal would have a significant negative impact on conserving / enhancing rural character.’ (6.3).

31. The site was refused permission for 50 homes in 2015 and quotes the decision statement (6.4).
32. *Whilst the site does not go against the NPPF advice of avoiding isolated new housing, the site is located in a lesser populated area, by contrast West Way is located in a more central and populated area.*
33. *‘The SA states that Hayes Lane would have a positive impact on objective 9 (improve non-car modes of transport), we disagree with this assessment. It should be acknowledged that this site is the furthest from the centre of the village of all the allocated sites in the Neighbourhood Plan. It should be noted that the Examiner infers that this site is not particularly sustainably located by remarking that the site at Crosby Farm relates better to the centre of the village than this allocation. It is considered therefore that the SA is not correct as this allocation would not improve non-car modes of transport.’(6.6)*
34. *‘It is considered that the changes to Policy 8 of the Neighbourhood Plan would not achieve Sustainable development, the changes would result in the Plan allocating most of its housing in a site which will have adverse landscape impacts, be located at the edge of village, and comprise pattern of development which is not in keeping with character of surrounding built form.’ (6.7)*
35. *‘the allocation of at least double the number of units originally proposed is a strategy put forward entirely by the Council. It is unclear how this strategy came about and how this figure is justified, as such, this approach is subject to challenge’.*
36. *‘The Examiner had recommended that the policy be amended to delete all the criteria listed within the policy. The Council does not agree with this and instead suggests that as the criteria within the policy relates to site specific details it should be included, the Council states in its decision statement that “To include such criteria is in accordance with the idea of localism which aims to allow communities to guide and shape development and without any more detailed guidance could lead to a plan that is radically different to that envisaged by the community who have worked to produce the plan.” This is somewhat ironic considering that the Council are proposing to amend the policy to allow the number of units on site to be double that put forward by the Steering Group and Parish Council. Surely the very idea of localism is that the local community are empowered to make decisions on what should be included in their Plans, and it is not for the District Council to dictate the number of units allocated on the site.’*
37. **Policy 9 – Land at West Way.** The Examiner felt that the site had a number of negative impacts, the representation does not agree with this.
38. *‘The Council’s decision statement notes that a number of negative impacts are identified in relation to this site. However, it should be noted that there were a number of negative impacts identified on all of the sites assessed in the SA. Turning firstly to the impact on rural character, the SA considers that the site would have a possible or slight negative impact, the Council question this assessment as no detailed commentary is provided to explain how this assessment was reached. It should be noted that the SA provides a similar level of commentary on all sites regarding the impact on rural character’ (7.2). This followed by a tabulation of the Sustainability Appraisal commentary on Land East of Hayes Lane, Land at the end of West, Crosby Farm, West of Spring Lane and The Cobblers.*
39. *‘As demonstrated above, the level of commentary provided for the West Way site is commensurate with the other site appraisals’ (7.3).*

40. *'The Council consider in their decision statement that there is a lack of written evidence in relation to this particular assessment. However, it is unclear what other written evidence should have been provided by the Steering Group or Millwood Designer Homes' (7.4).*
41. *'The comments made by the Examiner are based entirely on opinion only and have not been supported by any technical or expert evidence. As the Council will be aware, this was an issue raised by the court judgement on the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan' (7.5).*
42. *'We have concerns regarding the contents of the Examiners report in relation to his assessment of West Way, and how these differ to the expert opinion. The District Council are aware that there were a suite of expert and technical documents relating to this site as a result of the previous applications, and given that the Council were aware of this information it is therefore inappropriate to delete this site allocation on these grounds. This approach is flawed, it is based on an inadequate evidence base, and it should be noted that this results in a potential reason for the plan to be challenged' (7.6).*
43. *Notes that an application made back in 2017 on the same site for 18 homes was withdrawn on the advice of HDC, an application supported by a Landscape and Visual (Impact) Appraisal (found in Appendix A) 'which confirmed that impacts on landscape character would be local to the site only, and impacts on landscape character were assessed to be minor' (7.7).*
44. *'In addition, a further LVIA has been produced for the site, and this confirms that the Examiner's findings are flawed. The LVIA advises that the site is visually well-contained with established mature hedgerows on west and north boundaries. This supports the SA which states that the site is contained from longer views. It is considered that the Examiner therefore misread this in his assessment and his mistake was subsequently repeated by HDC. The LVIA also confirms that There are few site constraints; no trees (except on the boundary), and low biodiversity, and that the site is distanced from the Conservation Area by long private gardens and open space. A copy of the updated LVIA is attached as Appendix B'.*
45. **Highways & Access.** *'The SA assessed the site as having no impact or a neutral impact on highway safety objectives. The Examiner disagreed with this and instead considered that the effect would be negative, and refers to the comments in the SHELAA, which considered the junction into West Way from Hayes Lane to be very narrow. Again, the Examiner's view appears to be based on opinion only and have not supported by any technical or expert evidence'.*
46. *'The Council advises in its decision statement that given the narrow access to the site and on-street parking, it agrees with the Examiner's comments regarding highways and access. Nonetheless, the Council confirms in their decision statement that WSCC did not object to the plan on highways grounds, but notes that this was not site specific. However, they acknowledge that such comments would be provided at planning application stage. Therefore, it is our view that the Examiner and the Council have erred by providing comments on this matter, especially given the lack of evidence or apparent technical knowledge on this matter. There is no evidence of WSCC in their role as highways authority having been consulted on this site. This approach is flawed, it is based on an inadequate evidence base, and it should be noted that this results in a potential reason for the plan to be challenged' (7.10).*
47. *'It should also be noted that the access road to West Way is wider than the access road to Spring Lane. Furthermore, on-street parking occurs elsewhere in the village, particularly along Hayes Lane, opposite the site allocated through policy 8. The issues raised by the Examiner are not exclusive to the West Way site, and furthermore it is not considered that the highway concerns raised by the Examiner would be insurmountable' (7.11).*

48. *'A Technical Transport Note has been produced in response to the comments of the Examiner, this is included as Appendix C, and the note confirms the following:*
- *The proposed 15 dwellings and scout hut relocation would result in a level of traffic that would be immaterial to the operation of the local road network and would not contribute to a significant negative impact on highway safety;*
 - *The change in trips anticipated to use the West Way/Hayes Lane junction are immaterial to its operation and since visibility splays in excess of those required for a 30mph speed limit are available, we do not consider that utilising the junction to provide access to the site to be a highway safety concern;*
 - *The geometry of West Way itself is in accordance with the guidance provided within Manual for Streets and therefore suitable to serve the site;*
 - *We have reviewed Census data on car ownership and available off-street parking and consider that there are no material safety concerns relating to on-street parking along West Way; and*
 - *In all comparisons made with accepted sites in respect to key transport considerations, the PDS9 End of West Way site; is better located for access to local facilities; can achieve access in a safer manner; and will have minimal impact on the amenity of local neighbours owing to a low requirement for potential mitigation measures'.*
49. *'The Transport Note confirms that the highway and access concerns raised by the Examiner are unfounded, and are certainly not significant enough to warrant the alteration to the SA conclusions, or the deletion of this site allocation.'*
50. *'The Examiner states that in his opinion, the cumulative effect of the negative impacts on rural character, biodiversity and highways safety led him to consider that the allocation should be deleted. The Examiner does not provide any comments pertaining to biodiversity, and as such we are unsure as to the basis of this opinion'.*
51. *'It is noted that within the SA, each of the sites at West Way, Crosby's Farm, Spring Lane and Hayes Lane were identified as having a "negative impact on the sustainability objective" in terms of the aims to protect / enhance biodiversity. However, only West Way was deemed to have biodiversity issues by the Examiner and HDC. It is unclear how the Examiner came to this view, and why the District Council can therefore support this opinion. This approach is flawed, it is based on an inadequate evidence base, and it should be noted that this results in a potential reason for the plan to be challenged'.*
52. *Attached at Appendix D is 'an Ecological Impact Report was submitted with the previously withdrawn application, and this confirmed that the scheme would be able to maintain the 'favourable conservation status' of the local Great Crested Newt population'.*
53. *The Council will also be aware of a more recent planning application which was submitted in January 2018, but subsequently withdrawn upon publication of the Examiner's report. It should be noted that this application was supported by a further Ecological Appraisal which confirmed that the probability of Great Crested Newts within the site had been assessed as being negligible. Copy attached at Appendix E.*
54. *'A copy of this updated assessment is also submitted in support of this representation at Appendix F.'*
55. *Points to an inconsistency with the distance between sites and the Conservation Area: West Way is 180 metres away at its closest point with a negative impact. Whereas Spring Lane is 130 metres away at its closest point 'The SA however, did not consider this would not have a negative impact, instead the SA considered that this would have no impact / a neutral impact on the objective to protect / enhance heritage assets'.*

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>56. <i>'This is clearly an inconsistency in the SA assessment that needs to be given further consideration. .With this in mind, it is our view that the SA assessment for the West Way site should be amended to match that of the Spring Lane site'.</i></p> <p>57. In addition to this, Policy 10: Crosby Farm abuts the Conservation Area and was assessed as having a negative impact on the area, yet HDC and the Examiner agreed to keep it. <i>'The reason for this is unclear, and it is our view that a site that has a significant impact on any aspect warrants further discussion by the Examiner and the District Council'.</i></p> <p>58. Notes the Examiner's deletion of Cricket Pavilion and Scout's Hut on Crosby Farm site before arguing <i>'Millwood Designer Homes at the request of the NP Steering Group have offered to locate a scout hut as part of their site at West Way site. This have the benefit of providing the Scouts with accessible open space, and would also free up the Cobblers site for housing. It is our view that the allocation at West Way should remain in the NP, and could be subject to the requirement to provide a Scout Hut on the site or on land adjacent to the site'.</i></p> <p>59. <i>Deletion of 3 of the 6 Local Green Spaces and Coalescence policy, with the aim of prevent coalescence between Slinfold and Broadbridge Heath, will have a 'significant impact on the Neighbourhood Plan' and would not represent the overall strategy of the volunteers and local community.</i></p> <p>60. Concerns regarding procedure following Examiner's Report. <i>In Appendix G is the minutes from the meeting from held between HDC and the Steering Group to discuss the Examiner's recommendations and it is considered that the Council do not appear to have advised the Parish Council / Steering Group correctly. Firstly, it is incorrect to claim that the Neighbourhood Plan is the Local Planning Authority's Plan'.</i></p> <p>61. <i>'Secondly, the Council should have advised the Parish Council that Paragraph 13b of Schedule 4b of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 gives the Secretary of State (SoS) the power to intervene, where requested by the Parish Council / Steering Group in certain circumstances, which are relevant here. The Parish can submit a request to SoS when the Local Planning Authority does not follow all of the Examiner's recommendations, or where the LPA has modified the Plan in a way that was not recommended by the Examiner (except where the modification is to ensure compatibility with EU or human rights obligations or to correct an error)'.</i></p> <p>62. It is understood that it is the Parish Council's and Steering Group's preference to keep the West Way site. <i>'A copy of these minutes are attached at Appendix H'.</i></p> <p>63. This further backed up by minutes in Appendix I.</p> <p>64. <i>'the removal of the site allocation at West Way is unjustified as there is a lack of any evidential foundation for the Examiner's conclusion'.</i></p> <p>65. <i>'Given the comments of the Examiner and the Council, we consider that at the very least the Council or indeed the Parish Council could have contacted WSCC as the highway authority to obtain their views on the width of the access road and its suitability. Furthermore, they could have contacted the Council's Landscape Architect to obtain their views on the impact of the proposal on the rural character, and the Council's Ecologist to establish whether there are any biodiversity constraints or concerns relating to the site. Instead the Council have proceeded to remove a site allocation based solely on the Examiner's opinions and not on matters of fact. This approach is flawed, it is based on an inadequate evidence base, and it should be noted that this results in a potential reason for the plan to be challenged'.</i></p> |
|--|--|---|

		<p>66. <i>'In light of evidence that has been produced to refute the Examiner's opinions, it is considered that it is wholly inappropriate to delete the West Way site allocation on ecology, highways or landscape character grounds. To do so would be flawed, as it is a decision based on an inadequate evidence base, and it should be noted that this results in a potential reason for the plan to be challenged. It is our view that it would be more appropriate to retain the Hayes Lane site allocation as it was originally intended for 15 units only, and also retain the West Way site allocation within the NP'.</i></p> <p>67. <i>'The proposed site at West Way is available, it would be a deliverable and achievable site for development. This site would be able to provide 18 houses, it would also provide land for a community facility as required in the Neighbourhood Plan'.</i></p> <p>68. <i>'Given the site constraints of the Hayes Lane site which have been demonstrated above, we believe it is unclear and inconsistent as to how the Council have chosen to double the number of units allocated on the site. The evidence base supporting the SNP suggests that the Hayes Lane site is not the most appropriate location for development and it would not, therefore, be in accordance with National or Local Planning Policy to promote additional development in this location. This is contrary to the basic conditions'.</i></p> <p>69. <i>'it is our view that the amended Neighbourhood Plan should not proceed to referendum, instead, it should be independently re-examined. In addition, given the level of inaccuracies that the Council and Examiner have based their decision on, we consider that the Neighbourhood Plan should be subject to a hearing in order to allow Millwood Designer Homes to put forward their arguments against the Plan's suitability in full'.</i></p>
Ref #27	Have comments	<p>This representation has been made in two parts.</p> <p>Part 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Typos. Notes several inconsistencies with the paragraph numbering, with two numbered 1.2 on page 1 & 2. No paragraph numbered 4.0. Paragraphs 4.3 & 4.4 follow paragraph 5.2 on page 6. 2. Has concerns on adding the words 'at least'. <i>'That explanation / qualification of the words "at least" is included only in the explanatory notes in the Appendix, and there is no proposal that that explanation / meaning should be included with the Neighbourhood Plan itself. Hence the made Neighbourhood Plan with merely contain the words "at least" with no qualification or explanation'.</i> Proposes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>wording such as "about", "circa" or similar be used when specifying the number of units per site; and</i> • <i>that the 'meaning' of the chosen expression as referring to "+/- 10%" should clearly be specified within the finalised Neighbourhood Plan.</i> 3. <i>'1.3.1 Exam. Ref. PM9 – Policy 1 The modification proposed by HDC reads: "Insert at the end of Para. 45 ..." [emphasis added] It appears that this should read: "Amend Para. 4.5 to read..." [emphasis added].</i> 4. <i>'There appears to be an error in the amendment proposed by HDC. The first paragraph on p.16 of the HDC Decision states: "Residential development for at least 10 units at PDS11: West of Spring Lane will be supported <u>for will</u> where:" The underlined words appear to be superfluous'.</i>

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>5. <i>'The proposed re-instatement of paragraph 2 of this policy contains duplicated words (arising from an error in the original): "Proposals demonstrate that special regard has been had to preserving and enhancing the character the character of the adjacent Conservation Area'</i></p> <p>6. <i>Strongly support the Examiner's proposal to delete end of West Way and oppose the Parish Council's attempt to reinstate. Arguing that this would set a precedent for building on the central fields. Mentions the following documents and how the allocation goes against them:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Appraisal of Potential Housing Sites at Slinfold, commissioned by the Parish Council • Slinfold Conservation Area Advice Leaflet, and Slinfold Parish Design Statement • Policy 6 of the Current Plan specifically reaffirms the Parish Design Statement: <i>'Development proposals which seek to respect the design, density and layout of the surrounding area as detailed in the Slinfold Parish Design Statement will be supported'</i>. • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) • HDC's 2014 Landscape Capacity Assessment (Landscape Study Area: SF1) • <i>'The Examiner's view is consistent with the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Appraisal of Potential Housing Sites at Slinfold, by David Huskisson Associates which was originally commissioned by the Parish Council but they subsequently chose to ignore it'</i>. <p>7. <i>'This development is wholly within the area commonly known as the village's 'Central Fields', which are referred to in the discussion below. Parts of this site all-but directly abut the Conservation Area, and it is visible from most of the properties within the Conservation Area along the south & west sides of The Street'. This followed on quoting parts of the Slinfold Conservation Area Advice Leaflet, the Slinfold Parish Design and the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan Statement on the importance of Central Fields and the potential negative impacts that building on a site that abuts the Conservation Area would have. Including key Mitigation Issues:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low density, small scale development in large plots, respecting the rural character of the Conservation Area adjoining. Great care would be needed to avoid the appearance of 'backland' infill. • Retain and manage existing thick hedgerow boundaries outside of rear gardens. <p>8. <i>Before concluding that 'in proposing development on this End of West Way site, the Neighbourhood Plan is going against its own advice and policies — including those which it has specifically brought forward from previous guidance from the Conservation Area Leaflet and the Parish Design Statement — with no reason or explanation given, either within the Neighbourhood Plan nor (as far as I can see) within any of the Supporting Documents'</i>.</p> <p>9. <i>Site Assessment from HDC. Reinforcing the assessments mentioned above for this site, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) from HDC for this site (SHLAA Reference: SA061; Site Name: Land at Nibblerts Farm) states:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>'... The site is ... located within an area of low lying land abutting the Slinfold Conservation area. This area makes an important contribution to the setting of Slinfold and the landscape features would be sensitive to development. The area has also been assessed as having low/no capacity for development in HDC's 2014 Landscape Capacity Assessment. The site is subsequently assessed as Not Currently Developable'</i>. <p>10. <i>'Sites Assessments from HDC. Shows quote from SHEELA which states that the site is currently not developable</i></p> |
|--|--|--|

Landscape Capacity Assessment 2014 goes into the following:

- *Landscape Character Sensitivity: Very important contribution of extensive, undeveloped green area to the village setting.*
- *Visual Sensitivity: Due to the extent to which the area is visible from adjoining residential properties and in part from Spring Lane, visual sensitivity of this area to development is assessed as moderate to high.*
- *Landscape Capacity: Key landscape features and qualities in this area are very sensitive to housing development. The rural character of this area together with its important contribution to the setting of Slinfold, and the high moderate-high visual sensitivity are key factors that result in a low/no capacity for small scale housing development’.*

11. *Mentions public consultation held in April 2015 which found 70 % of residents thought it important to protect three certain distinctive views ‘across central fields’. ‘(copy provided as Attachment A7 with my comments submitted under the Reg. 16 consultation)’.*

12. *The illustrative proposals go against the specified principles and guidelines requirements set in Policy of the current plan.*

13. *‘It is noted that the ‘illustrative proposals’ previously publicised by Millwood for this site, suggest that the new housing would be ‘estate-style’ housing, with all properties of a similar style. Yet the requirements set out in the Slinfold Parish Design Statement — which are incorporated into the current Plan by Policy 6 — specified the following Principles and Guidelines requirements (pp. 25-26):*

New Developments

If a new ‘estate’ were to be developed in Slinfold then these extra conditions should be adhered to:

- *There should be a diversity of styles – both between neighbouring properties and between different areas of the development.*
- *There should be no segregation of housing – e.g. ‘Affordable Housing’ should not just be bunched together in a corner.*

Designs

- *Houses should generally present some type of gable rather than a simple box-shape.*
- *Windows should generally give the appearance of small panes rather than large picture-windows, and should be appropriate to the design of the property.*

It also specifies a number of requirements relating to Building Materials of other matters. I trust that the Parish Council and HDC will seek to enforce these and other requirements set out in the Slinfold Parish Design Statement when considering future planning applications for this and/or other development sites.

14. *‘Any development of this site is directly contrary to numerous past documents and advice that have specifically been carried forward into the currently proposed Neighbourhood Plan. It follows that any such development would directly conflict with other requirements within the Neighbourhood Plan itself. Moreover, the proposed development of this site would be directly contrary to the advice given in Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Appraisal commissioned by the Parish Council; and is also contrary to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) from HDC.*

15. *‘Examination. Ref. PM2 – Policy 8 – East of Hayes Lane. Support with modifications’*

16. *Support proposal to increase the number of units to about 30 (+/- 10%) — not “at least 30”. Requirement that: “The design positively responds to the prevailing character of the surrounding area”*

17. *'Do not support. Specification that the preceding requirement necessarily requires: "a linear proposal which mirrors that on the opposite side of Hayes Lane" My understanding is that a suggestion for a different location of housing within this site may be more acceptable to some of the residents living opposite the site'.*
18. *'if such development were at the back of the site, then there could be an area of Open Space occupying the remainder of the site, situated between the development and Hayes Lane, which would be accessible to everyone, would provide a more pleasant outlook for the existing residents of Hayes Lane, and also for the new properties'.*
19. *'The examiner stated (para.4.20 (i) (a)) that he "consider[s] the requirement [to mirror the development on the opposite side of Hayes Lane] is too restrictive, in that there could be improvements in design and layout which would assist sustainability without seeking to replicate what already exists. Deleting that requirement would not preclude retaining the requirement that: "The design positively responds to the prevailing character of the surrounding area".'*
20. *Current proposal is mutually contradictory. Item 3 of the proposed policy requires that: "Proposals allow for the retention of existing mature trees and hedges". This is contrary as these 'existing mature trees and hedges' separate the site from the road.*
21. *'It follows that the items 1. & 3 of the proposed revised policy are mutually incompatible:*
 - *'either the development mirrors that on the opposite side of Hayes Lane, and is visible from and largely open to the road; or'*
 - *'it is largely hidden behind the retained existing mature trees and hedges, such that there can be no mirroring'.*
22. *'It also follows that, if the roadside trees & hedges are retained, the proposed development cannot properly 'mirror' the 'opposite side of Hayes Lane'. Any new properties could perhaps retain similar 'styles' (although the existing properties are probably 70 – 80+ years old)'.*
23. *'It further follows that, if any new properties cannot 'mirror' the existing properties because of the retention of the road-side trees & hedges, then there is no need for them to be restricted to being at the 'front' of the field.'*
24. *The proposed development could still reflect the 'style' of the existing development on the western side of the road — but it cannot properly "mirror" it.*

Part 2

1. *'The Examiner proposed the deletion of Local Green Space LGS1: Central Fields (Examiner's Report para. 4.36). His primary reason for that was that that designation was unnecessary "[g]iven that [he had] recommended deleting PDS9 as a housing allocation.'"*
2. *'If PDS9 (End of West Way) is re-introduced back into the Plan as a housing allocation (as being proposed by Slinfold Parish Council), it follows that the Examiner's reason for deleting LGS1 is no longer valid. In that event, therefore, LGS1 should also be re-introduced back into the Plan, with any appropriate modifications to its boundaries depending on any revisions to PDS9. If a re-introduced PDS9 were to include any open space, it may also be appropriate for that open space to be included within any revised boundary for LGS1'.*

Ref #28	Supports modifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agrees with HDC's proposed modifications. 2. Central fields has important wildlife and contributes to the village identity. 3. <i>'Access via Hayes Lane and West Way would be extremely problematic'</i>
Ref #29	Support Policy 9 PDS9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the Examiner's deletion of End of West Way as the site adjoins the conservation area and the site is unsustainable.
Ref #30	Oppose the deletion of the end of West Wat proposal from the original Slinfold NP.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opposes HDC's plan to alter the Neighbourhood Plan submitted by Slinfold Parish Council by deleting End of West Way. 2. The Examiner considered the site to have a 'slight negative impact' on the Conservation Area yet three houses have been built closer than this site recently. 3. Notes that the Examiner assessed the Highways safety as neutral yet HDC saw it as a narrow access to the site with on street parking. 4. "The entrance to West Way has wide visibility splays over grassed areas and is not narrow". 5. Argues that the West Way site is the only which offers the only real gain in the village, offering a new scout hut and communal green space. 6. Opposes the increase in density on the Hayes Lane site as it has flooding and a road full of pot holes whilst the houses on the other side have small front gardens with insufficient parking space. 7. Modification: reinstate West Way to the Neighbourhood Plan.
Ref #31	Support removal of end of West Way as proposed site	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'Strongly supports the Examiner's decision to remove the proposed site at the end of West Way from the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan.'</i> 2. <i>'The proposed inclusion of the site as part of the neighbourhood plan has been made by Slinfold Parish Council without consultation with the parish members i.e. those whose view they should be representing'</i> 3. <i>'The proposed plan is an amendment of an earlier submission and encroaches further on the central fields'.</i> 4. <i>'The central fields have been the subject of multiple planning submissions which have all been rejected with the site having been previously described as sacrosanct'.</i> 5. <i>'Slinfold Parish Council are challenging the guidance of the subject matter expert appointed to determine the suitability and impact of plans. My preference is to follow the guidance provided by the Examiner as the most qualified person to provide an objective assessment'.</i> 6. <i>'The proposed development would introduce additional traffic into an area that is already overloaded. The proposed introduction of a scout hut would exacerbate the problem'.</i>
Ref #32	Support Modification PM2; 4; 5 & 6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I support all of the modifications proposed by HDC, although would have a preference for specific numbers of houses rather than "at least", or to limit the number by clearly specifying a range'.</i>

	Reference: Policies 8; 10; 11 & 12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <i>'I understand that Slinfold Parish Council are challenging the deletion of Policy 9 (the previously proposed end of West Way development), despite the clarity and common sense of the examiners rationale for doing so. I am extremely uncomfortable that this proposal is being resurrected yet again and in particular without wider consultation within the local community'.</i> 3. <i>'The village is fortunate to have a central conservation area. This development would spoil that, as well as being not sustainable in the opinion of the examiner. This would, inevitably, also open the way for further development of the "central fields" area from the village pub through to the Downs Link, fundamentally changing the character of the village'.</i>
Ref #33	Oppose Modification PM2, PM4, PM5, PM6, PM7, PM9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I fully support the proposed Neighbourhood plan as drafted, which took into account fully the wishes of those in the Parish, following a long and detailed study and consultation. The sites emerged from a longer list which were well discussed and investigated. In particular, great care was taken over the numbers which the parish could sustain in all sorts of ways. The Inspector's proposed modifications delete one of the supported sites in Westway, and give no indication of limitation as to number, which cannot be an acceptable way of dealing with applications for development, and ignore the wishes of the residents'.</i> 2. Modification: <i>'It is very important that numbers are controlled to allow development which is appropriate to the setting and to what the infrastructure of the village itself can support'.</i>
Ref #34	Oppose Modification PM2, PM4, PM5, PM6, PM7, PM9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I fully support the proposed Neighbourhood plan as drafted, which took into account fully the wishes of those in the Parish, following a long and detailed study and consultation. The sites emerged from a longer list which were well discussed and investigated. In particular, great care was taken over the numbers which the parish could sustain in all sorts of ways. The Inspector's proposed modifications delete one of the supported sites in Westway, and give no indication of limitation as to number, which cannot be an acceptable way of dealing with applications for development, and ignore the wishes of the residents'.</i> 2. <i>'It is very important that numbers are controlled to allow development which is appropriate to the setting and to what the infrastructure of the village itself can support'.</i>
Ref #35	Support Policy 9 Deletion of End of West Way	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Favours the deletion of End of West for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of rural views in the conservation area of the village • the unsustainable nature of the development • loss of important wildlife habitat • Rather 4 development sites and not 5. 2. Supports the Examiner's report and Horsham District Council's decision to support the examiners proposal to delete the end of West Way as a development site.
Ref #36	Support Policy 9 Deletion of	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Favours the deletion of End of West for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of rural views in the conservation area of the village • the unsustainable nature of the development

	End of West Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of important wildlife habitat • Rather 4 development sites and not 5. <p>2. Supports the Examiner's report and Horsham District Council's decision to support the examiners proposal to delete the end of West Way as a development site.</p>
Ref #37	Support Removal of end of West Way as a proposed site.	<p>1. Fully supports HDC in accepting the Examiner's modification to delete the End of West Way from the plan.</p> <p>2. Opposes the reinstatement of West Way by the Parish Council without consultation</p> <p>3. <i>'the importance of an assessment by an independent professional Examiner cannot be underestimated in establishing an objective way forward for the village that is of neutral bias'.</i></p> <p>4. <i>'The inclusion of the Scout Hut shows further disregard for the Examiner's report that assessed Highways safety as not being neutral for a residential development let alone for a development proposal that now includes a Scout Hut that will see many parents driving to and from it each evening throughout the week to collect their children from Beavers/Cubs/Scouts/Explorers, all of which happen on different nights'.</i></p>
Ref #38	Oppose modifications	<p>1. <i>'I wish to support the plan put forward by Slinfold Parish Council'.</i></p>
Ref #39	Oppose HDC and Examiner's modifications	<p>1. Opposes modifications accepted by HDC.</p> <p>2. Wishes to see West Way reinstated in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>3. Supports the allocation of a scout hut on the site.</p> <p>4. The original allocation of the Scout's Hut on Cobblers Road is <i>'quite dangerous for pedestrians and motorists as it stands'.</i></p>
Ref #40	Oppose PM5	<p>1. <i>'strongly oppose the plan in relation to policy 11, West of Spring Lane.'</i></p> <p>2. <i>'The plan recognises Spring Lane as a one track road and is an essential part of the village and provides a rural walkway for residents, visitors, cyclists and horse riders. It provides an important access to the Downs Link. However policy 11 is in direct conflict with the plans own stated aims. Spring Lane is single track and it is abundantly clear that it would be inappropriate to then propose to build a number of new homes next to and with access from Spring Lane with the extra vehicular activity along this single track road. The draft plan is clearly incorrect in suggesting that new houses in the field will not impact on Spring Lane'.</i></p> <p>3. <i>'The parish dropped plans for development of East of Spring Lane as inappropriate to the neighbourhood plan. However the plan is inconsistent as it then does not treat the field to the West of Spring Lane in a consistent manner. The lane is essential as a rural walkway and this would undoubtedly be marred by building houses on either side of the lane'.</i></p> <p>4. <i>'The plan fails to address the need to provide connected networks for wildlife. The field to the West of Spring Lane provides a natural habitat for many varied species of wildlife including access for deer and rabbits from Downs Link and from Central Fields. This is a critical access point for such wildlife and links Central Fields and Downs Link to the wider area of the parish over to the west of the industrial estates on Stane Street. The proposal would destroy this natural habitat and the route for wildlife'.</i></p>

		<p>5. <i>'The field to the West of Spring Lane is clearly visible to local residents and visitors from both Spring Lane and the South Downs Link and should be classed as LGS. The proposed buildings are directly adjacent to the bungalows which front onto Park Street. Any proposal for building on the site should be considered within the context of the prevailing character of the surrounding area. The plan suggests that properties of 2 storeys would be in keeping with the local area. This is clearly incorrect and needs to be reassessed. The bungalows on Park Street are single storey buildings and any development next to them should be restricted in height to be in keeping with the local environment'.</i></p> <p>6. <i>'Buffers to the north of the site need to be added to any plan'.</i></p> <p>7. <i>'The original plans from November 2015 showed vehicular access part way down Spring Lane, opposite Amberfield. The existing field entrance is currently at the south end of the field and we consider that this should be retained as access to any development in order to provide some level of protection to the existing homes in the area. There should also be open space on both the northern and southern parts of the site in order to protect the existing environment'.</i></p> <p>8. <i>'We do not consider that the small field to the West of Spring Lane is appropriate for low density housing. In relation to other proposed sites which have much larger surrounding areas, we consider that any building should be restricted to a maximum of 4 single storey units to be in keeping with open spaces proposed elsewhere and the surrounding area if the plan insists on proposing any units at all. It would be unfair to do otherwise'.</i></p> <p>9. <i>'any homes should be single storey to be in keeping with the prevailing character of the surrounding area and the plan needs to include appropriate buffering on both the northern and eastern sides of the site to protect the existing environment'.</i></p>
Ref #41 Natural England	Support	<p>1. Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan</p>
Ref #42	Support Modifications	<p>1. <i>'Supports modifications but has concerns is with the road infrastructure notably Hayes Lane'.</i></p> <p>2. <i>'The road itself is in need of repair, both surface repair and drainage'.</i></p> <p>3. <i>'Of much greater concern is road safety. The capacity of the road is severely limited by the number of cars parked along the lane, reducing traffic flow to one lane for several hundred meters. Visibility of pedestrian activity is limited.</i></p> <p>4. <i>'This issue can be ameliorated by creating parking facilities along the lane and ensuring that cars are not allowed to park on the road itself'.</i></p> <p>5. <i>'Whist this is of concern today, it will only become worse as developments take place. Using the facility of a section 206 agreement, surely it would be sensible to ensure the infrastructure of the village is improved as a precondition of further housing development?'</i></p>
Ref #43	Comment On Slinfold plan	<p>1. <i>'Disappointed that the examiner has removed our proposed Scout Hut from the plan. The Crosby farm site was chosen by the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan in consultation with the community, developers and the Scout Group. There is some contradiction in the thought process. Point 4.2 iii e, states that "the site is peripheral to the village compared to one which would be more central", however, point 4.2 iii a, states that "the site relates better to the centre of the village". The Slinfold Scout Hut</i></p>

		<p><i>Background Paper May 2017, shows that the Crosby Farm location is in fact a central village location as anyone who lives in Slinfold knows. That was why the location was chosen. The Scout Group would like the examiner to reconsider this decision’.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <i>‘The Scout Group have been very clear from the beginning to state that their primary objective to finding a suitable location has been a central village location to allow the young people and carers to be able to walk to the hut, in safety, 12 months a year. To have 24 hour vehicular access and to have parking. The Crosby farm site offered all these requirements’.</i> 3. <i>‘The Scout Group would like to challenge the comment in Point 4.2 iii d, “given the desire of potential developers to fit one (a Scout Hut) into their possible developments “, initially, at consultation stage, there was a Scout Hut on every development, however, these have been systematically withdrawn’.</i> 4. <i>‘We understand that the development at the end of West way is being re-examined and the current plan includes a Scout Hut. Like the Crosby Site this site could offer all our requirements’.</i> 5. <i>‘There is an urgency to find/ redefine a new home for Slinfold Scout Hut to secure Scouting and a community asset into the future. The number of available central village sites are being allocated to housing so potential sites are becoming fewer. Slinfold Scout Group would like to be allocated a site within the village, on a 100 plus year lease, with a planned timescale and financial help to build the hut’.</i>
Ref #44	Oppose Policy 4 PM4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongly opposes the Examiner’s recommendation and approval of the proposed Crosby Farm. 2. <i>The site adjoins the historic Conservation Area and is outside the designated development boundary. HDC Landscape stated it had a ‘high visual sensitivity of this landscape area’ and SHELAA (2016) concluded the site was ‘NOT DEVELOPABLE’</i> 3. <i>‘The site consists of pasture land, bordered by the Sussex Literary Trail public footpath, mature hedgerows and trees, farm buildings, barns and office buildings’.</i> 4. <i>‘Loss of employment opportunities from two office buildings B1/B8’.</i> 5. <i>‘Loss of agricultural land and farm buildings including the main barn, which will either be relocated onto another greenfield site or will result in the demise of the existing farm’.</i> 6. <i>‘The site only measures 1.1 hectares but has the highest density of up to 24 dwellings, a cricket pavilion and car parking for 25 cars, far greater than any other proposed or existing residential site in Slinfold’.</i> 7. <i>‘It’s more than double the density of the proposed Spring Lane development (PDS11) with only 10 houses on a 2 hectare site. The Independent Examiner states that ‘Crosby Farm site development would have more impact on the setting of the village than West of Spring Lane’.</i> 8. <i>This dense development goes against:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the Parish’s Development Principles (Policy 6) which states ‘Respect local density and layout of existing housing’</i> • <i>the SPC Plan clearly states ‘the development should respect the setting of the Conservation area’</i> • <i>the SPC Landscape Capacity stated only ‘Low Capacity of Housing’</i> • <i>the HDC Landscape which stated ‘Small Scale’</i> 9. <i>We appreciate houses must be built but we would like to suggest the 24 dwellings from the Crosby Farm development proposal be incorporated into larger, more suitable and less detrimental sites within the village: East of Hayes Lane (PDS8) and West of Spring Lane (PDS11) developments.</i>

		10. Requests that End of West Way is reinstated.
Ref #45	Oppose Modifications	1. <i>The Slinfold Neighbourhood plan was arrived at after much consultation with the village as a whole and 5 sites were identified - after voting by the villagers - which would meet the criteria and absorb the housing required. I would like to back the Plan to keep West Way development and therefore 5 sites rather than 4. This would give a more even spread across the village and in addition West Way developers would offer a new Scout Hut - very much needed - and open.</i>
Ref #46	Not given	1. Requests information regarding the plan from 2017.
Ref #47	Oppose PM2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I sincerely hope that common sense prevails and that HDC choose to consider the comments of the 'independent' examiner alongside the extensive effort of the SNP Group'.</i> 2. <i>If HDC choose the latter, I'd respectfully suggest that this is in direct conflict with the principles of 'localism' and its own strategic direction.</i> 3. <i>The Examiner 'spent very little time in the village and fails to grasp the dynamic of the village 'look & feel'.</i> 4. <i>'The scheme at West Way offered a sensible compromise (i.e. preserving a very large open space that is celebrated by the village yet making this space accessible for the enjoyment of all, which it isn't at present; rather than those lucky few who's houses back on to it)'.</i> 5. Modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopt the 5 sites as outlined in the SNP.</i> • <i>If HDC do go with the examiners recommendations in full, could they not avoid doubling the numbers of East of Hayes Lane, by accepting a total build number towards the lower end of the requirement, acknowledging the fact that there are a number of windfall sites being built in the village?</i> • <i>In an effort to learn lessons from the build at Hayeswood and the detrimental effect it has had on the views through the trees as one walks along The Downslink; could HDC consider making a requirement of any build East of Hayes Lane (and that at Welwyn Field also), to plant a second skin of trees on the inside of those plots parallel to The Downslink, so that the integrity of The Downslink's look & feel is maintained, rather than losing out to more urbanisation?</i>
Ref #48	Support Policy 9 PM2 Support with modifications Policy 8 PM2 Policy 10 PM4 Policy 12 PM6	Representation comes in two parts. Part 1 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports HDC's modification to End of Hayes Lane, on the condition of the site having a housing limit as the current proposed number of 30 would imbalance the village. 2. Supports the deletion of West Way from the plan. 3. Support with modifications Crosby Farm: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the wording on the number of units allowed should be amended to "24 (+/- 10%) dwellings"

	Oppose Policy 11 PM5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision should be made here for the replacement Scout Hut. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Opposes the allocation of housing on West of Spring Lane. 5. Support with modifications Cobblers development, arguing there should be no Scouts' Hut on this site. 6. The following suggested modifications are made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>making provision for electric car charging points / areas</i> • <i>making provision for parking/storage for community/shared vehicles</i> • <i>public footpaths in and around Slinfold are made more friendly to those who are ambulatory-challenged (eg. Elderly, disabled, small children) - ie replace difficult and poorly-maintained stiles with alternative fence-crossings</i> • <i>the plan does not give sufficient protection to the rural character of the Downs Link as it passed through Slinfold. It should not be allowed to become an urban path</i> • <i>Welwyn on Hayes Lane, North of the Downs Link, and on Park Street, should should be included in the plan both in terms of numbers and design. They will both have a substantial impact on the roads on which they are sited.</i> <p>Part 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I support the deletion of proposed development at the end of West Way'.</i> 2. <i>'The road layout of West Way is such that it has always lent itself to being extended into the Central Fields. Blocking the end of the road by putting a building across it could reduce the likelihood of that extension every happening. A pair of semi-detached houses could work, but locating the replacement Scout Hut across the end would be an ideal solution'.</i>
Ref #49	Have comments PM2, PM4, PM5, PM6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports with the Examiner's deletion of the End of West Way site. 2. But opposes the modification which adds 'at least' to the site housing 3. Has concerns of over development. <i>'This would be a disaster for a village like Slinfold and ruin the character of the village. Amenities in the village (eg school places, road network) are limited and could not support unlimited development. Over development would fundamentally change the character of the village. In addition, it would place a large burden on the already stretched drainage system in the village'.</i> 4. Suggested modification: <i>'Keep the numbers that the Parish council have suggested in the plan.'</i>
Ref #50	Support with modifications Policy 10 PM4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Supports the allocation of Crosby Farm.</i> 2. <i>Supports the Examiner's recommendations and agrees that the inclusion of criteria within the policy is not necessary, particularly where it is covered by the Horsham District Planning Framework.</i> 3. <i>The Council's decision to re-introduce some of the policy criterion is therefore considered unnecessary. However, raises no objection in principle subject to one further modification in relation to criterion 5. Criterion 5 states that "Contributions facilitates the development of a new cricket pavilion."</i> 4. <i>Opposes the inclusion of the word "Contributions" as this suggests that a financial contribution will be required in order to gain planning permission. Given that the provision of a new cricket pavilion is not necessary to make the allocation acceptable in planning terms, then such a requirement fails the tests set out in CIL Regulation 122.</i>

		<p>5. <i>Slinfold Developments Ltd is facilitating the development of a new cricket pavilion by providing land to enable the relocation of a new cricket pavilion and car parking. In addition, any subsequent planning application for the residential development will also include the cricket pavilion and associated car parking.</i></p> <p>6. <i>Modification: ‘Delete the word “Contributions” from criterion 5 and reword as set out in the Submission Plan version, as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“5. The site facilitates the development of a new cricket pavilion”</i>
Ref #51	Support with modifications PM6 and ALL	<p>1. <i>In principle we support the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan with modifications proposed by HDC which will result in circa 77 houses over 4 sites.</i></p> <p>2. <i>2 specific comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Examiners Ref: PM6 – Scout hut. Agree with HDC that location within Cobblers is best so long as funding is imminent as this is an urgent requirement for the village and needs to be resolved and built asap.</i> • <i>Examiners Ref: ALL – in all HDCs modifications the number of units is prefixed with “at least”. This contradicts the reasoning which states “to bring about further flexibility to the policy in regards to dwelling numbers (+/-10%) to allow for viability buffer...” Adding “at least” does NOT allow for -10% ! It should state “the number of dwellings +/-10%”</i>
Ref #52	Oppose Modification East of Hayes Lane	<p>1. <i>Argues that following the removal of the Local Green Space of the site, the rest of this site could be developed, and sees no policy reason as to why this can’t happen.</i></p> <p>2. <i>The ‘buffer zone’ proposed by HDC which will cover most of the Local Green Space has not been given proper justification and it is still felt that the whole site can be developed.</i></p> <p>3. <i>‘The eastern boundary edge of the site, made up of the existing hedgerow and tree line simply extends the existing settlement edge of Slinfold and therefore will result in a natural progression of development to the south of Slinfold respecting and mirroring the existing development pattern of the village’.</i></p> <p>4. <i>‘Rather than using the natural boundary of the site, the Council have drawn an arbitrary line through the site and have not provided any justification for this’.</i></p> <p>5. <i>‘To restrict development to the western part of the site will limit the potential and planning opportunities that exist at the site and prevent the most efficient and effective use of the site, therefore not in accordance with paragraph 117 of the draft NPPF’.</i></p> <p>6. <i>‘If the Council allocated the whole of the site for development, this would allow for a better designed development which will be able to include more areas of open green space than a smaller development would on the western part of the site only. Not only would this improve the layout and reflect the rural character of the surrounding area, it will provide a better living environment for future residents of the development’.</i></p> <p>7. <i>‘We therefore respectfully request that the site allocation PDS8: Land East of Hayes Lane should be increased to include the whole of the site which will improve the relationship of the site with the existing settlement of Slinfold’.</i></p> <p>8. <i>Notes the Examiner’s agreement with the plan’s housing number of 77.</i></p> <p>9. <i>Assesses the ‘Medium Village (Tier 3) in the Horsham Development Planning Framework (HDPF), Paragraph 117 of the NPPF and the Government proposed new methodology for calculating local authorities objectively assessed housing need.</i></p>

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>10. <i>'In addition, in the recent 'Planning for Homes in the Right Places' consultation paper, the Government proposed a new methodology for calculating local authorities objectively assessed need. This methodology is due for adoption in the summer of 2018. 3.8 As a result of this change in methodology, Horsham District Council's objectively assessed housing need figure is set to rise from 650 dwellings per annum to 974 dwellings per annum. This is an increase of 324 homes per annum which Horsham will need to deliver under this new methodology. 3.9 In order to meet its increasing housing need, neighbourhood plans should seek to plan positively and allocate housing on suitable, available and deliverable sites to meet this future need'.</i></p> <p>11. <i>'In order to meet its increasing housing need, neighbourhood plans should seek to plan positively and allocate housing on suitable, available and deliverable sites to meet this future need. We therefore recommend that the Council revisits its housing figures and seeks to increase the level of housing allocated in Slinfold in order to meet both current and future housing needs'.</i></p> <p>12. <i>Following the council's modification of 'at least 30 dwellings' on-site work has been done on site capacity. 'Our work on site capacity indicates that the site is suitable to accommodate up to 50 dwellings and therefore the site allocation for the site should be amended reflect these figures and the planning potential of the site'.</i></p> <p>13. <i>Density. Looks the historic building patterns, layout and density of land around of the East of Hayes Lane. 'It is considered that the Site can be successfully brought forward for approximately 50 dwellings as the resultant density of 25 dph can be seen to be comparable to that of nearby residential development to the north and west.....we therefore urge the Council to remove the 10% buffer criteria attached to the site allocation at the Land East of Hayes Lane and either increase the housing number allocated at the site or remove the limitations to the number of dwellings allocated at the site'.</i></p> <p>14. <i>Gives details of application made in 2015 which included 50 dwellings, Scout's Hut and children's play area. Notes that the application (DC/15/0591) was 'refused on the basis that the proposal would result in development inconsistent with the overarching strategy for development set out in the emerging Horsham District Planning Framework and would be best placed to be considered through the Neighbourhood Plan process'.</i></p> <p>15. <i>'As part of the previous proposal submitted for the site, it included substantial areas of public open space, new ecological habitats, new children's play area, a scout hut, new formal footpath connections and financial contributions towards infrastructure. In addition, the proposed surface water drainage scheme would reduce existing run off from the site'.</i></p> <p>16. <i>'Although the Examiner proposed to remove the development objectives to support each of the proposed site allocations, the Council have decided to disagree with this modification'.</i></p> <p>17. <i>'We agree with the Examiner that policy 32 (The Quality of New Development) and policy 33 (Development Principles) are sufficient in setting out design considerations for future development and therefore the specific design objectives attached to each site allocation are not required'.</i></p> <p>18. <i>In relation to the site at Land East of Hayes Lane, the specific objectives, in relation to linear development, attached to the site allocation is too restrictive and could impede the development potential of the site. As such, the current allocation will not make the effective use of land as stated within paragraph 117 of the draft NPPF which states:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions."</i> |
|--|--|---|

		<p>19. <i>'As referred to in section 2, the Council has drawn an arbitrary line through the site to accommodate the design for a linear development rather than using the existing tree line that forms the natural boundary of the site, running from the existing built up settlement to the north'.</i></p> <p>20. <i>'Although the site is located opposite to development on the other side of Hayes Lane, the Site also acts as a natural extension to the existing built up settlement of Slinfold to the north. The character of that area is not linear and it is entirely appropriate that this character of development is followed on the site'.</i></p> <p>21. <i>'As explained at paragraph 2.9, the boundary features of the site including the hedgerow on the eastern boundary tie in to the built-up area boundary to the north and create a logical and natural boundary for the site's development'.</i></p> <p>22. <i>'These factors were instrumental in defining the nature and extent of the planning application submitted at the site (Ref: DC/15/0591) and the design work within that application demonstrated that the site was suitable to accommodate up to 50 units in a non-linear layout'.</i></p> <p>23. <i>'We consider that the specific objective in relation to linear development attached to the site allocation at Land East of Hayes Lane is overly restrictive and would prevent the most effective and appropriate use being made of the site.... We therefore respectfully request that this objective, in relation to a linear proposal, be removed from the site allocation'.</i></p> <p>24. <i>Attached is the following Appendices:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix One – Regulation 14 Consultation Response • Appendix Two – Regulation 16 Consultation Response • Appendix Three – Site Location Plan • Appendix Four – Illustrative Masterplan
Ref #53	Support the Removal of End of West Way	<p>1. Fully supports HDC in accepting the Examiner's modification to delete the End of West Way from the plan.</p> <p>2. <i>'It is clear that the formal process for the evaluation of the Neighbourhood plan submitted by SPC was set out in advance and agreed by both HDC and SPC. That process involved bringing in an independent Examiner to objectively and impartially evaluate all the sites proposed on the neighbourhood plan. In giving his assessment of the plan the Examiner has offered their expert'.</i></p> <p>3. professional recommendations for improvements to the plan to ensure sustainability and compliance</p> <p>4. with basic conditions. Their assessment was that the West Way site is not sustainable which puts it in</p> <p>5. the same category as the Nowhurst and Bridge Farm sites that were removed from the Neighbourhood</p> <p>6. Plan by the Parish Council on the same grounds</p> <p>7. Opposes the reinstatement of West Way by the Parish Council without consultation</p> <p>8. <i>'the importance of an assessment by an independent professional Examiner cannot be underestimated in establishing an objective way forward for the village that is of neutral bias'.</i></p> <p>9. <i>'The inclusion of the Scout Hut shows further disregard for the Examiner's report that assessed Highways safety as not being neutral for a residential development let alone for a development proposal that now includes a Scout Hut that will see many parents driving to and from it each evening throughout the week to collect their children from Beavers/Cubs/Scouts/Explorers, all of which happen on different nights'.</i></p>

Ref #54	Oppose Modification 3.3 ii PDS9/LSG1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'strongly oppose this amendment. This development, more than any other, would positively benefit the families within our Parish. As it stands this is a piece of land that can not be used by the public and can only be enjoyed by those very few houses that surround it. It cannot be viewed clearly and without obstruction from the downs link (the houses at the end of Park Road are in the way) or any of the man walkways around the village. If this development went ahead the 2.6 acres of green space would be an excellent, safe and beautiful place for the children and adults of the village to enjoy which is the most sustainable thing you can do for a village like ours, provide green space for all to enjoy. It already has an excellent road access to it and would finish West Way off properly rather than just being a strange dead end with no turning point. I am very disappointed that the scenic views of so few people have been supported by HDC as being more important than the provision of usable green space for all'.</i>
Ref #55	Have Comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'Strongly oppose the irresponsible and ill prepared Examiner's Plan of 4 sites with unlimited homes and also oppose Horsham District Council's 4 site proposal albeit properly limited to 77 homes. We strongly support as people who are involved in the village over 23 years of living in Slinfold and understand everything about the village, the Slinfold Parsh Council Plan with their preferred 5 sites delivering up to 77 homes'.</i>
Ref #56 Slinfold Parish Council	Support with modifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'Slinfold Parish Council (SPC) recognise the requirement to 'plan positively' as set out in the NPPF and these comments are made in the awareness that a review of the NPPF is likely to be forthcoming this summer and could possibly increase an allocation of housing numbers and site density for the Parish. Consequently, these comments are made in the spirit of expediting the progress of this Plan to referendum'.</i> 2. <i>'General - SPC would support all sites being taken forward, subject to the replacement of the prefix "at least" with "around" to conform with the terms used in Horsham District Council's Plan'.</i> 3. <i>'In line with the Examiner's recommendation, SPC support the deletion of LGS2. Given the deletion of LGS2, SPC do not consider that the allocation area of East of Hayes Lane should be extended to include land that was proposed to be LGS2'.</i> 4. <i>'PM2 Policy 8 - SPC Consider the wording for this Policy should retain the number of units at 15 and not 30 and replace the prefix of "at least" with "around" to conform with the terms used in HDC's Plan'.</i> 5. <i>'PM3 Policy 9 - SPC support the removal of Policy 9 Land End of West Way'.</i> 6. <i>'PM6 br2 - SPC support and request a statement of intent from HDC to give the Scout Hut at Cobblers a lease renewal, or a surrender and regrant in the immediate location for a term in excess of 50 years. This will enable the Scouts to raise funds for a new hut and give one of our most valuable community assets a meaningful future'.</i> 7. <i>'SPC are informed that an application for the property Welwyn on Hayes Lane for 13 units is imminent and that if consented, this application would provide an immediate contribution to the SNP housing numbers. This will strengthen housing supply in the Parish, enhancing the contribution the Parish is making toward overall housing requirements in the District up to 2031. This reinforces SPC's view that the expected housing requirement of 60-100 dwellings over the Plan period, will be delivered via a mix of allocations and windfall and will be readily achieved'.</i>

Ref #57	Opposes Modifications Removal of West Way	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I do not agree with the omission of the site at the end of West Way from the number of sites to be developed. I agree with SPC view that there should be 5 available sites within the parish'.</i> 2. <i>'I do not agree with the use of the wording 'at least 33 houses' in the SPC submissions on the HDC Modifications. This wording should be omitted'.</i>
Ref #58	Supports deletion of the End of West Way	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongly supports the Examiner's modification to delete the end of West Way from the Neighbourhood Plan. 2. Agrees with the Examiner's comments on the site. 3. Hayes Lane is very narrow by the entrance of the site. 4. <i>'If this development went forward it would be the 'thin end of the wedge' regarding the surrounding fields which are a very special part of Slinfold, both aesthetically and for wildlife'.</i>
Ref #59	Support Modifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'The housing numbers and site density increases rumoured in the pipeline from Central Government makes a 'made' Plan imperative'.</i> 2. <i>'The inclusion of a development at the end of Westway was always contentious and in my opinion should never have been included'.</i> 3. <i>'I am sad that the one last truly rural road in the Parish, Spring Lane is to be sacrificed in preference to a few extra houses situated on the Hayes Lane site'.</i> 4. <i>'I hope the modified plan goes forward to Referendum as soon as possible'.</i>
Ref #60	Have Comments PDS9, West of West Way	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'My comments relate to the deletion of PDS9, West of West Way'.</i> 2. <i>'Objection to the proposed development West of West Way. The Central Fields, as the independent Examiner found, contribute significantly to the shape and character of Slinfold, creating many of the excellent views into the conservation area. I believe it is essential that areas free of development remain on at least two sides of the existing conservation area (as they do now, in the Central Fields and North either side of Clapgate Lane) to preserve the character and history of the centre of the Village'.</i> 3. <i>'The presence of an abundance of wildlife adds further weight to the argument to retain these fields, whilst any attempt to relocate this resident wildlife would result in almost certain injuries or deaths to protected species such as Great Crested Newts and Slow Worms. Even a small development in the Central Fields area sets a planning precedent to future developers'.</i> 4. Modifications: <i>'Deletion of the proposed development West of West Way (PDS9)'.</i>
Ref #61 JSA Planning	Supports deletion of Policy LGS1: Central Fields Promotion of a new site.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'Draft Submission Neighbourhood Plan defines six areas as Local Green Space (LGS) under Policy 3, including them on separate maps as LGS1 to LGS6. The land (subject of this representation) was part of the large field suggested to be allocated as 'Central Fields' (site ref: LGS1) in the Submission Plan'.</i> 2. <i>'In previous representations, we strongly contended that the emerging Policy 3, in particular Policy LGS1, fails the test set out under Paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF'.</i> 3. <i>'pleased to see that the Examiner's report, dated 9th January 2018, recommended the deletion of Policy LGS1: Central Fields. The Examiner noted that the land is in close proximity to the community and has some historic significance. The Examiner also</i>

- noted that LGS1 is technically part of the countryside outside the redrawn built-up area boundary and therefore is already protected from inappropriate 2 development by Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) Policy 26’.*
- 4. ‘Accordingly, the Examiner has recommended the deletion of LGS1, which was also agreed by the Council. We strongly support the deletion of LGS1 as recommend’.*
 - 5. ‘the Examiner has recommended the deletion of LGS1, which was also agreed by the Council. We strongly support the deletion of LGS1 as recommend’.*
 - 6. ‘the Examiner has recommended the deletion of the Policy 9: End of West Way (PSD9) as a housing allocation. We consider that our clients land is far more suitable as a smaller housing allocation and therefore we support the deletion of this policy and its replacement or rewording to deliver this site as a housing allocation’.*
 - 7. ‘The deletion of Policy PDS9 would result in net reduction of at least 18 dwellings, which would result in a total of only 59 dwellings being delivered throughout the NP period. As mentioned above, Slinfold is one of the eight medium villages which can easily accommodate more than the average 70 dwellings in line with the adopted HDPF pursuant of meeting requisite district housing land supply targets.*
 - 8. The land being represented is currently available and deliverable.*
 - 9. ‘The land has the potential to deliver circa 8 dwellings and a Scout Hut/Community Hall, which would bring the NP’s total deliver up to 67 dwellings (much closer to the average of 70 dwellings per settlement identified) across the plan period’.*
 - 10. ‘Furthermore, there is a significant need for more housing throughout the district and the allocation would also release pressure on more constrained sites such as AONB/South Downs National Park, which are given the highest designation of protection’.*
 - 11. ‘Careful consideration has been given to ensure that the proposed development would enhance the character and appearance of the semi-rural area and appearance of any nearby listed buildings and the setting of the Conservation Area. The proposed dwellings would provide off-street parking in line with the Council’s adopted parking standards. The inductive layout has been designed to reflect the village density and the character of the area. Given the site would only accommodate 8 dwellings, it would have no adverse impact on highway safety. Considering the site’s location and its accessibility to public transport facilities and local shops and services (see attached letter dated 21st July 2017 for more details), the site should be considered as ‘highly sustainable development’ that accords with both the Development Plan and the National policy. Furthermore, given the limited scale of development (8 dwellings) and position adjacent to the existing built-up settlement limit, we consider that the development of the site would not cause a negative impact on the semi-rural nature of the surroundings. Given that PSD9 will remain as open fields, the delivery of the subject site would clearly not result in significant cumulative impacts upon the character, biodiversity or highways safety’.*
 - 12. ‘There are no restrictive covenants or other obstructions to development and the development would be able to proceed within 0-5-year framework given the immediate availability of the subject site. We understand, however, that the Neighbourhood Plan is an advance stage’.*
 - 13. ‘We consider that the Examiners comments are indicative that the subject site should have been considered as a more suitable housing allocation compared with the land at PSD9. We hope, therefore, that in light of the above considerations, the Parish Council take this opportunity to introduce this site as a new housing allocation to better meet requisite housing requirements on a more appropriate site’.*

		<p>14. <i>'Given the current advance stage of the plan, however, if the subject site regrettably cannot not supported as a short-term housing delivery, we strongly recommend that our client's land should be allocated to meet the identified housing needs in the district over the next 15 years, within later iterations of the Neighbourhood Plan or should existing draft allocations underdeliver or fall away completely.'</i></p> <p>15. <i>Notwithstanding this, we currently suggest that the existing settlement boundary should be amended and the emerging Policy PDS9 should now be changed to instead allocate our client's land for housing within the emerging SNP. We would suggest that the following is inserted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Residential Development proposals at Land rear of the Red Lyon Pub, Slinfold, as shown on the attached location plan, will be supported to meet the identified local housing needs over the Plan period'.</i> • <i>This is followed by a table showing that the site is 'Available', 'Suitable', 'Deliverable', 'Sustainable' and has 8 units.</i> <p>16. <i>'Alternatively, a new policy could be created to deliver the subject site as an allocation'.</i></p> <p>17. <i>The following is attached to the representation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Site Plan Sketch option</i> • <i>Regulation 16 representation</i>
Ref #62	Oppose Modification Policy 8 PM2	<p>1. <i>'Deviation from the SNP proposal in a linear development would be detrimental to Hayes Lane'.</i></p>
Ref #63	Have Comments Policy 9 : End of West Way	<p>1. <i>'Supports the Examiner's modification to delete land at the end of West Way'.</i></p> <p>2. <i>'The access to the site is not suitable for volumes of traffic and heavy works vehicles'.</i></p> <p>3. <i>'West Way is barely wide enough for two cars, and often there can be problems driving down the road past parked cars or getting on/off your own drive if cars are parked opposite'.</i></p> <p>4. <i>'The increased volume of cars to the development and Scout Hut, with the addition of visitors cars potentially parked on West Way should the site not have sufficient provision for visitor parking (or the roads be wide enough for visitor parking as we have observed on other development sites in the area) will only worsen problems on the road and make it unsafe for existing residents, their children and pets.</i></p> <p>5. <i>'The current drainage infrastructure on the road is not sufficient. During bad weather, the drainage cannot cope and therefore backs up through storm drains and manhole covers'.</i></p> <p>6. <i>The Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) undertaken in 2015, and previous SHLAA assessments, deemed this site (SA061) as 'Not currently developable'.</i></p>
Ref #64	Support PM3	<p>1. <i>'I support the deletion of proposed development at the end of West Way'.</i></p> <p>2. <i>'I believe that developing at the end of West Way would be the start of gradual further development of the 'central fields', and this should all be protected'.</i></p>

Ref #65	Support PM1 - PM17	<p>This representation came in two parts.</p> <p>Part 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the deletion of Policy 9. 2. Opposes the reinstatement of Policy proposed by Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan, this having been <i>'against the evidence from many sources, all of which point to the obvious non-sustainability of the site at West Way'</i>. 3. The site has Highways issues, flooding, haven for wildlife including protected species including slow worms and Great Crested Newts. The protected species are at threat of polluting 'the Brook', a watercourse which supports the wildlife. 4. The current houses on West Way all have oil tanks and the road will need to have gas supply added. 5. Describes the Site assessment of the site as 'guess work' with 'no written evidence or document that supports their unsubstantiated assertions'. 6. Development on this site would have a negative impact. <i>'It will have a serious negative impact – the Examiner noted the wealth of evidence to counter claims that impact would be neutral'</i>. 7. <i>'There will be wholesale destruction, pollution, huge drainage works, deaths or protected species'</i> 8. The development doesn't meet the sustainability criteria with little nearby employment, car reliant area and one local shop. 9. <i>'Socially, the proposed houses will most likely prove too expensive for local families and anyway there's no provision for social housing'</i>. 10. There will likely be 'light pollution it's a dark sky rural area any development will permanently destroy the feel, character and appearance of a secluded rural area, which is part of the Central Fields which no public right of way have been untouched for hundreds of years and adjoin a conservation area'. 11. Site proposal has no housing provision. 12. The NPPF and HDPF policy states that no development should happen on green field sites, unless it is proven that the benefits outweigh the negative impacts, it is felt that West Way does not. 13. Maps since 1843 show little has happened in terms of development since then. 14. The plan does not reflect upon sustainable development as the NPPF states that Neighbourhood Plan should. 15. Slinfold's reinstatement of the site is a contradiction as the site 'inevitable harm, particularly environmental objectives', meaning the reinstatement contradicts the plan's own Sustainability Appraisal. <p>Part 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attached pictures of Central Fields.
Ref #66	Opposes Modifications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'Supports Slinfold's own Neighbourhood Plan where 5 sites deliver 77 homes'. 2. 'This plan has been considered and supported by people who live in and know the village and has been arrived at through consultation'.

Ref #67	Have comments PM3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I oppose the Horsham District Council's modifications to the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2031'</i> 2. <i>Modifications: 'support the Slinfold Neighbourhood plan including the development of Westway as it spreads the developments across the village and ensures that all of the developments are not overly large and matches the current developments and the character of the village'.</i>
Ref #68	Have comments PM3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'I oppose the Horsham District Council's modifications to the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2031'</i> 2. <i>'I support the Slinfold Neighbourhood plan including the development of Westway as it spreads the developments across the village and ensures that all of the developments are not overly large and matches the current developments and the character of the village'.</i>
Ref #69	Oppose Modification PM5 Reference: 11	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'Spring Lane is a narrow rural lane currently with only six houses, if there has to be any future development this should certainly be limited to ten additional units and ideally less. The road is popular with walkers and any additional traffic would be a danger as there are no pavements, I the previous village plan Spring Lane was classified as a rural road and not suitable for development'.</i> 2. <i>'Strongly against any development within the 'central fields' they are an amenity enjoyed by all of the village and once development is allowed even on a small scale the unique character of Slinfold will be diminished'.</i>
Ref #70	Oppose PM2 Policy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opposes deletion of West Way and additional homes to East of Hayes Lane. 2. Hayes Lane has flooding issues and traffic is already a problem. 3. There has recently been applications refused for this site. 4. Disappointed that the originally proposed Scouts hut has been removed.
Ref #71	Have comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the Parish Council's plan with five sites, which includes West Way.
Ref #72	Supports the deletion of West Way	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the deletion of West Way with housing being allocated on four sites. 2. <i>'due to road way access, destruction of natural habitats – the 'Fold' of 'Slinfold' and a belief of the preservation of Bats and endangered habitat'.</i> 3. Modification: <i>'less building in fewer areas'.</i>
Ref #73	Supports the deletion of West Way	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>'Support the HDC plan (modifications) with 4 sites delivering 77 homes no development at end of West Way'</i> 2. <i>'West Way and approaches from Hayes Lane are to narrow for even 2 cars to pass, let alone lorries'.</i> 3. <i>'The junction from Lyons Road, Hayes Lane, especially coming from Village direction in dangerous enough even without additional traffic'.</i> 4. <i>'I agree with his statement that any development off west way would a negative impact on the rural character of the village'.</i>

