

# **WISBOROUGH GREEN PARISH COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REVIEW**

## **SITE SELECTION REPORT APRIL 2021**

### **Introduction**

This report has been prepared as part of the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan Review being undertaken by Wisborough Green Parish Council (WGPC).

WGPC is updating the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan 2014 to 2029, made by Chichester District Council on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2016 and the South Downs National Park Authority on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2016, as a result of the Chichester District Council (CDC) Local Plan review.

The current CDC Local Plan, adopted in July 2015, was required by the inspector to be reviewed within five years to ensure sufficient housing was planned to meet the district's needs. Parish Council representatives attended a meeting with CDC in July 2018 to understand the implications for the village. Explanation was given to government policy, the need to review the Local Plan, importance of meeting housing need and having a 5-year housing land supply. In terms of timescale, the Preferred Options consultation was held in December 2018/January 2019 which revealed the housing numbers for identified parishes. The village was encouraged to engage with the CDC consultation in the December 2018 WGPC newsletter.

In December 2018, WGPC was informed that the parishes in the north of the Chichester district had received a further housing allocation; Wisborough Green was allocated an additional 25 houses. The Parish Council submitted a response to the consultation raising concerns about the allocation.

The Parish Council decided to use the Local Plan review as an opportunity to update the Neighbourhood Plan with the intention to allocate further development sites, update statistics, legislation and referencing as necessary, and amend policies to improve clarity; some ambiguity had been identified, particularly by appeal decisions. It was agreed on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2018 that a Neighbourhood Plan Review Steering Group should be established.

After the Local Plan Review: Preferred Approach consultation, the Parish Council was advised that the allocated 25 houses could increase; a decision is expected in November 2019. CDC advised in November 2020 that the housing allocation was 40.

Throughout this process, monthly updates have been included in the Parish magazine, as well as the Parish Council newsletter, to keep the community fully informed.

## Neighbourhood Plan Review - Process

- 1. Formation of Neighbourhood Plan Review Steering Group (NPRSG):** The establishment was publicised in Parish Council April 2018 newsletter and additional help requested; one response. Offers of help were also forthcoming from ex-Parish Councillors who had been originally involved. Comprising of Parish Council and Community members, the first meeting was held on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2018; potential conflict of interests at the time were declared and recorded. The Terms of Reference for the NPRSG were adopted by the Parish Council on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2018 and the NPRSG on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2019. The Steering Group has met almost monthly since its formation.
- 2. Consultation Timetable:** In order to conform to the timescale given by CDC for their Local Plan Review, the NPRSG assigned a timescale for the NP Review on 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019. This has subsequently altered due to the delay with the Local Plan Review and on CDC's advice.
- 3. Parish Housing Needs Survey:** This was undertaken in autumn 2018, primarily in support of the establishment of a Community Land Trust but has also provided valuable evidence in support of local housing need.
- 4. Grant Funding:** Following the call for sites, a successful grant funding and technical support application was made to Locality, a government backed organisation which offers support and advice to communities.
  - **Year ending March 2019:** The Parish Council was in receipt £1,575 grant funding to engage an independent consultant to advise on site assessment.
  - **Year ending March 2020:** The Parish Council received £7,412 grant funding to continue with the review consultation process and obtain further independent advice as identified by the NPRSG. However, unspent funds on the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020 of £1,261.32 were repaid to Groundwork.
  - **Year ending March 2021:** In February 2021, the Parish Council was in receipt of £3,916.00 grant funding to engage an independent consultant to assist with policy

wording and completion of supporting documentation and to progress to the Regulation 14 consultation.

5. AECOM Technical Support: Applications to Locality for independent technical support, at the appropriate time, were successful and the resulting reports are provided as supporting evidence:

- Site Assessment
- Policy Development/Community Questionnaire Review
- Green Gap Assessment
- Habitats Regulation Assessment
- Strategic Environmental Assessment

## 6. Strategic Local Green Gaps

In July 2019, CDC circulated details of the Landscape Capacity Study March 2019 which included reference to two areas in Wisborough Green. During discussion with CDC, the group was advised that green gaps, as identified in Neighbourhood Local Gap Policy OA5, should be reviewed as part of the Neighbourhood review. The rationale was unclear and conflicted with other advice. Chapman Planning advised caution in promoting a site within an identified green gap as it could potentially weaken the existing policy and open up other gaps for developer challenge. In order to undertake the required review, over the summer 2019, all existing gaps were assessed by the NPRSG.

Terra Firma Consultancy Ltd, the consultancy company used by Chichester District Council to undertake the district's Landscape Capacity Study, was engaged to undertake a locally valued open land assessment.

The NPRSG prepared an initial report and sought further advice from AECOM to ensure a robust approach. The NPRSG reviewed and discussed details to check accuracy. As some Group members have residences close by or overlooking a gap, it was agreed that for accuracy and parity across the gaps, residents who had previously helped with the Area Character Appraisals for the Village Design Statement or had shown interest in the Parish Council or WGNP, would be approached to review and verify the information.

The NPRSG undertook a standardisation exercise on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020 and agreed that the exercise had confirmed accuracy of the assessments, provided some useful comments to be incorporated and identified a few errors to be corrected. Full details of the community validation comments are provided as evidence.

Independent validation of this process was provided by AECOM. The conclusion in the AECOM report dated November 2020 states:

*In conclusion, the Re-assessment is considered suitably robust for its intended purpose, which is to provide evidence to inform future work to prepare the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Review. It is clear that a great deal of effort has gone into ensuring the involvement of local residents, as reflected in Appendix 2, which presents the outcome of work to standardise the assessment proformas. This generates confidence in the robustness of the Re-assessment as a whole, although clearly leads to challenges from an editing perspective. This brief report has made a number of suggestions around how the Re-assessment might be improved; however, all relate to points of editing rather than fundamental recommendations that must be addressed as a point of necessity.*

At its meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2020, the NPRSG agreed to the minor editorial changes and approved the document. The Group agreed that the work undertaken by the Terra Firma Consultancy and AECOM, along with the local assessment process, provided the necessary evidence to support retention of the Local Green Gaps in the NP with re-definition to remove ambiguity.

## **7. Policy Development**

AECOM provided advice and support in relation to the Evidence Base and Policy development. The aim was to review the existing evidence base, identify any gaps within it, and then present policy options and recommendations based not only on the existing evidence base but also on any additional relevant information that applied. Advice was also provided in relation to the community questionnaire, circulated in January 2020, to ensure that the survey provided the necessary support for any policy changes.

Community Survey January 2020: A community survey was developed and undertaken by Action in rural Sussex working in conjunction with the NPRSG. The purpose was to provide every household with an opportunity to contribute to the evidence gathering of issues and concerns across the Parish and to accurately reflect the needs and views of the community within the Neighbourhood Plan review.

Evidence was gathered on a wide range of issues, including facilities, local businesses, green and open spaces, local housing needs, sustainable transport and other service provision. The full report can be found in the evidence base on the Wisborough Green website.

## 8. Highways Assessment

In order to progress with any site, the NPRSG determined that it was essential to establish that access was achievable and for the proposed number in order to promote the site further to the community; for several sites, suitable access had not been proven.

An application to Locality for assistance to establish access was declined.

An application to the local Highways Authority resulted in an email explanation of the pre-application advice process, all of which was not available at the present time.

Laurence Shaw Associates, Traffic Engineering Consultants, were therefore engaged by the Parish Council to undertake an assessment of the proposed access for the 7 sites to ensure that access was achievable, and the site could be considered further.

This Highways Report June 2020, provided in the evidence base, determined that access was achievable for 5 of the 7 sites, the exceptions being:

WG19-7 Paddock Farm: Access width, visibility, proximity of lay-by, limited turning circles. The access would need to be widened.

WG19-11/12 Farnagates: Visibility linked with traffic speed, pedestrian access and crossing. Significant highways work required to improve visibility and pedestrian safety.

WG19-7 Paddock Farm: The planning agent was requested to make a pre-application request to both WSCC and CDC to determine that the proposed access was achievable. WSCC advised that access was achievable, but CDC Planning Department raised concerns about the impact upon the Conservation Area and Listed buildings, advising that "It is difficult to see how the proposals in this location would avoid the harm identified above and therefore unacceptable in principle."

## Neighbourhood Plan Review – Site Selection Process

- 9. Call for Sites:** A call for potential development sites was made in the community at the start of 2019. Articles were published in the February and March Parish Magazines (circulated to all households at the end of the previous month) giving the closing date of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019; posters were also displayed on the village notice boards. Reference was made to the CDC's published Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and on advice from CDC, approaches were also made to the HELAA contacts held by CDC. Landowners were asked to complete a 'Call for Sites' form which was based upon the CDC HELAA submission form, being GDPR compliant.

In response to 'Call for Sites': 13 sites were put forward for assessment.

Identified on the HELAA: 1 site assessed although no contact established with landowner.

**10. Prior to Site Assessment:** Before any local assessment was undertaken, independent advice was sought from Chapman Planning (Sally Chapman BA (Hons), Dip UP, MRTPI) on recommendation to the Parish Council. This cost was covered by the first grant. Chapman Planning undertook the following:

- Reviewed background documentation relating to Neighbourhood Plan site allocation process, Local Plan Review requirements, HELAA etc.
- Reviewed current legislation and best practice.
- Prepared a report making recommendations for a robust approach to the site allocation process for the Neighbourhood Plan Review.

Following receipt of the report, available in the evidence base on the village website, the following was agreed to update the local site assessment process:

- Clarify and improve descriptions of the site selection criteria used in the last review particularly to bring into line with terminology used in the NP. All the recommendations of the report in this regard would be incorporated.
- The RAG (Red, Amber, Green) assessment would be used again, but with improved definition and justification of the system.
- Mitigation would be removed as a heading and inserted in each criteria commentary.
- The 5-minute isochrone was discussed, and it was agreed to leave its centre as the centre of the Green. This was viewed as the practical centre of the Village.
- Ideally, an on-site review of the update work and layout of the Village was considered desirable.

**11. Local Site Assessment:** Using the criteria and updated assessment form confirmed by Chapman Planning, each site was assessed by the NPRSG, excluding one member who had a site interest. One other member declared an interest in Stable Field and did not undertake this assessment. Following assessment, a standardisation meeting was held and site assessment details reviewed. Site assessment details were subsequently considered at meetings/by email with final confirmation just prior to the consultation event printing deadline. (The member's site interest was withdrawn at the end of August and noted accordingly in the NPRSG meeting minutes.) The NPRSG's site assessments can be found in the evidence base on the village website.

**12. Independent Site Assessment:** To provide independent assessment, site visits and assessment were undertaken by AECOM consultants for each site put forward for

inclusion in the Revised Neighbourhood Plan. The full report has been provided in the evidence base. Details were published at the consultation event and the full report also made available.

**13. First Site Selection Consultation Event September 2019:** Following receipt of the AECOM Site Assessment Report and standardisation of the local assessments, a recommendation for suitable sites to go forward to the September Public Consultation was presented and agreed by WGPC on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2019.

The exclusionary criteria were:-

1. Land had insufficient capacity for housing units (6 units or more required) to contribute to the allocated housing number.
2. Land unavailable within the plan period.
3. Land does not comply with national/local planning policy (NPPF/Local Plan/SDNP/NP).
4. The traffic light system within the criteria highlighting the potential level of suitability of each site revealing more than 1 RED light.
5. Land withdrawn – access unachievable.

Of the original 14 proposed sites, 7 sites were deemed not to meet the above criteria:

WG19-1: Spring Meadow  
WG19-2: Ansells Yard  
WG19-6: Land South of A272  
WG19-9: Glebe View Garden (insufficient capacity)  
WG19-10: Macdonalds Field (withdrawn)  
WG19-13: Farnagates Field 3  
WG19-14: Newpound Field

There were no green traffic light sites in Wisborough Green. The remaining 7 sites were identified and presented as the most suitable at the public consultation.

Six sites with either red/amber or double amber traffic lights:

WG19-3: Tanglewood  
WG19-5: Winterfold Garden  
WG19-7: Paddock Farm Field  
WG19-8: Glebe Field  
WG19-11: Farnagates 1  
WG19-12: Farnagates 2

Two sites with double red traffic lights were also put forward for consideration as, at this point in time, further evidence and Highways advice was being gathered that might have mitigated concerns or changed the overall assessment:

WG19-4: Stable Field: located within a Green Gap.

WG19-7: Paddock Farm Field: without a confirmed access.

Consultation Method: Consultation displays were designed to try to explain a complex process to those not fully briefed on planning matters. There were no 'green' traffic light sites in the village and all sites included for consideration were not without constraints. In conjunction with the response booklet, it was the intention that members of the community were fully aware that the anticipated allocation number could increase, were briefed on the implications of affordable housing as well as large or small sites and were able to comment on the individual sites and the required mitigation. Consultees were provided with an opportunity to comment if they felt the site assessment was incorrect.

All sites assessed through the process were presented at the consultation event for feedback, including the options that had been identified through assessment (and for which residents were asked whether they supported development of the site and to state a preference) and the sites that were deemed not to meet the exclusionary criteria (with residents being asked whether this decision was supported).

The display boards information explained the following:

- Section 1: Explanation of the process and why it is being repeated.
- Section 2: Background information which will help form your opinion and comments.
  - Assessment Process
  - Assessment Process – Traffic Light System
  - Affordable Housing Provision
  - Concentrating/Dispersing Development
- Section 3: The 7 sites identified as being the most suitable.  
(Full local site assessment details displayed and AECOM conclusion)
- Section 4: The 7 remaining sites that were deemed not to meet the exclusionary criteria with the relevant explanation.
- Section 5: What happens next?

Consultation Results: The information displayed, and the design of the consultation response booklet allowed for clear data to be captured which demonstrated the community wish in an objective way. The full report is provided in the evidence base.

The consultation conclusions were:

- The consultation was representative. It was well attended by 190 visitors from all areas of the Parish. It achieved its objective in gathering quality information from Parishioners in order to inform the revision to the current Neighbourhood Plan.

- A large majority felt the consultation had been presented in a clear and understandable way and felt sufficient information to aid decision making had been provided.
- There was general agreement with the site assessment process and the individual site assessments, with Stable Field having slightly lower agreement than others.
- There was strong preference not to have all the development on a single site.
- There was no clear or strong preference for any one site. Tanglewood Nursery with pavement, Winterfold Garden and Stable Field with pavement were the more popular sites.
- There was dominant agreement of why the sites that had been deemed not to meet the exclusionary criteria had been assessed as unsuitable.
- The Farnagates sites (WG19-11 & 12) received the least support. The 5 remaining sites provide sufficient capacity for the current allocation and so the Farnagates sites were removed from further consideration.
- Access to some sites has yet to be determined. There is therefore a risk to availability if safe site access is challenging to achieve or insufficient for the proposed number.
- There was strong support to challenge Chichester District Council if there is any increase beyond the proposed additional 25 housing allocation.

With the above in mind (as well as the village housing requirement), the following sites were taken forward for further consideration with the Farnagates sites removed from consideration due to lack of public support.

WG19-3: Tanglewood  
 WG19-4: Stable Field  
 WG19-5: Winterfold Garden  
 WG19-7: Paddock Farm Field  
 WG19-8: Glebe Field

**14. Second Site Consultation January 2021:** The Parish Council was advised by CDC in late November 2020 that the housing allocation number had been increased from 25 to 40. CDC had also published the HELAA 2020 which identified one site which has previously been discounted in the assessment process.

Consultation Method: Due to Covid regulations, it was not possible to hold a consultation event in the Village Hall. As such, a consultation leaflet was prepared which was distributed to most households in the village within the parish magazine. Approximately 675 leaflets were distributed, and additional copies were provided in the Village Shop and also available on the village website.

An article was included in the magazine to highlight the inclusion of the leaflet in case it had dropped out or been mislaid, advising that additional copies were available. The consultation was also publicised on the noticeboards, outside the village shop and on the village Facebook page.

The leaflet provided:

- Explanation as to why the Neighbourhood Plan process had been delayed.
- The increased housing allocation for the village and the reason not to challenge.
- The possible implications of the District Council not having a Local Plan or 5-year housing land supply in place.
- The possible implications of the Government's Planning White paper and planning reforms.
- Explanation to the next stages of the process.
- Main conclusions from the September 2019 consultation event.

The leaflet updated residents on the site assessment process since the previous public consultation. It also advised that, not only had the housing allocation increased, but since the September 2019 consultation, the Parish Council had been advised of changes relevant to the site assessment. Ansells Yard had previously been identified as an unsuitable site primarily due to the distance from the village and pedestrian access constraints. However, the site was identified by CDC on the HELAA 2020 as having potential and with the increased village housing requirement and details of a potential pedestrian footway to the village being possible, it was decided to consider this site further.

Parish residents were asked to indicate their site choice in order of preference in the table below, with 1 being their most preferred choice and 6 being their least preferred choice. The sites under consideration:

WG19-2	Ansells Yard (with a pavement) For up to 18 dwellings and at least 3 business units
WG19-3	Tanglewood Nursery (with a pavement) For up to 12 dwellings
WG19-4	Stable Field (with a pavement) For up to 10 dwellings and open space gifted to the Parish Council for recreation (approx. 0.45 ha residential/0.87 ha open space)
WG19-5	Winterfold Garden For 8 dwellings
WG19-7	Paddock Farm For up to 10 dwellings
WG19-8	Glebe Field For up to 10 dwellings on the eastern section

#### Consultation Conclusions:

- A total of 324 validated and correctly completed responses were received.

This represents a response rate of 23% using the 2011 Census population figure of 1414, or 27% of those on the electoral role (1185). This is an increase on the September 2019 consultation response: 11.5% and 14% respectively.

- A collection point in the Village Shop was well used (32%), but only by a small majority. The Parish Council Post Box at the Village Hall (29%) and email (27%) were also well used. The current Covid regulations and perhaps reluctance to unnecessarily enter the shop may have resulted in increased use of the Parish Council post box.
- Responses came from across the entire parish, with the majority, 55, from 'Petworth Road/Balchins Close', 52 from 'Billingshurst Road/Old Mill Lane/Glebe Way/Harsfold Lane/The Longcroft/Wisborough Gardens', 49 from Newpound Lane. The Petworth Road and Billingshurst Road categories were also the majority for the September 2019 consultation.
- The village housing allocation is 40 dwellings and the public consultation identified the following preference for meeting the target:

WG19-2 Anells Yard	1 <sup>st</sup> preference
WG19-3 Tanglewood Nursery	2 <sup>nd</sup> preference
WG19-4 Stable Field	3 <sup>rd</sup> preference
WG19-5 Winterfold Garden	4 <sup>th</sup> preference
WG19-7 Glebe Field	5 <sup>th</sup> preference
WG19-8 Paddock Farm Field	6 <sup>th</sup> preference
- Anells Yard received the top vote by a large margin.
- It is clear that Kirdford Road sites are most favoured, with Tanglewood Nursery and Stable Field as second and third preferences.
- The top four sites include Winterfold Garden.
- The margin above Paddock Farm Field is significant.

**15. Strategic Environmental Assessment:** In order for a Revised Neighbourhood Plan to meet the basic conditions at examination it must be compatible with EU obligations. One of these obligations relates to the effect a plan may have on the environment. AECOM was engaged to facilitate the assessment. As sites were being allocated in the Plan, it was determined that an SEA was required, with the scoping report being agreed by the statutory consultees, Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency in December 2019.

It was not possible to progress the SEA process until the housing allocation was confirmed by CDC. In February 2021, AECOM re-commenced the SEA process which includes considering sites assessed (i.e. reasonable alternatives). A SEA has now been undertaken by AECOM and is published alongside the Neighbourhood Plan. The SEA can be found in the evidence section on the village website ([www.wisboroughgreen.org](http://www.wisboroughgreen.org)).

**16. Habitats Regulation Assessment:** Another key obligation is the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC ‘on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora’. Under the ‘Habitats Directive’, an assessment must be undertaken if the Plan is likely to have a significant effect on a European protected wildlife site i.e., if policies and proposals in the Plan might impact on one or more European sites. The SEA Directive requires that if a plan or programme requires ‘Appropriate Assessment’ under the Habitats Directive, then that Plan or programme will also require an SEA.

It was determined that a HRA was required, and AECOM was engaged to complete the process when the Housing Allocation and sites/site numbers had been confirmed and draft Site-Specific Policies prepared. AECOM completed this work in February 2021. The conclusions were noted, and suggested comments incorporated into the Plan. Ultimately, the HRA found that the Neighbourhood Plan will not result in adverse effects to the integrity of European protected sites. The full report is provided in the evidence base.

## **17. Discussions with Landowners**

Engagement with landowners has been an ongoing process through the course of the site selection process. When the favoured community sites became clear, the Steering Group had further discussions with landowners/developers to address the key site constraints, where necessary.

Kirdford Road Sites: The sites under consideration currently have no pedestrian access to the village but these sites were supported through the consultation exercises where a pavement could be provided which would be beneficial for new and existing residents. All the developers for these sites are accepting of the need to provide a pavement but the funding and land use (highway or private) has yet to be determined. It is also noted that the provision of a pavement will also require Parish Council land – the Green – with a pavement (location yet to be determined) connecting the existing pedestrian network by the playground to a crossing point by The Luth/The Park entrance. In summary, a pavement to the village is required to deliver these sites and, through discussions with the landowner and West Sussex County Council, it is considered that this is achievable through individual developers contributing to relevant sections of a continuous footway from the Ansell’s Yard site to the Village Green.

Stable Field: The site is located in a Local Green Gap and was supported through community consultation with the provision of an area of land to be gifted to the Parish Council. The Steering Group continued discussions with the landowner, not just in terms of the pedestrian access to the village but also in relation to addressing the other constraints of the site, namely its location within the Local Green Gap and a key view from the Conservation Area. A pedestrian footway within the site and then along the frontage of Park Lodge had been proposed through a previous planning application and was considered an achievable option. By containing the residential development to the west of the site, with the eastern section retaining an open use for recreation, a

meaningful green gap and the sense of openness to this part of the village could be retained and would also safeguard important views from the Conservation Area. The donation of the land to the Parish Council will also ensure that the open space and recreation facilities are provided in perpetuity which will provide long-term benefits to the local community.

Ansells Yard: Discussions have also been had with the agent acting for the landowner for Ansell’s Yard which is being promoted for a scheme for 18 residential and 3 business units (3no B/E(g) class units). These are 3 large units (around 1500 sq. ft. each) and the agent has indicated a willingness, for later consideration, to provide smaller units and a more flexible layout for self-contained workplace units. There is also an area of paddock included within the original site plan, but the land designation and potential use has yet to be determined. The agent has indicated that it could be possible to include the additional paddock area in the scheme to provide a children’s play area/open space. However, regardless of adding further paddock land to the site, it is proposed that part of the site will be designed as a children’s play area.

All Sites: The draft site details and policies were sent to the agents/developers for the 4 proposed sites. All sites were confirmed as being suitable, available and achievable.

## 18. Report Summary

### Sites not included in the Revised Neighbourhood Plan

Following a robust assessment process, a number of sites were found to be not suitable, available or achievable. This, in addition to the outcome of the public consultations, resulted in the following sites being excluded from the Revised Neighbourhood Plan 2019 – 2037:

- WG19-1: Spring Meadow
- WG19-6: Land South of A272
- WG19-7: Paddock Farm Field
- WG19-8: Glebe Field
- WG19-9: Glebe View Garden
- WG19-10: Macdonalds Field
- WG19-11: Farnagates 1
- WG19-12: Farnagates 2
- WG19-13: Farnagates 3
- WG19-14: Newpound Field

Site Ref	Site Name	Primary Reasons for Exclusion
WG19-1	Spring Meadow	<p><b>Suitability – site is not suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape Impact – medium landscape value and high sensitivity as identified in the CDC Landscape Capacity Study which states any new development outside of the</li> </ul>

		<p>settlement boundary and south of the A272 in sub-area 166 could unlikely be accommodated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrow one-way access with little opportunity to widen.</li> </ul> <p><b>Available – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoted by landowner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No known viability constraints.</li> <li>• Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September 2019 consultation; dominant agreement as to why the site had been deemed not to meet the exclusionary criteria and assessed as unsuitable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>This site is not suitable and not a favoured site by the local community and so is not included in the Plan.</p>
WG19-6	Land South of A272	<p><b>Suitability – site is not suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape Impact – medium landscape value and high sensitivity as identified in the CDC Landscape Capacity Study which states any new development outside of the settlement boundary and south of the A272 in sub-area 166 could unlikely be accommodated.</li> <li>• Access to the site is narrow with little possibility of upgrading to support development.</li> <li>• Unsuitable in CDC HELAA.</li> <li>• Further comments in HELAA – setting of Conservation Area, listed buildings, southern part of the site in Flood Zone 3b. Additional land in Flood Zones 2 and 3a.</li> </ul> <p><b>Available – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoted by landowner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No known viability constraints.</li> <li>• Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September 2019 consultation; dominant agreement as to why the site had been deemed not to meet the exclusionary criteria and assessed as unsuitable.</li> </ul>

		<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>This site is not suitable and not a favoured site by the local community and so is not included in the Plan.</p>
WG19-7	Paddock Farm Field	<p><b>Suitability – site is not suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape Impact – medium landscape value and high sensitivity as identified in the CDC Landscape Capacity Study which states any new development outside of the settlement boundary and south of the A272 in sub-area 166 could unlikely be accommodated.</li> <li>• Access to the site is narrow with little possibility of upgrading to support development.</li> <li>• Unsuitable in CDC HELAA.</li> <li>• Further comments in HELAA – setting of Conservation Area, listed buildings, southern part of the site in Flood Zone 3b. Additional land in Flood Zones 2 and 3a.</li> </ul> <p><b>Available – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoted by landowner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No known viability constraints.</li> <li>• Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September 2019 consultation; not a favoured site. Ranked 9<sup>th</sup> out of 11 site options.</li> <li>• January 2021 consultation: least favoured site. Ranked 6<sup>th</sup> out of 6.</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>This site is not suitable and not a favoured site by the local community and so is not included in the Plan.</p>
WG19-8	Glebe Field	<p><b>Suitability – site is potentially suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over impact on the setting of the nearby Grade 1 Listed church with concerns raised previously by Historic England.</li> </ul> <p><b>Available – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoted by landowner.</li> <li>• Identified on CDC HELAA.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No known viability constraints.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 2019 consultation; Ranked 4<sup>th</sup> for 10 dwellings in order of site preference. Ranked 6<sup>th</sup> for 18 dwellings and 8<sup>th</sup> for 25 dwellings.</li> <li>January 2021 consultation: Ranked 5<sup>th</sup> out of 6 in order of site preference.</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>This site has suitability concerns and given its preference in community consultations, is not needed to meet the Parish housing target and so has not been included in the Plan.</p>
WG19-9	Glebe View Garden	<p><b>Suitability – site is potentially suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially suitable</li> </ul> <p><b>Available – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoted by landowner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No known viability constraints.</li> <li>Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 2019 consultation; dominant agreement as to why the site had been deemed not to meet the exclusionary criteria and assessed as unsuitable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>Whilst potentially suitable, the site can only accommodate up to 4 houses (one of the site exclusion criteria for the Plan is for sites able to accommodate a minimum of 6 dwellings). The site is not a favoured site by the local community, it is therefore not included in the Plan.</p>
WG19-10	Macdonalds Field	<p><b>Suitability – site is not suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No suitable access to the site currently.</li> </ul> <p><b>Available – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn by landowner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No known viability constraints.</li> <li>Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul>

		<p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 2019 consultation; dominant agreement as to why the site had been deemed not to meet the exclusionary criteria and assessed as unsuitable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The site is not suitable and has been withdrawn. It is therefore not included in the Plan.</p>
WG19-11	Farnagates 1	<p><b>Suitability – site is potentially suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over landscape and visual impact – open site with rural character and long views to the South Downs National Park.</li> </ul> <p><b>Available – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoted by landowner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No known viability constraints.</li> <li>Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 2019 consultation; least favoured above Farnagates 2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The site is potentially suitable but is not a favoured site by the local community and is therefore not included in the Plan.</p>
WG19-12	Farnagates 2	<p><b>Suitability – site is potentially suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over landscape and visual impact – open site with rural character and long views to the South Downs National Park.</li> <li>No access to the site currently.</li> </ul> <p><b>Available – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoted by landowner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No known viability constraints.</li> <li>Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 2019 consultation; least favoured site.</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b> The site is potentially suitable but is not a favoured site by the local community and is therefore not included in the Plan.</p>
WG19-13	Farnagates 3	<p><b>Suitability – site is not suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proximity to village.</li> <li>Concern over landscape and visual impact – open site with rural character and long views to the South Downs National Park.</li> <li>Uncertainty over suitability of access.</li> </ul> <p><b>Available – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoted by landowner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No known viability constraints.</li> <li>Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 2019 consultation; dominant agreement as to why the site had been deemed not to meet the exclusionary criteria and assessed as unsuitable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b> The site is not suitable and is not a favoured site by the local community and is therefore not included in the Plan.</p>
WG19-14	Newpound Field	<p><b>Suitability – site is not suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proximity to village with no safe pedestrian access to the village.</li> <li>Uncertainty over suitability of access.</li> </ul> <p><b>Available – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoted by landowner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No known viability constraints.</li> <li>Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 2019 consultation; dominant agreement as to why the site had been deemed not to meet the</li> </ul>

		<p>exclusionary criteria and assessed as unsuitable.</p> <p><b>Summary</b> The site is not suitable and is not a favoured site by the local community and is therefore not included in the Plan.</p>
--	--	--

### **Sites recommended for inclusion in the Revised Neighbourhood Plan**

The following sites were the first 4 community preference sites, and, following a robust site assessment process, were found to be suitable (in some cases with necessary mitigation), available and achievable. It is recommended that these sites are considered for allocation in the Revised Neighbourhood Plan 2019 - 2037, with a site policy to ensure that environmental and other matters are addressed in subsequent planning applications.

WG19-2 Anells Yard (For up to 18 dwellings and at least 3 business units)	1 <sup>st</sup>
WG19-3 Tanglewood Nursery (For up to 12 dwellings)	2 <sup>nd</sup>
WG19-4 Stable Field (For up to 10 dwellings and gifted open space)	3 <sup>rd</sup>
WG19-5 Winterfold Garden (For 8 dwellings)	4 <sup>th</sup>

The table below summaries the site assessment and primary reasons for inclusion in the Revised Neighbourhood Plan:

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Primary Reasons for Exclusion</b>
WG19-2	Anells Yard	<p><b>Suitability – site is suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part Greenfield / part Brownfield site</li> <li>• Potential loss / partial loss of employment space and existing businesses</li> <li>• Access to the site is currently in place and is suitable.</li> <li>• Proximity to the village – site is outside of 5-minute walking isochrone.</li> <li>• Site currently does not benefit from pedestrian access to the village (no pavement) but a pavement is proposed by the landowner and discussions have been had with WSCC.</li> </ul> <p><b>Availability – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoted by landowner.</li> <li>• Likely to be later in the Plan period.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential site contamination from previous use requiring</li> </ul>

		<p>remediation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demolition of existing buildings and re-provision of employment space.</li> <li>• Viability has been demonstrated as the site was promoted through the Neighbourhood Plan (and CDC HELAA) for a mixed use residential and employment scheme.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September 2019 consultation; site originally deemed not to meet exclusionary criteria albeit that approximately 20% of responders disagreed with the exclusion of this site.</li> <li>• January 2021 consultation: ranked 1<sup>st</sup> (by a large margin) in order of site preference (with pavement).</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The site is considered suitable, available and achievable subject to the mitigation set out in the draft Revised Neighbourhood Plan policy and is recommended for inclusion for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is large enough to provide on-site affordable housing which is a significant benefit to the Parish.</li> <li>• During the consultation on the original Neighbourhood Plan, the local community expressed a strong preference for the re-use of Brownfield sites. This was evident through the September 2019 consultation where a number of responders questioned the exclusion of the site.</li> <li>• The CDC HELAA recognises that the site is suitable for a mixed-use development and the policy secures the re-provision of employment space.</li> <li>• The provision of a pavement to the village (linking to existing or other planned footways) is considered achievable, is secured through policy and will provide wider benefits to existing and future residents of this part of the village.</li> </ul>
WG19-3	Tanglewood Nursery	<p><b>Suitability – site is suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is a vacant former employment site.</li> <li>• Greenfield site but previously used as a nursery.</li> <li>• The site retains little rural character or landscape value and so no significant landscape or visual impact.</li> <li>• Site currently does not benefit from pedestrian access to the village (no pavement) but a pavement is proposed by</li> </ul>

		<p>the landowner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access is achievable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Availability – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoted by landowner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No known viability constraints.</li> <li>• Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September 2019 consultation; ranked 1<sup>st</sup> in order of site preference (with pavement).</li> <li>• January 2021 consultation: ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> in order of site preference (with pavement).</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The site is considered suitable, available and achievable subject to the mitigation set out in the draft Revised Neighbourhood Plan policy and is recommended for inclusion for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the consultation on the original Neighbourhood Plan, the local community expressed a strong preference for the re-use of land (perceiving the nursery as Brownfield and not Greenfield) and for small sites.</li> <li>• The provision of a pavement to the village (linking to existing or other planned footways) is considered achievable, is secured through policy and will provide wider benefits to existing and future residents of this part of the village.</li> <li>• Overall, this site is one of the most favoured sites put forward for development and is considered suitable, available and achievable.</li> </ul>
WG19-4	Stable Field	<p><b>Suitability – site is suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is located within a Local Green Gap.</li> <li>• Site is in close proximity to the Conservation Area (and lies within a key view from the Conservation Area) and Grade II Listed buildings.</li> <li>• The site is just outside of the 5-minute walking isochrone.</li> <li>• Site currently does not benefit from pedestrian access to the village (no pavement).</li> <li>• Possible landscape impact, however, this stretch of Kirdford Road has been developed for housing and</li> </ul>

		<p>development here would not appear out of place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential impact on protected trees along boundary (TPOs).</li> <li>• Access is achievable (confirmed at 2018 appeal).</li> </ul> <p><b>Availability – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoted by landowner and subject to a current planning application (March 2021).</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No known viability constraints.</li> <li>• Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> <li>• This site is subject to a current planning application March 2021 (WR/21/00391/FUL).</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September 2019 consultation; ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> in order of site preference (with pavement).</li> <li>• January 2021 consultation: ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> in order of site preference (with pavement).</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The site is considered suitable, available and achievable subject to the mitigation set out in the draft Revised Neighbourhood Plan policy and is recommended for inclusion for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is identified as suitable in the CDC HELAA.</li> <li>• Development would provide a continuation of development along Kirdford Road.</li> <li>• Access is achievable.</li> <li>• Development is contained in the western section of the site and subject to a sensitively designed scheme, a meaningful Local Green Gap and the sense of openness to this part of the village would be retained. This would also retain important views from the Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Securing the eastern part of the site for open space and sport/recreation facilities, to be gifted to the Parish Council, provides significant and long-term community benefits.</li> <li>• The provision of a pavement to the village (linking to existing or other planned footways) is considered achievable, is secured through policy and will provide wider benefits to existing and future residents of this part of the village.</li> <li>• Overall, this site has received local community support and</li> </ul>
--	--	--

		<p>the wider benefits and mitigation secured through the site allocation are considered to safeguard the intent of the Local Green Gap designation and outweigh the harm/loss of the green gap.</p>
WG19-5	Winterfold Garden	<p><b>Suitability – site is suitable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is located outside the settlement boundary but close to the village centre and is surrounded by development.</li> <li>• Greenfield site – currently a garden with no rural character or landscape value.</li> <li>• Located on the edge of the Conservation Area and close to Listed Buildings / non-designated heritage assets.</li> <li>• Suitable access.</li> <li>• Connects to existing pedestrian access to the village centre.</li> </ul> <p><b>Availability – site is available</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoted by landowner.</li> </ul> <p><b>Achievability – site is achievable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No known viability constraints.</li> <li>• Landowner did not identify any viability constraints.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September 2019 consultation; ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> in order of site preference.</li> <li>• January 2021 consultation: ranked 4<sup>th</sup> in order of site preference.</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>This site is relatively well-located on the edge of the built-up area and is considered suitable, available and achievable. The site was relatively well received through public consultation and, subject to the mitigation set out in the draft Revised Neighbourhood Plan policy, the site is recommended for inclusion in the Revised Neighbourhood Plan.</p>