

Land west of Village Hall, Rogate (LAA ref. CH236)

Number of comments on policy: 120

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	1	1	13	36	69

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents report that the proposal would alter the landscape by removing hedgerows and protected views at a key, elevated site near the conservation area and historic assets. They note that access via North Street is hazardous due to its narrow width, lack of pavements and lighting, and dangerous bends, with increased traffic expected to worsen congestion and safety risks. Concerns also emerge over the loss of heritage features and changes to rural character, as the development may harm the setting of listed buildings and longstanding village aesthetics. Additionally, respondents point to potential environmental harm from habitat loss and increased flood risk, as well as the strain on local infrastructure and services. They further question the consultation process and suggest that alternative sites with lower sensitivities could offer a more appropriate solution.

Key Themes raised:

- Landscape and Visual Impact
- Traffic, Access and Safety
- Heritage and Conservation Impact
- Environmental and Ecological Considerations
- Infrastructure and Service Capacity
- Procedural and Community Consent Issues
- Alternative Site Viability
- Development Scale and Density

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support this proposed allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment. The **Environment Agency** said there were no constraints noted within their remit.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a.

Parish / Town Councils

Rogate Parish Council opposes developing site CH236, citing conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan, landscape sensitivity, traffic hazards, and harm to the conservation area. The land is agricultural, highly visible, lacks safe access, and would disrupt heritage views and village character. Flooding, wildlife loss,

infrastructure shortcomings and increased light pollution are also cited. They call for more suitable, smaller-scale alternatives to protect the character and wellbeing of the community.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Plan because it was not possible to establish a suitable access arrangement.

Policy SDA54 Land east of Lodge Lane, Hassocks (previously MI014)

Number of comments on policy: 398

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	4	3	41	185	165

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Local infrastructure and public services - including schools, GP surgeries, roads and utilities - are already under significant strain, with further development likely to increase these pressures. Respondents noted that recent housing developments have overburdened community resources, reduced green space and altered the local character, while proposals for new dwellings east of Lodge Lane could add to traffic and congestion. Environmental concerns focus on the potential loss of biodiversity and wildlife habitats caused by removing natural vegetation, increasing impermeable surfaces and exacerbating flood risks. Additional feedback highlighted road safety challenges on narrow, congested routes, design and access issues that do not align with the rural setting, and conflicts with local planning policy and national park protection that may affect the strategic separation between settlements.

Key Themes raised:

- Strain on Local Infrastructure and Public Services
- Overdevelopment and Housing Need Justification
- Environmental and Biodiversity Impact
- Traffic and Road Safety
- Design, Aesthetics, and Access
- National Park Protection and Strategic Gap
- Flood Risk and Drainage

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support subject to a detailed landscape assessment.

District / Borough / County Council

Mid Sussex District Council does not object to the proposed site allocation but seeks clarity on the scope of mitigation/enhancement and flood risk measures. Concerns include impact on the Keymer Conservation Area, transport, pedestrian access, and infrastructure contributions. Further discussions with SDNPA are encouraged.

Parish / Town Councils

Hassocks Parish Council opposes the site due encroachment into the National Park, flood risk, and potential harm to the Keymer Conservation Area and nearby local nature site.

Ditchling Parish Council objects to the proposed site allocation citing encroachment into the Ditchling-Keymer settlement gap.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

- *Provide a summary of our response including an overview of how the policy has been amended*

Copilot can help in creating an initial summary:

1. *Navigate to relevant “Representations with responses” saved in each chapter folder of: [..\1. Reg 18 comments](#)*
 2. *Open the Excel file named ‘Representations with responses’*
 3. *Save a copy of this file onto your OneDrive*
 4. *In Excel, click the Copilot button in top ribbon*
 5. *Enter the following prompt: “summarize the key points made by the officer in column G”*
 6. *Copy the Copilot summary into this box*
 7. *Review and edit the summary for clarity and accuracy before finalizing*
- *Add detail where any tricky reps might warrant a more detailed response.*
 - *Where specific wording suggestions have been accepted and included in the new policy detail these here.*

Policy SDA30 Shoreham Cement Works (previously Policy SD56)

Number of comments on policy: 19

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 3

Disagree: 5

Not stated: 11

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Nineteen comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Habitat: The response supports the Local Plan’s aims but urges much stronger habitat protections, avoidance of riverside development, and clearer biodiversity commitments, while also backing the site’s allocation provided development is balanced with flood-risk limits and integrated into wider nature-recovery networks.

Housing Need: Emphasising the need for a high-quality mixed-use scheme that addresses housing, climate impacts and integration with nearby communities, while seeking continued involvement in shaping the site’s future. A sustainable mixed-use scheme is a vital, pragmatic opportunity to deliver much-needed housing and economic benefits with clear community backing.

Transport: Robust transport evidence is still needed before decisions can be made on the scale and type of development at Shoreham Cement Works, and that this work may ultimately show the site must contribute to wider sustainable transport infrastructure.

Ecology: Others argue that the policy wrongly prioritises development over ecological restoration and fails to provide the clarity, safeguards, and ambition needed to protect nearby designated habitats and deliver meaningful nature recovery across the site.

Contamination: Highlights the significant risks posed by disturbed asbestos to air, water, soil, wildlife and human health, and calls for clarity on whether contamination has been assessed and how asbestos on the site will be safely treated using appropriate specialist methods.

CRPE is disappointed by the lack of a clearer, more prescriptive policy for such a large site and calls for a detailed masterplan to show how previous consultation responses have shaped the proposed approach and to better guide developers. **Network Rail** supports part J of the draft Policy by endorsing active travel, improved access to Shoreham-by-Sea station, the potential for a mobility hub, and wider enhancements to public transport routes. **Natural England** expresses strong support for a landscape-led, sustainable mixed-use development that protects and enhances the site’s natural ecosystems, aligning closely with the organisation’s mission to conserve the environment for present and future generations. The **National Trust** welcomes the exemplar sustainable vision for Shoreham Cement Works, supports its landscape-led and environmentally sensitive approach, encourages a Design or Development Brief to guide future proposals, and recommends adding a strict water-efficiency requirement to protect local resources. The **Environment Agency** maintains its

earlier comments and supports the policy overall, but recommends amending section 4(f) to explicitly require consideration of natural flood management techniques when addressing potential flood risk. **Southern Water** highlights that the site currently lacks connection to its water and wastewater networks, outlines the need for early engagement on drainage and water-supply plans, and stresses that any future strategy must prevent groundwater or surface water from entering the public sewer system. **Historic England** recognises a better understanding of the heritage significances of the site.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

1. Policy already includes safeguards for heritage and biodiversity, and in some cases additional references (e.g. in the Riverside criterion) have been added to strengthen ecological safeguards.

2. Environmental concerns are acknowledged and reflected. Comments from organisations such as Sussex Ornithological Society (SOS) and Sussex Wildlife Trust (SWT) resulted in adding explicit references to biodiversity sensitivity in the Riverside area. The policy wording is considered sufficiently robust to balance development viability with environmental protection, even if not as prescriptive as some groups (e.g. SWT, CPRE Sussex) requested. Some development is required to fund restoration, addressing concerns about prioritising nature over development.

3. Stakeholder support and requests are welcomed, including from Historic England, Horsham District Council, National Trust, Natural England and the local MP. Criterion 2 says any future proposals must include a comprehensive site-wide masterplan developed in consultation with stakeholders.

4. Practical matters incorporated: issues such as flood risk wording, drainage, and water infrastructure have been updated or clarified in policy text following stakeholder input. Additional criterion 2(q) has been added to address ground and building contamination. Transport concerns raised by WSCC are noted; additional transport work is underway to inform the application of the transport criteria.

Policy SDA42 Land South of London Road, Coldwaltham (previously Policy SD64)

Number of comments on policy: 5

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 3

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 1

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Five comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Connection: there would be benefit from stronger active-travel links to nearby communities and countryside, which could be supported through developer contributions and should be reflected in policy.

Environmental Factors: Environmental pressures on the Arun Valley SSSIs have worsened, with declining condition linked to abstraction and pollution.

Wastewater: Ongoing wastewater pollution issues at Waltham Brooks raise further concerns, leading to serious doubt about whether development here is environmentally deliverable.

Natural England shares the policy should explicitly note that the site lies within both the Sussex North Water Resource Zone and the 6.5km Key Conservation Area of the Sussex Bat SACs, requiring water neutrality and appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures for development. The **Environment Agency** states that the site's location within Source Protection Zone 3 makes the policy's requirement to demonstrate no significant harm to groundwater resources appropriate and fully supported.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

The concerns are noted but this allocation has already been through examination in the previous Plan and been found sound. It would not be reasonable to expect the new development to solve existing problems.

The Position Statement on water neutrality was withdrawn by Natural England on 31/10/25 so this issue has fallen away. Policy SDN3 covers requirements in relation to the Sussex Bats SACs and a cross reference to this is included in the supporting text.

Cowdray Works Yard, Easebourne (previously Policy SD66)

Number of comments on policy: 6

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 2

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Six comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Services: Development must retain the hospital facility to support convalescence for an ageing population.

Access: There are access limitations noted on the adjacent property.

Southern Water advise that the exact position of the water main near the site boundary must be confirmed before development, with access for maintenance preserved, as building over this strategic asset is prohibited and diversion costs can be significant. The **Environment Agency** highlights that the policy could encourage developers to explore daylighting the culvert on the western side of the site to deliver ecological and environmental benefits. **Natural England** highlights that the allocation lies within the Sussex North Water Resource Zone and should include a policy requirement for water neutrality, and it also falls within the 6.5km Key Conservation Area of the Sussex Bat SACs, requiring clear policy wording on necessary avoidance and mitigation measures.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This development is currently being implemented under the extant planning permission so it has not been necessary to carry it over into the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

Policy SDA47 Land at Elm Rise, Findon (previously Policy SD69)

Number of comments on policy: 1

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 0

Not stated: 1

Summary of issues and key themes raised

One comment was made on this site. The following matter was raised:

The **Environment Agency** notes the site's location in Source Protection Zones 2 and 3 means the policy's requirement to show that the development will not significantly harm groundwater resources is appropriate and supported.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Given the extant planning permission on this site, additional policy requirements would not be appropriate.

Policy SDA48 Soldiers Field House, Findon (previously Policy SD70)

Number of comments on policy: 3

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 0

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Three comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Policy Wording: The site's policy wording remains unchanged, and its existing permission has already been lawfully implemented with contractors appointed and further works due to continue in the short to mid-term.

The **Environment Agency** suggests developers should follow the national drainage hierarchy and prioritise connection to the public sewer, ensuring early foul-water planning and compliance with permitting requirements, while demonstrating that no significant harm will occur to groundwater given the site's location in Source Protection Zones 2 and 3.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Given the extant planning permissions on this site, additional policy requirements would not be appropriate.

Policy SDA16 Holmbush Caravan Park, Midhurst (previously Policy SD79)

Number of comments on policy: 53

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 2

Disagree: 22

Not stated: 29

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents highlight that the current road network—including the Fairway, Bourne Way and nearby routes—is in poor condition and unsafe for both vehicles and pedestrians, with hazards such as potholes and blind bends potentially worsening with an additional 140 cars from 70 new homes. They note the site’s rich wildlife and mature trees, expressing concern that development would lead to the loss of valuable ecological corridors and irreversible habitat disruption, while also indicating that the area might be better preserved as a community asset or nature reserve. There are worries that the planned housing scale could overburden local amenities and infrastructure, with noise, dust and increased traffic further straining a small town. Some respondents question the amendment process, emphasising the need to balance local interests and equitable benefits, and raising issues over flood risk and the overall suitability of the land.

Key Themes raised:

- Traffic, Road Safety and Access Infrastructure
- Environmental and Biodiversity Impact
- Community Character and Local Infrastructure Pressure
- Alternative Land Use
- Housing Scale, Affordability and Density
- Flood Risk and Land Suitability

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** note the site has areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 within the boundary. They are supportive of the policy wording 1.c-d.

Parish / Town Councils

Midhurst Town Council comment that the site is suitable for development, with a recommendation for maximum flexibility in design rather than strict adherence to previous designs.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

1. Previous Examination Found the Site Suitable: the South Downs Local Plan Examination previously concluded that development of 50–70 homes on this site is acceptable.

2. Capacity Reduced to 50 Homes: although earlier plans allowed for up to 70 dwellings, the capacity is now reduced to 50. The reduction reflects the increased biodiversity on the site and the statutory requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).

3. Environmental Protections Are Already Addressed: existing policy criteria cover biodiversity requirements; site boundary treatments; and protection of the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC. Some policies have been amended to include references to:

- Connections to existing Public Rights of Way (PROWs).
- Stream buffers (cross-referenced to SDW1).
- Requirements from statutory bodies like Southern Water (easements and infrastructure access).

4. Developer Contributions & Wider Links: development could help enable active travel connections, such as the Pulborough–Midhurst former railway corridor. These may be supported by CIL funding.

5. Clarifications: adjustments have been made to supporting text in response to requests from stakeholders (e.g., Western Sussex Rivers Trust, Southern Water, and Natural England). It is clarified that water neutrality requirements are no longer applicable.

6. Position on C2 Use (Care Homes): the Regulation 18 version included C2, but officers have concluded that the site is not suitable for care home–type C2 development due to its topography.

Policy SDA17 Land at the Fairway, Midhurst (previously Policy SD80)

Number of comments on policy: 8

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 1

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 6

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Eight comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Parking and Traffic Safety: They argue that building on the existing car park would worsen already severe parking pressures, traffic congestion, and safety issues on The Fairway, which is narrow, poorly maintained, and heavily used by buses.

Infrastructure: They also highlight that local infrastructure, schools, roads, and healthcare is already overstretched, and that adding around 70 new homes would significantly exacerbate these problems.

Natural England comments recommend that the policy explicitly note the site's location within the Sussex North Water Resource Zone and the 6.5km Key Conservation Area of the Sussex Bat SACs, and require both water neutrality and appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures for development. There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit. **Southern Water** advises that Policy SD80 must require site layouts to protect a 6-metre easement around existing underground infrastructure to ensure access for maintenance and avoid costly or unacceptable asset diversion.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Development of this site for 8-10 homes was found to be acceptable in the last Local Plan examination, and it is considered that there have been no change in circumstances since that time to merit a different decision.

The Position Statement on water neutrality was withdrawn by Natural England on 31/10/25 so this issue has fallen away. Policy SDN3 covers requirements in relation to the Sussex Bats SACs and a cross reference to this is included in the supporting text.

Advice from Southern Water is included in supporting text.

Policy SDA74 Land at Loppers Ash, South Harting (previously Policy SD86)

Number of comments on policy: 4

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Four comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Access: Respondents argue that the policy encourages multiple access points that would harm the historic character and practical functioning of New Lane while increasing engineering works, hard surfacing, and drainage risks. They instead advocate for a single access opposite the existing South Acre entrance, which they believe would minimise environmental impact, improve safety and parking efficiency, and better protect views and landscape character.

Southern Water advises that the precise location of wastewater infrastructure near the site boundary must be confirmed before construction, with access for maintenance preserved, because development cannot be built over these assets and diverting them can be prohibitively expensive. There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit. **Natural England** support the allocation but recommends updating the policy to require water neutrality and appropriate mitigation measures, noting the site's location within both the Sussex North Water Resource Zone and the wider conservation area of the Sussex Bat SACs.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

There is a balance to be made between the impact of more than one access point and the increased hardstanding within the site that a single access would require. The removal of the requirement for a single access point means that the appropriate balance can be considered through the application rather than pre-judged at allocation stage. Appropriate drainage solutions are covered by policies SDW2 and SDW3.

Southern Water's advice has been added to the supporting text.

The Position Statement on water neutrality was withdrawn by Natural England on 31/10/25 so this issue has fallen away. Policy SDN3 covers requirements in relation to the Sussex Bats SACs and a cross reference to this is included in the supporting text.

Policy SDA73 Land North of the Forge, South Harting (previously Policy SD87)

Number of comments on policy: 3

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 0

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Three comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Southern Water advises that the precise location of its wastewater infrastructure near the site boundary must be confirmed before any development begins, with access for maintenance preserved, because building over these assets is not permitted and diverting them can be extremely costly. There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit. **Natural England** shares that the policy should note that the site lies within both the Sussex North Water Resource Zone and the 12km Wider Conservation Area of the Sussex Bat SACs, requiring water neutrality and appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures for development.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Southern Water's advice has been added to the supporting text.

The Position Statement on water neutrality was withdrawn by Natural England on 31/10/25 so this issue has fallen away. Policy SDN3 covers requirements in relation to the Sussex Bats SACs and a cross reference to this is included in the supporting text.

Policy SDA75 Stedham Sawmill, Stedham (previously Policy SD88)

Number of comments on policy: 4

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Agree: 0

Disagree: 1

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Four comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Layout: The revised layout reduces housing land and increases density, makes integrating existing commercial structures and sheds difficult.

Access: Worsens pedestrian and cycle access to the village centre and contains a mapping error that must show the A272 as the only access point.

Natural England notes that the site lies within both the Sussex North Water Resource Zone and the 6.5km Wider Conservation Area of the Sussex Bat SACs, requiring water neutrality and appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures.

There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit.

Southern Water advises that the exact location of wastewater infrastructure near the site boundary must be confirmed before construction, with access for maintenance and potential upgrades protected, as development cannot be built over these assets and diversion costs can be prohibitive.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

The reduction in site size has been reflected in the updated allocation and a requirement for pedestrian / cycle link to School Lane is retained. Criterion 7 has been amended to make it clear that vehicular access will only be from the south onto the A272.

The advice from Southern Water is included in supporting text.

The Position Statement on water neutrality was withdrawn by Natural England on 31/10/25 so this issue has fallen away. Policy SDN3 covers requirements in relation to the Sussex Bats SACs and a cross reference to this is included in the supporting text.

Land South of Heather Close, West Ashling (previously Policy SD91)

Number of comments on policy: 3

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation
--

Agree: 0

Disagree: 0

Not stated: 3

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Three comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Southern Water note their underground infrastructure on the site requires a clear easement of at least 6 metres, meaning any development layout must avoid building over these assets and ensure future access for maintenance or upgrades. There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit.

Natural England shows support with comments, the site allocation lies within several sensitive ecological zones, so the policy should explicitly require mitigation for Solent SPA impacts, nutrient neutrality, and appropriate measures for the Sussex Bat SACs.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

This development has been implemented so it is not necessary to carry it forward into the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

Policy SDA18 Land adjacent to The Grange Car Park, Midhurst (previously CH222)

Number of comments on policy: 13

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
2	4	1	0	1	5

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents presented divided views on housing provision, with some suggesting that development should prioritise truly affordable housing and allow for a higher dwelling count than the proposed if high architectural standards are achieved, while others content that further housing should be delayed until local infrastructure such as roads, schools, healthcare and retail facilities are improved. Feedback on mixed-use development advocates for including community spaces and local amenities like retail or sports facilities alongside additional housing. Concerns over traffic, parking and transport management were highlighted, noting existing congestion and the potential loss of parking if adjacent car park land is incorporated, and respondents stress the need for careful planning in this area. Additional comments addressed the optimisation of land use, improved urban design to enhance the town's visual impact, and environmental considerations regarding nearby natural areas.

Key Themes raised:

- Housing Provision, Affordability and Density
- Mixed-Use Development and Community Amenities
- Local Infrastructure and Service Capacity
- Traffic, parking and transport Management
- Optimising Land Use
- Urban Design and Visual Impact
- Environmental and Landscape Implications

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation – n/a

District / Borough / County Councils – n/a

Parish / Town Councils

Midhurst Town Council: support the proposed site allocation emphasising its prominent location for visitors. They advocate for affordable flats or cottages that uphold high architectural standards to complement the town's character.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy wording specifies that consideration should be given to the design, massing and layout including the provision of private outdoor spaces and that

the built-form should be no greater than 2.5-storeys in height and could provide flatted and/or maisonette accommodation.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Policy wording includes that development shall not lead to a net loss in parking provision unless it can be demonstrated that such provision is not needed to serve the locality

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health and community provisions

Policy SDA19 Land at Forest Road, Midhurst (previously CH217)

Number of comments on policy: 7

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
2	1	1	0	2	1

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Seven comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Access and Traffic Concerns: Single access via Forest Road would increase pressure on narrow residential roads (Forest Road and Holmbush Way) already congested with street parking, HGVs, buses, and pedestrians, creating safety risks and potential delays for emergency vehicles.

Pedestrian and Cycle Safety: The same route is the only pedestrian/cycle access and is heavily used by children walking to school.

Infrastructure Capacity: No clear plan for additional infrastructure; local schools and medical facilities are already under strain and may not accommodate extra demand.

Parking Provision: Strong need to adhere to parking requirements to prevent overspill onto Forest Road, worsening congestion.

Local Amenities: Limited local shopping options; residents would need to travel further for major supermarkets, increasing economic and environmental impacts.

Environment Agency: no constraints within organisations remit

Natural England: Support, no comments

Midhurst Town Council: consider the site appropriate for affordable housing only

Friends of South Downs: Strongly Support

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Policy wording requires that development should not lead to a net loss in parking provision unless it can be demonstrated that such provision is not needed to serve the locality.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health and community provisions

Policy SDA20 Former Bus Depot, Pitsham Lane, Midhurst (previously CH218)

Number of comments on policy: 13

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
2	3	1	1	1	5

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raised concerns about the potential loss of natural features and visual amenity, including the removal of tree screens and an unattractive building design, alongside risks from increased construction traffic such as noise, pollution and safety issues. They noted that a rise in vehicles on narrow residential roads—also used by pedestrians and cyclists - could affect emergency access and contribute to congestion, while alternative routes like Apple Tree Road were seen as offering some relief. Some respondents questioned the intensity of new housing given its impact on local schools, healthcare, and community facilities, with current plans not addressing these service pressures. There were also reservations about shared access routes and the need for dedicated pathways, mixed views on the extent of community consultation.

Key Themes raised:

- Environmental Impacts and Visual Amenity
- Traffic and Safety Impacts
- Site Suitability and Development Intensity
- Alternative Access Solutions and Route Design

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

n/a.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a.

Parish / Town Councils

Midhurst Town Council support the proposed site allocation.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Vehicular Access to be provided from Apple Tree Road
- A public active travel link to be provided from Apple Tree Road to the Pitsham Lane bridleway through the site

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health and community provisions

Policy SDA21 Land east of Pitsham Lane, Midhurst (previously CH165)

Number of comments on policy: 42

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	1	3	9	7	21

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents noted that increased traffic from construction, delivery, heavy goods and private vehicles may worsen congestion on narrow local roads and main roads through Midhurst while adding to noise, air pollution and pressure on schools, health care and emergency services. They raised concerns about the greenfield site's suitability, highlighting its location outside the designated settlement boundary and potential adverse effects on flood risk areas, ancient woodland and natural vistas, which could conflict with planning policies. Other comments focused on environmental risks such as habitat fragmentation and degraded water quality, as well as safety issues on routes that may require road widening. Feedback also pointed to worries over housing scale and design straining local facilities, alongside criticisms of a planning process marked by limited public consultation and ambiguous terminology, with additional comments addressing construction noise, loss of agricultural land and changes to the town's character.

Key Themes raised:

- Traffic and Infrastructure Impact
- Site Suitability and Planning Policy Compliance
- Environmental and Biodiversity Impact
- Access and Vehicular Safety
- Landscape and Countryside Character
- Housing Scale and Design Considerations
- Community and Local Services Impact

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** notes the site is close to Flood Zone 2 and 3 and supports allocation criteria e). The site is also located on an historic landfill (Pitsham Rough), so they recommend policy criteria should include that any contaminated land issues require adequate assessment. **Natural England** note the site is adjacent to ancient woodland, and reference should be made to Policy SD11.4.

District / Borough / County Council

West Sussex County Council recommends Holmbush Way as the main vehicular access due to narrow, unsafe roads on Hornbeam Way and Hawthorn Close. While active travel access is feasible, widening existing roads is impractical. Pedestrian

access to Holmbush Way would also improve bus connectivity to Midhurst and Chichester via Downview Drive.

Parish / Town Councils

Cocking Parish Council object to the site's inclusion in Regulation 18 due to landscape harm, loss of agricultural land, biodiversity risks, environmental impact, poor highway access, and disruption to dark skies. Concerns include damage to bat habitats, flooding risks, and unsafe road conditions, making development inappropriate for the area. **Midhurst Town Council** object to the proposed site allocation and assert that the site is a rural exception site for affordable housing

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Additional consultation and technical review were undertaken with the highway authority and policy wording developed to include vehicular and pedestrian via Hornbeam Way, the inclusion of a requirement for a pedestrian link onto Holmbush Way, and provision of an active travel connection on to Pitsham Lane Bridleway
- Incorporating specific buffering requirements for both the watercourse and ancient woodland on the eastern boundary
- Inclusion of policy wording to require a contaminated land survey and mitigation if required
- Inclusion of supporting text which recommends the provision of smaller, higher density building typologies
- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Indicative capacity set at 50 homes
- Incorporating specific buffering requirements for both the watercourse and ancient woodland on the eastern boundary
- Detailed landscape and design requirements with specific reference to the boundaries and the provision of a landscape-led masterplan

Policy SDA22 Land at former Easebourne School (previously CH203)

Number of comments on policy: 20

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	2	0	5	5	7

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raised concerns over local services and infrastructure, highlighting current issues with water, healthcare and school capacities, and a narrow, congested rural road could be further strained by additional development. Concerns were raised about the potential impact of additional traffic on Easebourne Street. Respondents were also concerned about potential impacts to local landscape character and the Easebourne Conservation Area. They noted that adding 8–10 dwellings on a 0.7ha green field may lead to overdevelopment that contrasts with the area’s low-density rural context and could affect privacy, visual prominence and the established character of local heritage assets. Several points mentioned risks to environmental quality and biodiversity, including the loss of mature trees, ponds and agricultural land, as well as increased impermeable surfaces that might worsen drainage and flood risks.

Key Themes raised:

- Community Services & Local Infrastructure
- Scale & Density
- Heritage & Landscape Character
- Environmental & Biodiversity Impact
- Traffic, Access & Safety
- Design Integration & Visual Impact
- Water Supply Issues

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support the proposed allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment. The **Environment Agency** says no constraints have been identified within their remit.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a

Parish / Town Councils

Easebourne Parish Council raise concerns about heritage impact, traffic safety, loss of mature trees, flooding risks, and water shortages. The narrow roads and lack of pavements make pedestrian access dangerous, while the site’s development

contradicts the Parish Council's priorities for protecting open spaces and improving drainage.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- The indicative capacity has been set at 9 homes, representing 13 dwellings per hectare
- Policy includes wording related to transition from Local Plan allocation SD68 into SDA22.
- Policy wording requires that the road layout must not facilitate access to land to the north.
- Policy wording to protect trees on or directly adjacent to the site boundary.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Health, Education and Community provision

Policy SDA23 Midhurst Community Hospital and 1-2 Rotherfield Mews (previously CH147)

Number of comments on policy: 28

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	3	2	6	9	8

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents expressed divided views on repurposing 1–2 Rotherfield Mews and the Community Hospital Site. Some propose that a detailed ecological and landscape assessment could support its use for care or retirement units or the redevelopment of the Rotherfield Mews part of the site might offer affordable housing for medical staff. However, concerns were raised regarding safe access to the site and overdevelopment of the site which is already narrow and provides vital local services such as the GP surgery and pharmacy. There was concern regarding reduced essential parking, and compromised safe access, particularly when proposed road widening might affect mature trees and green spaces. Many warned that increased residential and care developments could strain the GP surgery and pharmacy, and more widely and cumulative impact of development in Easebourne and Midhurst on local infrastructure and may intensify traffic congestion on routes like the A286. , There were calls for a comprehensive masterplan that aligns with established planning and environmental guidelines and ensures clearer, more consistent consultation. Economic implications were noted, including potential challenges to local job prospects and housing affordability, as well as additional pressure on schools and other community assets.

Key Themes raised:

- Site Appropriateness and Land Use Compatibility
- Impact on Local Healthcare Infrastructure
- Traffic, Access, and Parking
- Cumulative Impact on Local Infrastructure and Services
- Environmental and Ecological Considerations
- Housing Density and Overdevelopment

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** notes the site has Flood Zone 2 within the site boundary and is close to Flood Zone 3 extents and supports allocation criteria e) . They also note this site is within Source Protection Zones 1,2 and 3, and recommend policy wording to ensure no significant harm to be caused to groundwater resources.

Natural England support this proposed allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a.

Parish / Town Councils

Easebourne Parish Council objects to this site allocation, due to inadequate access roads, strain on medical services, high density, parking concerns, and loss of mature trees. The proposal lacks consultation with Riverbank Medical Centre, and residents worry it would limit future expansion of medical facilities in the area. **Midhurst Town Council** object to housing development on this site, advocating for its retention as a medical facility due to parking shortages, expansion limitations, and staff recruitment issues. If housing is considered, it should be affordable, with Rotherfield Mews converted for nursing/medical staff accommodation.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Inclusion of policy wording regarding flood mitigation, buffering to the River Rother and provision of sustainable drainage systems
- The site allocation is for Residential Institution (Class C2) with an indicative capacity of a 66 bed care home.
- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- The site allocation is for Residential Institution (Class C2) with an indicative capacity of a 66 bed care home.
- The supporting text clarifies that allocation for use as a Residential Institution (Class C2) would allow for use as either a care home or as a hospital facility, including the provision of convalescence facilities.
- Inclusion of policy wording which requires a holistic approach to access, circulation for pedestrian and vehicles, and parking provision which integrates with the Riverbank Medical Centre and Pharmacy.

Policy SDA24 Land west of Budgenor Lodge, Easebourne (previously CH206)

Number of comments on policy: 57

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	0	1	8	24	23

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raise concerns about access to the site and note that development could worsen current traffic, access and safety issues, with narrow, poorly maintained routes such as Hollist Lane, Canada Grove and Hazelwood Close expected to face increased congestion and risks for vulnerable road users. Concerns extend to local infrastructure and services, including schools and medical centres, which may not cope with additional demand, while overdevelopment and an expanded settlement boundary could further strain community resources and convert valuable agricultural land. There are also worries that increased density and intrusive design may affect the heritage and visual amenity of sites like Budgenor Lodge and other existing properties to the south and east of the site, alongside a potential loss of local wildlife habitats and degradation of the natural environment. In addition, respondents question elements of the planning process, citing insufficient public consultation, policy overlap and risks related to flooding, drainage and ground stability, as well as issues such as noise, light pollution and an unbalanced housing mix.

Key Themes raised:

- Traffic, Access and Safety Challenges
- Pressure on Local Infrastructure and Services
- Overdevelopment and Settlement Boundary Pressure
- Agricultural Land Loss
- Heritage and Visual Amenity
- Wildlife and Biodiversity Impacts
- Flooding, Drainage and Ground Stability

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** encourage early consideration of how foul water will be managed for this site. They also note this site is within Source Protection Zones 2 and 3, and recommend policy wording to ensure no significant harm to be caused to groundwater resources.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a.

Parish / Town Councils

Easebourne Parish Council raise concerns regarding loss of active farmland, harm to a bat corridor, proximity to a listed building, flood risks, stability concerns, and unsafe road access. Residents fear it contradicts heritage protections, worsens parking shortages, and endangers pedestrian safety.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Requirement for pre-application bank stability testing on the eastern boundary
- Requirement for the provision of pre-application bat surveys

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Requirement for pre-application bank stability testing on the eastern boundary
- Requirement for the provision of pre-application bat surveys
- Requirement for design to positively address the site contours and the interrelationship between the site and existing residential properties on the southern and eastern boundaries.
- Requirement that the layout does not facilitate vehicular access into the adjacent fields
- The supporting text notes the need for a robust construction management plan with particular attention required to access arrangements

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health and community provisions

Policy SDA26 Land at Rotherbridge Lane. Petworth (previously CH092/93)

Number of comments on policy: 10

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	2	4	1	0	2

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents noted that the development lacks sufficient natural screening, defined boundaries, and the trees and hedgerows that currently safeguard existing vegetation belts, potentially affecting countryside views and character. They stressed the need for robust sustainable design measures, including water neutrality and enhanced planting, although the site's limited size may impede effective transitions.

Recommendations included formalising links with adjoining parcels and upgrading non-motorised pathways, with some connections seen as offering only limited benefits. Concerns were raised over the retention of key hedgerows, inconsistencies with current planning policies, the preservation of historic public open space, and issues regarding transport access and parking.

Key Themes raised:

- Landscape and Visual Amenity
- Sustainable Design and Environmental Mitigation
- Connectivity and Active Travel Infrastructure
- Site Boundaries and Integration
- Community and Local Amenity Impact

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support the proposed allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a

Parish / Town Councils

Petworth Town Council raise concerns about access to Station Road (A285) and parking availability.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Requirement for a holistic approach to junction development on Station Road

- Retraction of the developable area (and associated reduction in indicative capacity) into the original farmstead area to retain Mile House as a 'gateway' to Petworth from the south.
- Requirement to provide public access to the area south of Rotherbridge Lane to include space to dwell to enjoy views towards The Downs to the south.
- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Requirement to retain and enhance Rotherbridge Lane as a public right of way and support future network development in the area for pedestrians and cyclists.

Policy SDA27 Land north of Northend Close, Petworth (previously CH096)

Number of comments on policy: 5

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	1	2	0	2	0

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Five comments were made on this site. The following matters were raised:

Flood Risk

There is currently flooding into nearby gardens. Concern is raised that new houses will reduce permeable soil, worsening drainage and flooding. The Environment Agency identifies no constraints on the site within their remit.

Access & Traffic

The proposed site lacks direct access, and the development would increase traffic on already narrow, congested roads where parking is already problematic.

Public Open Space provision

The National Trust does not object to development in principle but raises concerns about insufficient public open space in Petworth. Previous reliance on the historic park for recreation has created pressure on Trust land intended as a historic landscape. Support for policy criterion (a) requiring open space provision within the allocation site.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Clarification of drainage design requirements and opportunities for an integrated approach with NDP Allocation site PWS4 Land east of Hampers Common Industrial Estate.

Policy SDA35 East Street Farm, Amberley (previously HO037-38)

Number of comments on policy: 126

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	4	0	23	32	67

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents noted that the proposed transport arrangements using narrow village streets may not accommodate both construction and additional resident vehicles, potentially increasing congestion and compromising safety. They highlighted that adding 25–45 dwellings could overwhelm local infrastructure, erode Amberley’s historic character, and reduce green open spaces, with some suggesting that development be focused on the bottom field. Concerns were also raised over ageing utilities—including electricity, water, and sewage systems—and the risk of increased flooding due to additional impermeable surfaces. Feedback also warned of potential harm to a rare chalk stream, disruption to wildlife habitats, and loss of valued visual features, while heritage concerns focused on the erosion of traditional rural aesthetics and protected views. Additional comments questioned compliance with settlement boundaries and called for greater transparency and further assessments in relation to landscape, flood risk, and sustainability.

Key Themes raised:

- Transport, Access and Safety
- Community Character and Social Sustainability
- Infrastructure and Utility Capacity
- Environmental and Habitat Protection
- Heritage and Landscape Integrity
- Scale and Alternative Development Options
- Flood Risk and Drainage

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support subject to a detailed landscape assessment. The policy should reference Policy NEW3, ensuring an appraisal for wintering Bewick Swan within 5km of Arun Valley SPA. Additionally, given the site's proximity to Amberley Wild Brooks SSSI, an added criterion should require impact assessments and mitigation measures for designated sites.

District / Borough / County Council

West Sussex County Council to consider improving existing frequency for bus services on East Street to twice daily, to attract more bus trips from the development, subject to viability considerations. **Horsham District Council (landowner)** support the proposed site allocation recognizing its role in addressing local housing needs.

Clarification on development scale is requested to guide affordable housing, infrastructure, and open space provision. Early engagement with providers is emphasized for transport, education, utilities, and local power grid resilience.

Parish / Town Councils

Amberley Parish Council objects to the proposed site allocation citing overwhelming community opposition, environmental concerns, and policy conflicts. A survey showed 94% oppose 45 houses, with strong preference for green communal space. Concerns include road access, infrastructure strain, and landscape impact, with support for a nature reserve and community centre. The current road access is considered unsafe.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy references Policy SDN4 Arun Valley Functionally Linked Habitat

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Indicative capacity for 20 homes
- Vehicular access to be provided from Station Road
- Improvement to pedestrian routes across the site.
- Provision for a building to accommodate a community hall and village shop
- Requirement for pre-application infiltration testing and the layout of the scheme should include measures to improve current water management systems.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health and community provisions

Policy SDA39 Land East of Coombe Crescent, Bury (previously CH003)

Number of comments on policy: 20

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	2	2	3	7	6

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents state that the proposed site allocation fails to comply with both local and national planning guidelines by supporting development on agricultural greenfield land instead of prioritising brownfield sites. They note that the proposal would undermine the rural character, compromise important views and heritage assets, and introduce a high density of dwellings that may overwhelm local infrastructure. Concerns also arise over transport and accessibility, with limited public services and unsafe pedestrian routes, while issues related to wildlife, biodiversity, flood risks and environmental impacts are seen as significant challenges. Additional points include uncertainties in planning terminology and mapping.

Key Themes raised:

- Planning Policy Compliance
- Landscape, Heritage and Visual Amenity
- Agricultural Land and Rural Character
- Overdevelopment and Density
- Transport and Accessibility
- Local Community Infrastructure
- Wildlife and Biodiversity
- Environmental and Flood Risk

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** note this site has a small area of Flood Zone 3 and supports allocation criteria h). **Natural England** support this proposed allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a

Parish / Town Councils

Bury Parish Council object to this proposed allocation, due to policy conflicts, density, transport concerns, and landscape impact. While housing is needed, the Council insists development should enhance, not exploit the village. They support reassessing site CH192 (Bury Manor Farm).

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Inclusion of a developable area which does not include flood zones 2 & 3, and specific policy requirements related to flood mitigation and drainage requirements.
- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Inclusion of a developable area and access requirements which clarify the location of development and how it will be accessed.
- Inclusion of specific policy detail related to continued provision of public rights of way 753 and 754.
- Inclusion of specific policy detail related to buffering for the River Arun and contribution to the Arun Valley Site of Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Local Wildlife Site.
- Inclusion of specific policy detail relating to the relationship between new development and properties with rear gardens which border the site.

Policy SDA41 Land east of A286 and north of Mill Lane, Cocking (previously CH199)

Number of comments on policy: 89

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
1	2	2	17	33	34

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents noted that the proposed 25-house development—a 13% increase in existing housing stock—would impact the character and historic nature of Cocking, further strain Cocking’s limited community amenities and infrastructure, with concerns over parking shortages, heightened road safety risks on the busy A286, and persistent utility issues such as water, sewerage and power problems. They argued that additional street lighting could worsen light pollution in an area prized for its international dark sky reserve status, while the development is also seen as risking irreversible damage to the landscape, heritage and wildlife, including threats to a rare chalk stream, ancient woodland and key wildlife corridors. Feedback further highlighted inconsistencies in planning policy, procedural shortcomings, and the potential for cumulative impacts from future expansion that may undermine established local services and conservation objectives.

Key Themes raised:

- Community and Local Amenity Impact
- Infrastructure, Utilities and Local Services
- Landscape, Visual Amenity and Heritage
- Wildlife, Biodiversity and Environmental Integrity
- Traffic, Access and Road Safety
- Planning Policy Consistency and Strategic Objectives
- Future Expansion and Cumulative Impact
- Dark Night Sky and Special Environmental Designations

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** notes there are no constraints on this site within the Environment Agency’s remit. **Natural England** note the site is adjacent to ancient woodland, and reference should be made to Policy SD11.4.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a.

Parish / Town Councils

Cocking Parish Council object to the site's inclusion in Regulation 18 due to landscape harm, harm to the relatively unchanged historic core and conservation

area of Cocking, negative impact on settlement pattern, extending development into the countryside, impact on key views, would impact experiential and amenity qualities from the A286, South Downs Way and other public footpaths, lack of mature boundary to the north to mitigate impact of development, loss of agricultural land, biodiversity risks and environmental impact especially in regards the chalk stream, poor highway access and urbanising impacts of upgrading highways access, and disruption to dark skies.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Provision of policy wording to require appropriate buffering for the Costers Brook watercourse, its riparian zone, and the adjacent ancient woodland habitat to the east.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Provision of a developable area which does not include the area to the north of the expected vehicular access point to protect views to the south east from the A286
- Provision of policy wording to require appropriate buffering for the Costers Brook watercourse, its riparian zone, and the adjacent ancient woodland habitat to the east. Additional supporting text detailing likely species and detail offsetting requirements has also been provided.
- Supporting text supporting public footpath provision and public open space as part of an integrated approach to drainage and green infrastructure provision.

Policy SDA46 Land at Hawksfold, Fernhurst (previously CH026)

Number of comments on policy: 32

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	5	2	2	21	2

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents detailed concerns that the proposal may reduce green spaces and public footpaths, disrupt the rural outlook, and strain local infrastructure, particularly on narrow routes such as Hawksfold Lane East. They highlighted that increased traffic could pose safety risks for pedestrians and local users. However it was also noted that even a modest development might not fully reflect the site’s potential, as technical assessments suggest capacity for more dwellings. Additional comments focused on potential impacts to scenic views and wildlife habitats, issues with access on private roads now used as public paths, non-compliance with established planning guidelines, and shortcomings in the consultation process, with several respondents questioning communication and the clarity of proposal details.

Key Themes raised:

- Community and Local Amenity Impact
- Traffic and Road Infrastructure
- Landscape and Countryside Character
- Scale and Density of Development
- Access and Safety Issues
- Environmental and Ecological Impact

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Natural England support this proposed allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment. The **Environment Agency** said there were no constraints noted within their remit.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a

Parish / Town Councils

Fernhurst Parish Council strongly objects to the Hawksfold site allocation, citing community opposition to creeping development, lack of special circumstances, and insufficient affordable housing provision. The Council insists any development must align with Fernhurst Neighbourhood Plan policies and continues to uphold their prior Local Plan Review submissions, including the Parish Priority Statement.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Inclusion of both specific policy wording and detailed supporting text regarding the design approach for the access arrangement, the use of shared space principles, and integration of Public Right of Way 1263.
- Inclusion of specific policy wording regarding buffers for the adjacent parcels of ancient woodland.

Policy SDA50 Former Allotments north of The Quadrangle, Findon (previously AR009)

Number of comments on policy: 7

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
0	4	0	0	1	2

Summary of issues and key themes raised

There were seven comments on this site. The main issues raised were:

Some support for development of the site, acknowledging that it is separated from Findon Village by the A24 but lies next to existing housing and commercial units, with modest local services nearby and broader amenities accessible via an hourly bus to Findon Valley and Worthing.

There are no constraints on this site within the **Environment Agency's** remit. **Natural England** support the allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment. **Adur District Council** request engagement with infrastructure providers to address potential landscape, traffic, and service impacts.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Inclusion of a requirement to contribute towards a pedestrian crossing facility on the A24.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Inclusion of requirement to contribute towards a pedestrian crossing facility on the A24.

Policy SDA59 Land West of The Street, Lodsworth (previously CH215)

Number of comments on policy: 85

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
2	1	1	10	51	20

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents questioned the suitability of designating agricultural, greenfield and historically significant rural land for residential development, noting that such change could erode the area's agricultural, ecological and heritage values while risking further pressure on protected green spaces. Concerns were raised over increased traffic on narrow, congested roads that currently lack sufficient pedestrian, cycling and public transport facilities, potentially compromising road safety and straining local infrastructure and services. Respondents also highlighted that the development might disrupt the village's historic pattern and visual landscape by obscuring valued views and heritage assets, while causing irreversible environmental impacts such as damage to wildlife habitats and natural features. Furthermore, there were apprehensions that the policy could set a precedent for additional development beyond established boundaries, with cumulative social and economic implications.

Key Themes raised:

- Land Use and Site Suitability
- Transport, Access and Traffic Safety
- Connectivity issues and infrastructure strain
- Heritage and Village Character
- Visual Impact and Landscape
- Environmental and Biodiversity Impacts

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** encourage early consideration of how foul water will be managed for this site. **Natural England** support the proposed site allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment.

District / Borough / County Council

n/a.

Parish / Town Councils

Lodsworth Parish Council strongly objects to this proposed site allocation due to landscape sensitivity, harm to historic setting, poor access, disruption to local businesses, and lack of housing need.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy requires that the development does not prejudice the continued functionality of the New Langham Borehole.
- Provision of a Public Right of Way from the northeastern corner of the site where it connects with The Street (and Public Right of Way 1085), following the eastern field boundary, and connecting into the eastern corner of Old Langham Farm via the site
- Policy requires that the scheme reflects and retains the isolated farmstead character of Old Langham Farm.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- New public right of way required to have surfacing suitable for year-round use, field margin planting, properties will front onto the new footpath where it enters the development to provide natural surveillance. Appropriate pedestrian wayfinding to be provided.
- Boundary treatments which are visible from the public realm, including Public Right of Way 1085, shall be formed of characteristic walls and/hedging.
- Supporting text notes the need to support Lodsworth as a 'dark village'.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Education, health and community provisions

Policy SDA62 Land west of Valentines Lea, Northchapel (previously CH074)

Number of comments on policy: 51

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
4	1	3	5	16	22

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raised concerns over community infrastructure, with some suggesting that a higher local population could support amenities such as schools, pubs, shops, and community clubs, while others noted a lack of essential services and the risk of strained traffic, parking, water pressure, and drainage systems. They highlighted that additional housing might increase vehicle numbers and complicate access on narrow or hazardous routes, potentially impacting the safety of local children, elderly residents, and pets. Environmental issues were also noted, including the potential loss of wildlife habitats, mature trees, and green corridors, alongside fears of worsened drainage and flooding due to reduced permeable surfaces. Preservation of productive agricultural land was seen as vital for local food security and the countryside character, although some commented on the need for affordable housing despite concerns over transport, employment, and empty properties. Further points included worries about temporary construction impacts—such as noise, dust, and safety hazards—and criticisms of the planning process for its limited consultation and short notification periods, with additional remarks on potential loss of privacy and diminished aesthetic qualities.

Key Themes raised:

- Community Infrastructure and Local Amenities
- Traffic, Parking and Access Safety
- Environmental and Ecological Impact
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Agricultural Land Use and Countryside Preservation
- Housing Demand and Affordability
- Construction Impacts and Temporary Disruption
- Planning Process and Stakeholder Engagement

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

Environment Agency encourage early consideration of how foul water will be managed for this site. **Natural England** note this site allocation is adjacent to ancient woodland, and recommend reference to Policy SD11.4.

District / Borough / County Council

West Sussex County Council suggest extension of existing shared use path into the Northchapel site as a policy requirement for the site allocation.

Parish / Town Councils

Northchapel Parish Council objects to the proposed site allocation due to flood risks and unsafe road access. While recognizing local housing needs, they suggest an alternative rejected site (CH266), believing it could be viable if concerns about buffer zones and sewage works are addressed.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Inclusion of specific policy requirements related to connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists via Public Rights of Way NOC-589-1, NOC-589, NOC-823 and the A283

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Inclusion of two vehicular access options within the policy
- Inclusion of specific policy requirements related to connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists via Public Rights of Way NOC-589-1, NOC-589, NOC-823 and the A283
- Inclusion of specific policy requirement to integrate drainage measures which improve drainage management for properties at the northern end of Valentines Lea.
- Inclusion of specific policy requirement to provide offsite improvements to public open spaces including those fronted by properties 26-34 and 43-52 Valentines Lea and within the centre of the Valentines Lea development.
- Inclusion of specific policy requirement to including the provision of a public open space with a circular walking route on the western side of the site. The policy also includes provision to allow the delivery of allotments in this area to meet local need if required.

Policy SDA72 Land off Steepdown Road, Sompting (previously AD001)

Number of comments on policy: 114

Reaction to Regulation 18 Consultation

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not stated
3	2	1	2	65	41

Summary of issues and key themes raised

Respondents raised concerns that additional development may worsen traffic congestion and strain local infrastructure, citing narrow, poorly maintained roads, limited public transport and insufficient drainage, healthcare and educational services. They warned that converting greenfield land would risk irreversible damage to established wildlife habitats and local ecosystems, while contributing to overdevelopment in an already heavily built-up area. Comments also highlighted potential losses to cherished landscape, heritage and visual amenity in a nationally protected landscape and questioned whether a modest housing mix meets planning policy criteria for exceptional local benefit. Additional issues include increased flood risk due to inherent site conditions, and broader impacts on property values and community character.

Key Themes raised:

- Traffic and Local Infrastructure
- Environmental and Biodiversity Impact
- Housing Need and Overdevelopment
- Landscape, Heritage and Visual Amenity
- Planning Policy Compliance and Exceptional Benefit
- Community Services and Local Amenities
- Site Conditions and Flood Risk

Summary of feedback from specific stakeholders:

National group or organisation

The **Environment Agency** note this site has a small section within Source Protection Zones 1,2 and 3, and recommend policy criteria wording accordingly. **Natural England** support the proposed site allocation subject to detailed landscape assessment.

District / Borough / County Council

Arun District Council notes the proposed site near Sompting and is keen to collaborate with SDNPA as proposals for the site are further developed. The Council also notes poor transport and amenities for a care home option.

Parish / Town Councils

n/a.

Overview of SDNPA response and way forward for the Local Plan

Changes made in response to comments from statutory consultees;

- Policy has been amended to provide an indicative capacity for only C3 Housing provision.
- Inclusion of text requiring the protection of groundwater resources.

Changes made in response to comments from the public;

- Inclusion of specific policy detail related to the landscaping of the edge of the site and its transition to open countryside and the provision of public open space directly adjacent to Steepdown Road.

Whilst the following concerns are noted, these are beyond the remit of the Local Plan and cannot be addressed through planning policy. They may be delivered through other mechanisms such as the Community Infrastructure Levy or wider infrastructure programmes.

- Wider area transport concerns
- Community/Education/Health services provision