

## Appendix D

Updated May 2026

## Assessment outcomes for 'Rejected' sites

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
AD005	Land north of Holmbush Close	Southwick	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on biodiversity and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity due to the limited public viewpoints and low level of the site in relation to surrounding topography. The views to/from the north and west areas would need to be investigated further. The east and north-east areas would be visually prominent compared to the existing residential properties off Holmbush Close to the south.	The site is within 250m of a historic landfill site. The site is downland pasture, is located in a biodiversity opportunity area (BOA), and includes nesting biodiversity action plan (BAP) species. Further research is needed to understand if mitigation could overcome biodiversity concerns. The higher ground in the east and north-east areas is visually prominent compared to existing residential development to the south.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AD006	Land north and east of Hill Farm Way	Southwick	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to the size of the site dominating the hillside in a prominent and highly visible location with exceptional levels of public access and connectivity across the A27 to the National Park beyond. The smaller proposed developable area in the south-west also has a high landscape sensitivity. The slope upwards towards the north and east does cover some longer distance views and the site is open from the PRoW network (north and west) and longer distance views to the west, as well as connection to the wider landscape.	The site is adjacent to Local Wildlife Sites (north and east) and a historic landfill site (west) and is bound by - and includes - the PRoW network. The impact of development on the historic farmstead in the south-west corner would need further consideration. The proposed developable area in the south-west is assessed as highly sensitive in landscape terms (see above) and, for this reason, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
AD008	Halewick Lane	Sompting	Rejected	The site is not available for residential development and is not suitable for residential development due to its poor relationship with the defined settlement boundary.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity due to its previously developed land (PDL) character, its location in a dip in the slope, and the heavy tree screening around its perimeter.	There is potential for development but not residential development. This is because the site is disconnected from the defined settlement boundary and other development uses may be more appropriate given its location and previous uses.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites by a third party. There has been no evidence provided to suggest that the site is available for residential development. The Notice on the access gate indicates that the site is being developed by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) as an energy storage facility.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AR001	Arundel Stables, Park Place	Arundel	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its location within the conservation area, in a prominent location beyond the existing settlement which would open views into development and significantly alter the setting of the town in views from the south and west. The site is highly visible from Park Place due to topography.	The site is within 250m of a Historic Landfill Site. The site is not considered to be suitable due to its location within the conservation area, its close proximity to a number of listed buildings, its topography, and surrounding roads.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development. It is noted that the stables are in operation.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to an acceptable access off A284.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
AR004	Sawmill, Arundel Park	Arundel	Rejected	The site is in active employment use and redevelopment would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its location within the Arundel Castle Registered Park and Garden. Although previously developed land, the site is sensitive to residential development due to potential negative impacts on the surrounding parkscape character.	The site is within a Grade II* registered park and garden. It is in close proximity to a Scheduled Ancient Monument and adjacent to the conservation area. The site is in close proximity to a Special Site of Scientific Interest (east) and Monarch's Way runs within 12m of the site (east). The site is not suitable on heritage grounds and the potential impact on heritage assets. Development would also lead to loss of employment land.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AR013	Land rear of Pony Farm Training Stables	Findon	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium/high landscape sensitivity due to edge of downland location, poor access, and impact on PRow which runs along the settlement edge. Views to the east are sensitive from the wider downland however a belt of mature trees currently restricts views into and out of the site. The site and neighbouring fields currently provide a rural edge to the built-up area and setting for the village. An appeal decision in 2019 found that "at a localised level there would be a degree of harm on the ground through the loss of part of a rural landscape which provides a setting for the village and contributes positively to its character."	The site is adjacent to existing residential development on the sensitive eastern side of the settlement. There is a PRow to south of the site. Given the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable for residential development due to the effect of development on the character and appearance of the landscape.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development but there has been recent planning activity on the site.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
AR015	Findon Manor Hotel, High Street	Findon	Rejected	The site is in active use as a hotel and is not available for residential development.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its historic continuity and prominent position on the High Street.	The site is in a sustainable location and comprises a Grade II listed building (hotel) and its curtilage. The boundary is composed of mature trees covered by a group Tree Preservation Order. There will be constraints associated with the listed building status and the works required for conversion of the building. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review (as it is in active use as a hotel) but could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, heritage considerations, robust marketing and/or evidence of finances, occupancy rates, anticipated future trends, and how residential redevelopment could help to sustain the main hotel business.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development. It is in active use as a hotel and recent planning permission for a wedding pergola indicates continuation of existing use.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AR016	Land between A24 and High Street	Findon	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its scale and sensitive location in relation to the PRow network, mature trees, and relationship with Findon Place.	The site is adjacent to listed buildings on the High Street and crossed by a group Tree Preservation Order. There are PRowS – and a local green space - running across the site. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
AR019	Steep Side, Cross Lane	Findon	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity due to potential impacts in relation to access and existing trees.	The site could be suitable for a modest number of homes subject to sensitive design which retains mature trees on site and maintains the character of the area.	Yes	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AR020	Findon Towers, Cross Lane	Findon	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity due to potential impacts in relation to access and existing trees.	The whole site is covered by group Tree Preservation Order which is expected to restrict development to the centre of the site, on and around the footprint of the existing dwelling. The site may be suitable for extension and conversion or redevelopment on and around the existing footprint.	Yes	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AR021	Crossways , Priory Cottage and Well Cottage, Cross Lane	Findon	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity due to potential impacts in relation to access and existing trees.	The site comprises three large residential plots surrounded by mature trees. The site is considered to be suitable for a small number of additional dwellings.	Yes	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to an appropriate and safe access.	Yes
AR025	Land north of Lample House	Wepham	Rejected	The site is not considered suitable to yield 5 (net) dwellings or more.	Wepham is a small cluster of dwellings and farmsteads around the intersection of routeways above the river valley of the Arun. The settlement pattern is loose and diverse with some buildings close to the roads and others set back in small groups.	A development of 5+ dwellings on this site would be out of character with this settlement pattern and harmful to the landscape character. The hamlet also lacks any facilities and is not a sustainable location for development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
AR026	Land north of Clapham Street	Clapham	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity due to its size and scale on the dry valley side. It is highly visible and sensitive to development in views from Clapham, the conservation area (both parts), and Patching. The access would also be likely to be detrimental to the surrounding rural character.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk. The site is adjacent to Clapham Wood which includes ancient woodland, is a designated local wildlife site, and is the subject of an area tree preservation order. The site is adjacent to the conservation area and is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings, including a Grade II* listed building to the east. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable for development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AR027	Land at Gosling Croft Business Centre	Clapham	Rejected	The site is in active employment use and is not available for residential development.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity given that it is previously developed land within a small cluster of development within the village envelope of Clapham.	The site comprises an existing employment area within an area tree presentation order and adjacent to ancient woodland. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review (as it is in active employment use) but could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
AR028	Glebe Land at Church Hill	Slindon	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would impact on ancient woodland, the conservation area, and a PRoW, and would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site's size and proportions extend into open countryside, alongside Open Access Land and ancient woodland. Development would impact on a PRoW and the conservation area.	The site is in a mineral consultation area and is adjacent to ancient woodland along its eastern boundary. The site's narrowness means that an adequate buffer zone would need to cover the eastern third of the site, rendering an adequate layout for development hard to achieve. There is a PRoW running north to south through the middle of the site, and part of the site is within the conservation area.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AR032	Land south of Clapham Common (also known as Gravel Pit Field and Loves Corner)	Clapham	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has been previously considered by an Inspector as having a medium landscape sensitivity and being moderately representative of its landscape character area when considering fieldscape, woodland, hedges, and A27 influences. As set out in the officer's report (ref. SDNP/22/03525/FUL), development would result in the loss of characteristic open land which currently acts as a buffer to the A27, and would undermine the character and setting of both Clapham and Clapham Common by spreading and intensifying development uncharacteristically along the A280 Long Furlong.	The site is adjacent to Clapham Common which includes deciduous woodland priority habitat. Planning application ref. SDNP/22/03525/FUL was dismissed on appeal in November 2023.	No	The site is available for development as confirmed by planning application ref. SDNP/22/03525/FUL.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
AR035	Clapham Depot	Clapham	Rejected	The site is active use, is not available for residential development, and is allocated for employment uses in the Clapham NDP.	The site was previously assessed as having a low-to-medium landscape sensitivity. It comprises previously developed land within the village envelope of Clapham.	The site is in active use and is allocated for employment uses under Policy BT3 in the Clapham NDP. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review (as it is in active employment use) but could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AR047	Atalanta and Mayland, Findon Bypass	Findon	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is not considered suitable to yield 5 (net) dwellings or more.	This site was previously assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity owing to its location within the defined settlement boundary of Findon.	The site is located within the defined settlement boundary of Findon. Although the principle of further residential development could be supported, a development of 5 (net) dwellings or more would be inappropriate given the density, building form, positioning, and set back distances of existing residential development. Given the location within the defined settlement boundary, the site could come forward for a reduced number of dwellings subject to an appropriate design, layout and quantum.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
AR059	Findon Garden Centre and land adjacent to south	Findon	Rejected	The part of the site that is suitable is in active commercial use and is not available for residential development.	The north area has a low landscape sensitivity, while the south area has a higher landscape sensitivity. The site is partly hidden from longer distance views, for example from Cissbury Ring, due to established trees around boundaries. The north area – the garden centre, storage yard and car park – is a recent change in the landscape, while the south area - the paddocks - is a longer standing feature of open fields which is more characteristic of the valley bottom in the wider area.	The north area – the garden centre, car park and storage yard - is less sensitive in landscape terms. The opportunity to improve a route through the site, crossing A24, to the rest of village will be key consideration. The redevelopment of the north area is considered suitable, subject to improving links across A24.	Yes (In part)	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and was previously considered to be available for development. However, recent planning permission (ref. SDNP/24/01156/FUL) for the refurbishment of the garden centre buildings confirms that the north area is not available for residential development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AR060	Land between Downview Road and Stable Lane	Findon	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity owing to its proximity to PRow and location in the transition area to open downland. Existing hedgerows provide some enclosure but further planting would not be characteristic of open downland.	PRow along northern boundary and views from PRow to the east. The site is not considered suitable as development would further extend the settlement edge into open downland having an unacceptable impact on landscape character.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
AR061	Land north of Nightingales	Findon	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity due to being relatively well screened from long distance views by existing boundary trees/vegetation and few (if any) historic features. Due to the existing boundary vegetation, development is unlikely to impact negatively on settlement edge.	The site has low landscape sensitivity and development is unlikely to have a negative impact on settlement edge. The site is considered to have potential as a rural exception site notwithstanding securing suitable access.	Yes	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	The site access would need to be secured via the Nightingales and/or The Oval. Further work is required to determine if this is feasible and viable. Otherwise, there is no other reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AR062	Former Findon Fire Station, Horsham Road	Findon	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site has a very low landscape sensitivity given that it is a flat site which retains little or no historic elements within the defined settlement boundary of Findon.	The site is in the defined settlement boundary of Findon and is considered to have very low landscape sensitivity.	Yes	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
AR065	Travis Perkins Builders Merchants	Clapham	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site comprises previously developed land within the village envelope of Clapham.	The site is allocated for 30 dwellings under Policy HD3 in the Clapham NDP.	Yes	In August 2023, the parish council explained that the site was identified for possible development in the Clapham NDP as a windfall site, and that they do not have a contact for the operator. There is no recent evidence that the operator is likely to sell or promote the site for residential redevelopment.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
BR001	Dean Court Road	Rottingdean	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is bound by, and connects to, the PRoW network and Whiteway Lane Local Wildlife Site. The site is in a valley and open to local (across the valley to north-west) and some longer distance views. The site has a role in separating the urban area and the wider downs.	The site is in a valley, open to local and longer distance views, and has a role in separating the urban area and the wider downs. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to further investigation into a suitable vehicular access.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
BR004	Land at Longridge Avenue	Saltdean	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. Although the site is surrounded on three sides by modern development, the change in slope means that it is very open and prominent in longer distance views.	The site is open and prominent in views. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The site promoter has suggested that access could be achieved through the demolition of an existing bungalow at Longridge Avenue.	Yes
CH009	Charlton Sawmill, Knights Hill	Charlton	Rejected	The site is in active employment use. Development would not provide adequate access to local services and would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. The west area is open space, provides good local views, and has medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. The east area contains the existing sawmill and industrial units and has medium landscape sensitivity owing to its elevated position on the valley side, its proximity to an existing important public right of way to the east, and its relationship with the conservation area to the north.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk. The village of Charlton offers no access to local services except for a pub, and there are significant landscape sensitivities associated with the site. In terms of C3 residential use, the site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it is in active employment use. Some of the site could come forward under existing policies, subject to robust marketing and other considerations.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH011	Charlton Farm, Carlton Road	Charlton	Rejected	The site is not available, is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and is in active employment use. Additionally, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity due to its location within the conservation area and its prominent location on the main road through the village. Further advice regarding potential significant cultural heritage impacts is needed.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for chalk, Flood Zones 2 and 3, and the Charlton Conservation Area. There is a Grade II listed building on the site and a number of listed buildings in the vicinity. Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required. At the time of the 2015/16 SHLAA, there had been a recent planning permission for employment uses (Class B8 with B1). The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it is in active employment use. The site could come forward under existing policies, subject to robust marketing and other considerations.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH014	Former East Dean Service Station / Land at Manor Farm House	East Dean	Rejected	The site is in active employment use, the site's entrance is in Flood Zone 2, and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity due to its location within the conservation area and historic core of the village. In a less sensitive location, there would have been potential for the previously developed land status to lower the site's sensitivity. However, this is a prominent site at the entrance to the village and while there may be opportunity to enhance character at this location, careful bespoke design would be required to address the sensitivity.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk and is within 12km of the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC. The site is within the conservation area. The north boundary, site entrance and Charlton Road are within Flood Zone 2, are within the watercourse buffer of the River Lavant, and have potential for surface water flooding. In terms of C3 residential use, the site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review because it is understood to be in active employment use. The site also appears to provide access to several adjacent properties. It is not considered that a development of 5 homes or more can be accommodated without the loss of a viable employment use while accommodating access to adjacent properties and responding positively to the conservation area.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, although there is potential for contamination from the former use as a motor vehicle service station.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH024	Land at Chase Manor Farm	Fernhurst	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would impact on ancient woodland and would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has medium-to-high landscape sensitivity due to its reference as an assart fieldscape, poor access and likely impacts therein, and poor relationship with the settlement pattern of Fernhurst.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for brick clay and within zones for the Ebernoe Common SAC and Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC. There is ancient woodland within the site along the east boundary and protected trees on the north-west boundary. Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. A watercourse runs along the east boundary and this area is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and has identified surface water flood risk.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	It is not clear where a safe access could be achieved.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH025	Fernhurst Glebe	Fernhurst	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, priority habitat woodland and heritage assets due to lack of sensitive access to the site.	The site has high-to-moderate landscape sensitivity due to its relationship, especially in the southern area, with the conservation area and Grade II listed Old Rectory. The site is a designed landscape of informal parkland and former grounds of the Old Rectory. The northern area has a moderate sensitivity due to the surrounding housing development and weaker relationship with the historic core of the village. The southern area has a high sensitivity being within the conservation area and most closely related to the Old Rectory.	The site is covered by a Tree Preservation Order area (69/00458/TPO). The southern area is within the conservation area, and the site is adjacent to three Grade II listed buildings and may have archaeological potential. There is an area of surface water flood risk along the east boundary. The site is within the zones for Ebernoe Common SAC and Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC and a minerals consultation area for brick clay. The current access from busy Haslemere Road is narrow (approx. 3.1m) and the entrance is framed by two curtilage listed gateposts. Demolition would result in loss of significant historic fabric, and widening of the entrance would erode historic and landscape character. An alternative access further north is considered unsuitable given loss of characteristic and important trees, and the proximity of the crossing point and school access. Access from the south via Church Road is not considered suitable due to location in the conservation area, negative impact on the curtilage of the listed buildings, and distance from the location of potential development. Overall, it has not been demonstrated that a suitable access can be delivered that would conserve and enhance local character.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH030	Land on Church Lane	Fittleworth	Rejected	The site is Registered Common Land, is not available, and development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It is not well connected to the settlement and development would extend the built form into the surrounding countryside in a visible and intrusive location. The site is partly within a conservation area and development would impact on the setting of a Grade I listed church. The site is wooded over common and slopes to the south east. The land is elevated above the surrounding roads as is typical of the Greensand Character Area.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for soft sand and there is a local wildlife site adjacent to the south and west. The site is Registered Common Land and is within 5km of a Special Protection Area. Much of site is wooded and the east area is in a conservation area and adjacent to a Grade I listed church. There are a number of PRoWs across and within the site. The site also includes a bowling area and scout/guide building which are of community use. Given all the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site is Registered Common Land (Hesworth Common). There is no evidence that the site is being actively promoted or is available for development.	No	The site is surrounded on two sides by busy roads (A283 and B2138). It would be difficult to arrange access from these roads. Access may also be difficult due to topography. The third side (Church Lane) passes the Grade 1 listed church and is used for parking for church events.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH034	Land north of A283 Upper Street (Sorrel's Farm)	Fittleworth	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the historic landscape, would be contrary to the settlement pattern, and would be difficult to integrate into the village due to the strong boundary features on the southern boundary.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It is on the settlement edge adjacent to the A283 and the Serpents Trail PROW. The site abuts the conservation area to the west and forms part of a medieval field. There is a strong shaw/hedge to the boundary with the A283 which would make it difficult to integrate development with the rest of the village.	The west area is in a mineral consultation area for building stone. The site is well-related to village services, including a community shop and village hall. While there is new in-depth development to the east, most of the development on the north side of the A283 is linear and set back from the road, including some listed buildings. Only part of the agricultural field has been put forward for development and there is no existing boundary feature. Any development would disrupt the medieval field pattern.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH035	Land at Popple Hill Cottage	Graffham	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on ancient woodland and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It is large, currently forms part of the dispersed settlement pattern, and contributes to the experience of a large tract of undeveloped countryside along the PROW network. The road frontage would also truncate this experience within the village.	The site is adjacent to ancient woodland and in close proximity to a local wildlife site. There is a PROW along west and south boundaries. Access to the site is unlikely to be adequate as it currently is. For a site of this scale, access provision is likely to be detrimental to the surrounding rural character and would introduce incongruous urbanising influences.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH036	Land at Graffham (east) / Land opposite Guillod Cottages	Graffham	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its high level of visibility from the village, PRoW and scarp slope, and its assart fieldscape status. The site opens to offer wide views of the surrounding countryside. The site is increasingly sensitive towards the west where the relationship with the adjoining properties becomes weaker. The PRoW appears to be well used as there are good circular routes from the village. The scarp slope is a dominant landform.	The site is adjacent to a conservation area and two Grade II listed buildings. There is a PRoW running along the north boundary. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH037	Land rear of Almshouses	Graffham	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. It is an assart fieldscape, adjacent to a distinctive listed building (Almshouses) and is not well related to the settlement. Access likely to be detrimental to local character.	The site is adjacent to a conservation area and a Grade II listed building. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	Matters regarding access would need to be considered.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH046	Parkers Stables / Land off Pook Lane and Lower Road	East Lavant	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its size and location on rising ground to south of the village. Development would compromise the settlement pattern and the setting of the village and conservation area.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sharp sand and gravel. The site is partly within the conservation area and there are listed buildings adjacent and in close proximity to the site. There is a scheduled ancient monument adjacent to the north. The site is within the 6.5km zone for the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC, the 5km zone for the Solent Coast SPA, and the Western Streams catchment of the Solent. There is a local wildlife site in close proximity to the north. The area of the site that fronts onto Pook Lane and provides access to the site has surface water flood risk (1in30-1in1000). Access along Lower Road / Pook Lane are narrow and of rural character. Improvements to access to facilitate development of the site would not be suitable due to a likely suburbanising effect.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH047	West Lavant Field / Land west of Centurion Way and south of Primary School	Mid Lavant	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site includes a local community space and is in a local gap, and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to the size of the site impacting widely on village character experienced from the surrounding roads, PRoW and viewpoints.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sharp sand and gravel. The site is adjacent to a conservation area and a Grade II listed building. Archaeological investigation prior to any development or during construction may be required. The site is within the 5.6km zone of the Solent Coast SPA and is within the Western Streams catchment of the Solent. Access from the west of the school would have significant negative landscape impacts, while access from the A286 would be more appropriate in landscape terms and in relationship to the village. The northeast area (east of the school) is identified as a local community space (Policy LNDP11) while the remainder of the site is in an identified local gap (Policy LNDP3) in the Lavant NDP.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, although an alternative and suitable access is required.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH048	Land at Fordwater Road	East Lavant	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is important to the settlement pattern and has an impact on the fabric of the conservation area due to its prominent location and distinctive features. The views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sharp sand and gravel. The site is within the conservation area and there are two Grade II listed buildings and a Grade I listed church in close proximity. There is a narrow band of surface water flood risk bisecting the site east-west. Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH049	Land east of Churchmead Close	Mid Lavant	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The expansion of built form into the river valley floor would be inconsistent with the existing development line of the Centurion Way which is a well-chosen line.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sharp sand and gravel. The site is partly within Flood Zone 2 (north) and Flood Zone 3 (east boundary). There is a small area of surface water flood risk within the site (1in30-1in1000). The site is adjacent to a conservation area and there are three Grade II listed buildings adjacent to the site (to the south).	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH054	Land north of Lavant Down Road	Mid Lavant	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its exposed and flat settlement edge location with no surrounding structure in which to host development. The views from the Trundle and surrounding PRow would be affected by the intrusion of development beyond the existing settlement edge.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for sharp sand and gravel, the 6.5km zone of the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC, the 5.6km zone of the Solent Coast SPA, and the Western Streams Solent Catchment. Part of the site's frontage on Lavant Down Road is within Flood Zone 2 and the eastern third of the site is within the future climate risk flood zone area. Part of the site is also identified for surface water flood risk.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH057	Land part of Staple House Farm / Land east of Mid Lavant	Mid Lavant	Rejected	The site is not available, is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The expansion of built form into the river valley floor would be inconsistent with the surrounding settlement pattern and introduce urbanising elements into an otherwise undeveloped landscape feature.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sharp sand and gravel. The site is adjacent to the River Lavant. The site is within Flood Zones 2 and the north area and east boundary are within Flood Zone 3. There is a PRow along the eastern edge of the site.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH062	84, 84A and 86 Petersfield Road	Midhurst	Rejected	The site is not available in its entirety.	The site has a low-to-medium landscape sensitivity. The site does not have wider landscape impact and is within an area of existing housing. Existing trees are important to local amenity on A272.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for soft sand. There is a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) adjacent to the site (west). The site is considered suitable subject to retention and protection of mature trees.	Yes	The site is not in single ownership. One of three landowners has promoted their part of the site for development, but there is currently no evidence that the remainder of the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	Appropriate access directly onto the A272 or via Elmleigh would be feasible but may require the existing signalised pedestrian crossing to be moved. A transport statement would be required to support this proposal. The access arrangements should be reviewed as part of a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH065	Rothersfield	Easebourne	Rejected	The site is in active use as public open space and is not available. If available, development would result in the loss of public open space and would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium landscape sensitivity due to existing uses, local community value and existing trees. The connection to the River Rother Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) is important. The boundary along Dodsley Lane is locally distinctive.	The majority of the site is in Flood Zone 2. The site is in active use as public open space and so development would not be suitable, nor appropriate, unless alternative provision of an equal or better quality was sought. There are many mature trees around the perimeter of the site, which may be important to retain to ensure landscape impact is minimised/mitigated. There is also a local wildlife site adjacent to the site.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH067	Land south of Barlavington Way	Midhurst	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its size and poor relationship with the settlement pattern. Development would extend suburban influences into the wider countryside setting of Midhurst; the existing limit of development being well chosen in relation to the contours of the land. The site forms part of the wooded mosaic setting to the settlement of Midhurst and is visible as a characteristic settlement edge in this area, making a positive contribution to local landscape character.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for soft sand. The whole site is subject to a Tree Preservation Order. Much of the site is priority habitat woodland and the west area is Ancient Woodland. The presence of non-native invasive species such as Rhododendron are noted and would require removal and associated management. The disused Chichester-Midhurst railway line runs through site. The site is within 250m of historic landfill. There are areas of surface water flood risk through the site and the west boundary is within Flood Zones 2 and 3.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH076	Land south of Northchapel and west of A283	Northchapel	Rejected	Development would impact on ancient woodland and would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having high landscape sensitivity due to the assart fieldscape definition of the site, and the high visibility of the site at the entrance of the village. Whilst part of the countryside setting of Northchapel, the entrance to the village is more defined by the trees lining the A283, which ends at the site boundary.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for brick clay and within the 6.5km zone for the Ebernoe Common SAC. The site is highly visible and visually sensitive, and plays a key role in the transition from built development to more open countryside. There is ancient woodland along the north and west boundaries, and these boundaries are also within Flood Zones 2 and 3. A PRoW runs along the south-west and west boundaries.	No	The site was promoted in 2020 and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH077	Land south of Northchapel Primary School	Northchapel	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having high landscape sensitivity due to the assart fieldscape definition of the site, and the high visibility of the site in relation to the village as surrounding open countryside.	The site is highly visible and visually sensitive and plays a key role in the transition from built development to more open countryside. The site is adjacent to the Northchapel Conservation Area and a listed building. The western side is bisected by susceptibility to surface water flooding. The site is within the 6.5km zone for Ebernoe Common SAC and is within a mineral consultation area for brick clay.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH097	Land north of Hampers Common Industrial Estate	Petworth	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It is poorly related to the settlement pattern and relates more strongly to the surrounding countryside. The site is highly visible and contains a number of significant trees including one on the front boundary with the road.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for clay. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH099	Land south of Playing Field / Land south of Petworth Park and A272	Petworth	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a very high landscape sensitivity. It is on the south facing slope of the upper Rother valley, adjoins the conservation area, and forms part of the setting of a registered park and garden and the conservation area. Development would have an unacceptable level of impact on these features and impact on the wider views of the Downs and the registered park and garden.	The site is adjacent to a conservation area and opposite the Grade II listed Petworth Park Wall and Grade I listed Petworth Park (located to the north). There is ancient woodland adjacent to the south west corner. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH101	Land at junction of Tillington Road	Petworth	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It is within a conservation area and is adjacent to, in the setting of, a registered park and garden and various listed buildings. It has a poor relationship with the town for residential development.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for building stone. The site is within a conservation area and is adjacent to, in the setting of, a registered park and garden and various listed buildings.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no available and suitable access. The site is on the corner of a roundabout at a busy location and there does not appear to be an existing and safe access. There are very high walls on the site boundary with the road which could be affected by creating an access to the site.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH102	Grove Road Allotments	Petworth	Rejected	The site is in active use as allotments and is not available. Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It is located in a conservation area and is in active use as allotments providing green infrastructure, local food production, health and wellbeing opportunities, and climate change mitigation. The site is likely to have high landscape value / importance for the local community.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for building stone. The site is in active use as allotments and the current use is considered to be important in terms of the cultural landscape as perceived by the local community. It is also highly sensitive to change due to its physical features, and because it abuts an area of fieldscapes, and also abuts a well-used public right of way.	No	The site is currently in use as allotments. There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, although access will be to Grove Road.	Yes
CH103	Land at Allotments and Scout Hut	Petworth	Rejected	The site is in active use as allotments and a scout hut and is not available. Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. It is vulnerable to views from the conservation area and development could affect the setting of the conservation area. Access and levels are likely to be an issue (for Sheepdown Drive) with existing hedgerows and trees to also consider.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for building stone and clay. Development would result in the loss of allotments and a scout hut, both of which are in active use. The site is adjacent to the conservation area to the north and west, and a Grade II listed building to the north. The considered impacts of development could be potentially mitigable, any new access would need to be very sensitively designed and the impacts on the conservation area fully considered.	No	The site is in active use as allotments and a scout hut. There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, issues regarding access due to topography are noted.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH105	Land west of Woodpeckers and north of A272	Rogate	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity due to its location at the edge of settlement and adjacent to (and within the setting of) the conservation area. The site is well defined and is contiguous with existing boundaries. There is development to the south and so development would not be perceived in isolation. The views from PProW to the west are important to consider.	The site is adjacent to the conservation (with a small part within the site) and is adjacent to a Grade II listed building. The site is within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone. Trees exist on a number of boundaries to the site, and they contribute to the wooded character of the settlement. Their retention would therefore be sought. There is an existing access onto the A272 and further information is likely required on the capacity of this access. It is possible that a sensitive scheme, designed to complement the settlement form, could be provided on this site.	Yes	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH106	Land south of Hugo Platt	Rogate	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity as an assart fieldscape within a wide tract of fieldscapes. The site is poorly connected to the settlement and would appear as an uncharacteristic intrusion into the wider landscape setting of Rogate. The expansion of development in this area would perpetuate the uncharacteristic expansion of this nucleated settlement.	Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	The site has no clear access point from the road network.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH107	Land south of Parsonage Estate	Rogate	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity overall. The area west of the PRow has high landscape sensitivity as an assart fieldscapes. The site is open and with notable topography. Development would appear as an uncharacteristic intrusion into the wider landscape setting of Rogate, and would change the characteristics of the landscape as experienced from the PRow. The expansion of development in this area would perpetuate the uncharacteristic expansion of this nucleated settlement. To the east of the PRow, the site is slightly more enclosed and relates to the school and the adjacent dwelling. This area has medium-to-high landscape sensitivity and may also have local community value.	There is a PRow running through the site. The site is elevated compared to adjacent exiting development. The site is within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone. A suitable access to the site would need to be explored. Given all the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH109	Land east of Sans Songe / Land north of Garbetts Lane and south of A272	Rogate	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has high landscape sensitivity due to the existing steep topography which makes the site visually sensitive to wider views. Development would involve significant regrading which would be detrimental to local character. The site is located on the edge of the settlement and is poorly related to existing settlement pattern.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for building stone, and within the 12km zone for the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH113	Land south of the Old Rectory	Singleton	Rejected	Development would have potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity overall. The south area has a high landscape sensitivity as it is within the conservation area and historic core of Singleton, and contains a listed building. The north area has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity due to the visual sensitivity to height and density of development and impacts on the conservation area.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk and is within 12km of the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC. The site is partly within the conservation area and there is a Grade II listed building within the site, along with two Grade II listed buildings adjacent. A small part of the site is within Flood Zone 2. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	This site (CH113) was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA. A larger site (CH243) was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and included the north area of this site (CH113), confirming that the north area is still available.	Part	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH114	Land north of Charlton Road / Land at the Partridge In PH	Singleton	Rejected	The site is in active use as a public house and is not available. If available, the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It contains a listed building and is within the conservation area with several listed buildings overlooking the site. There is potential for significant detrimental impact to settlement character due to the size and proportion of the site.	The site is in active use as a public house which is also a Grade II listed building. The site is within a mineral consultation area for chalk, the Singleton Conservation Area, and 12km of the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC. The site is in Flood Zone 2 and the north-west area is in Flood Zone 3. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH115	Land at Manor Farm, Singleton	Singleton	Rejected	Although considered suitable for small scale, landscape-led and sensitively designed residential or mixed-use development, the site is no longer available for development.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is in a prominent location on this side of Singleton. It contains a listed building and is within the conservation area with several listed buildings overlooking the site. There is potential for significant detrimental impact to settlement character due to the size and proportion of the site as a whole.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk and is within 12km of the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC. The east area is within the conservation area. There is an area of surface water flood risk (1in30-1in1000) close to the west entrance to the site. There is a Grade II listed building within the site. The site is adjacent to a Registered Park and Garden and to a Grade I listed church. There is a PRoW along the east boundary. The site is considered potentially suitable for small scale, landscape-led and sensitively designed residential or mixed-use scheme comprising residential and small-scale office or workshop space, located between the listed building on site and the existing built form of Singleton village.	Yes (In part)	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites. However, the site promoter confirmed in September 2024 that they did not wish to proceed.	No	The existing access is unsuitable to accommodate significant intensification of the site. There is no reason to indicate that the site is not achievable for some small-scale development.	Yes
CH116	Land north of Singleton Primary School	Singleton	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is medium-to-high landscape sensitivity due to the elevation of the site above the surrounding built form of the village.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk and is within 12km of the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC. The long thin layout of the site is problematic in design/circulation terms. There is a PRoW along the west boundary. Access to the site on Charlton Road is within Flood Zones 2 and 3.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	It is not clear where access to the site could be achieved.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH117	The Glebe, Half House and Paddocks	South Harting	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to views from the PRoW over the site, from the wider landscape to the west and those within the conservation area. The site is notable for its location within the settlement which is part of South Harting's local distinctiveness.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk. The site is partly within the conservation area. There is a Grade II listed building within the site and there are a number of listed buildings adjacent. The site includes notable areas of surface water flood risk (1in30-1in1000). There is a PRoW along the western edge. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	Development is not currently considered to be achievable. Further consideration of safe and appropriate access would need to be made.	No
CH130	Land north of the Royal Oak	Midhurst	Rejected	The site is Registered Common Land and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has high landscape sensitivity due to its rural character, high visibility, poor relationship to settlement pattern, and the likely impacts of development. The impact of tree removal – to facilitate development - is likely to be a significant change to landscape character.	The site is Registered Common Land, within 250m of historic landfill, and is adjacent to a Grade II listed building. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH131	The Tennis Court Site / Land south of Goodwood Close / Land east of Southlands Park	Midhurst	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has medium-to-high landscape sensitivity due to potential for cumulative impacts from adjacent houses and proximity to A286. The site is part of the undeveloped settlement context. The site has notable topography and an elevated nature as a high point within the surrounding area.	The site is located on a local ridge line and part of the site is Registered Common Land. The topography presents challenges in developing this site without a harmful change to the immediate character and context of the area. There are several protected trees on site. A Grade II listed pub is 50m across the road to the east. The site is within 250m of historic landfill, within the Pendean Quarry consultation area, and within a mineral consultation area for soft sand. Vegetation may provide some screening, however any non-native invasive species such as Rhododendron require removal and associated management. There may be opportunity to establish non-motorised user connection across the site linking Southlands Park to Goodwood Close with access to wider Midhurst. The site was assessed in detail in determining applications SDNP/16/02698/FUL (4 homes) and SDNP/15/05631/FUL (5 homes) and was further considered in the subsequently dismissed appeals. It was concluded for both schemes that development would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape and would be detrimental to the character of the area.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH134	The Triangle Site / Land adjoining Holmbush Way	Midhurst	Rejected	In light of the constraints, particularly priority habitat woodland, flood risk, and utilities infrastructure provision, it is unlikely that 5 or more units can be suitably accommodated.	The site has a low-to-moderate landscape sensitivity due to its small size and limited visibility, although topography could result in increased visual impact from development of the site.	There is a Tree Preservation Area to the south. The site is within 250m of an Historic Landfill Site. The west area includes deciduous woodland priority habitat which connects to a wider area of woodland and remnant ancient woodland extending south of Midhurst. The site is adjacent to a culverted watercourse. The west boundary is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and a notable part of the site includes surface water flood risk (1in30-1in1000). The site is located on part of the dismantled railway between Chichester and Midhurst. Access will need to be maintained for Southern Water and Southern Electric engineers for service mains maintenance. In light of the constraints, it is unlikely that 5 or more units can be suitably accommodated.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH137	Land south of June Meadows	Midhurst	Rejected	The site is in active use as informal open space / amenity space.	The site has a low-to-medium landscape sensitivity. The site does not have wider landscape impact and is within an area of existing housing. The existing layout of housing is distinctive, and additional development may impact on this.	The site is partly in a mineral consultation area for soft sand. The site could be suitable with appropriate design to protect residential amenity and character of the area. However, the site is in active use as informal open space / amenity space and so development would not be suitable, nor appropriate, unless alternative provision of an equal or better quality is sought.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH139	Land east of North Street	Petworth	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium/high landscape sensitivity. It is located to the rear of a conservation area and is orientated alongside the rear of several listed properties. There are views from the east and potential impacts on town fabric from access issues.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for building stone and clay. The site is within a conservation area and is adjacent to a number of listed buildings. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, although issues regarding a suitable access are noted.	Yes
CH140	Quarry Farm, Grove Lane	Petworth	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to the views from the PRoW over the site and out to the surrounding countryside which would be blocked by development. The farmstead area has medium landscape sensitivity due to its location in the wider countryside and the need to prevent urbanising features being introduced. The site is visible from a range of locations owing to the size, topography and location. The PRoW to the north provides views over much of the sloped ground to the south east. The site is visible as pastureland which connects with the wider landscape beyond.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for building stone and clay. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, although it is noted that access would need to be via existing development to the north and a protected tree is noted.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH145	Land east of Luffs Meadow	Northchapel	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having high landscape sensitivity due to the assart fieldscape definition of the site, and the high visibility of the site in relation to the village as surrounding open countryside.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for brick clay and within the 6.5km zone for the Ebernoe Common SAC. The site has dominant topography, is highly visible and visually sensitive, and plays a key role in the transition from built development to more open countryside. There is Ancient Woodland surrounding the site to the south and south-east. There is a group of protected trees on the west boundary and a PRoW along the north boundary. The south and south-west boundaries are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The updated 2025 EA National Flood Map for planning shows this extends further into the site when taking into account climate change (2075-2125). The east boundary is susceptible to surface water flooding.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH150	Land west of Haslemere Road and north of Fernhurst Primary School	Fernhurst	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has high landscape sensitivity due to settlement edge being notably defined in this area by the PRoW which runs along the south boundary of the site. The site is highly visible and development would be detrimental to users of the PRoW.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for brick clay and is within the zone of the Ebernoe Common SAC. The site is adjacent to ancient woodland. There is a row of mature trees through the middle of the site. There is a small area of surface water flood risk near to the entrance of the site on the east boundary. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH151	Selham Sawmill	Selham	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its size and location within the River Rother corridor in an intimate and sensitive landscape. It does not relate to the settlement pattern and although previously developed, the existing agricultural character and use of the site is not uncharacteristic in the landscape. Development for housing would be inconsistent with the settlement pattern and incongruous with the existing landscape character.	The site is surrounded by Flood Zones 2 and 3 on three sides. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site is in active use. The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for residential development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH152	Land west of Park Cottage	Halnaker	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to the cultural heritage associations of the site and impact on the existing landscape features, schedule ancient monument, listed buildings and conservation area.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sharp sand and gravel. The site is adjacent to the conservation area. The site is opposite Halnaker House which is a Grade II listed building. There is a Scheduled Ancient Monument along the north boundary and Ancient Woodland located adjacent to the site (which abuts the west boundary). The site is considered to be unsuitable due to numerous site constraints and the findings of the landscape assessment.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH162	Land north of Hollist Lane and east of Buddington Lane	Easebourne	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as high landscape sensitivity owing to its elevated position above the Rother Valley, the poor relationship with the settlement pattern, and its exposure to views from the PRoW network. Access to the site would potentially have detrimental urbanising impacts on the existing rural character of Hollist Lane.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for building stone. Development of this extensive site - including gaining access from either Hollist or Buddington Lane - is unlikely to be suitable due to the elevated and exposed nature of the site and that it is poorly related to the existing settlement. Buddington Lane has some surface water flood risk (1in100 – 1in1000). It is considered that extending development westwards on this prominent and open site along Hollist Lane into the open countryside would have a detrimental urbanising impact on the sensitive and rural landscape character of the area including the narrow rural lane/s.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH163	Land south of Hollist Lane	Easebourne	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has high landscape sensitivity owing to its elevated position above the Rother Valley. The site as a whole has a poor relationship to the settlement, extending much further south and west than the current settlement. The site is visible from the PRoW network. Access to the site would have detrimental urbanising impacts on the existing rural character of Hollist Lane.	The north-west corner is in a mineral consultation area for building stone. Development - including gaining access to the site - is unlikely to be suitable due to the fairly detached and rural character of this location. Development would extend westwards along Hollist Lane into the open countryside. The ground slopes down south away from the road. There is concern over the proximity to the river and there are also possible flooding issues at the southern end of the site.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH166	Land north of A272 and west of Half Moon PH	Midhurst	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its prominent position at the entrance to the settlement beyond the historic common edge development at the Half Moon Public House which is a Grade II listed building. The site provides a wooded and grassland PRoW connection to the Woolbeding estate to the west. The woodland along the southern part of the site provides a setting and screening for post-war development to the north.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for soft sand, within the 6.5km zone for Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC, and within 12km zone for Ebernoe Common SAC. The site is adjacent to ancient woodland. A watercourse bisects north-south across the centre of the site. There are areas of surface water flood risk on the north boundary and through the centre of the site. The west area has notable topography change. The west boundary has open views to the surrounding countryside. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH170	Land west of A286 and north of Bell Lane	Cocking	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium to high landscape sensitivity due to its open nature and extensive visibility. Cocking has a nucleated settlement pattern. Development of the whole site would be unproportionate to settlement scale and have a poor relationship to settlement pattern, extending the built-form to the north-west, unbalancing the nucleated character, and sitting obtrusively at the settlement edge. The south area has a medium landscape sensitivity due to the existing village hall and recreational uses which are appropriate for this edge-of-settlement location. Development would be less pronounced in the south area and would extend Cocking no further than the railway line which already establishes the extent of built form along Bell Lane and at no greater depth than neighbouring development.	The site is within 6.5km of the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC, the south area is within a mineral consultation area for chalk, and the east area is adjacent to a conservation area. There is deciduous woodland priority habitat along Centurion Way forming a woodland corridor. The site is very open and visible in views from the north of Cocking, A286 and associated footpath. The village hall and recreation ground are in the south area and alternative locations for these would need to be found. It would be challenging to achieve a suitable and safe access to the south area given the steep gradient and narrow width of the existing driveway access, while protecting rural character. Access from A286 for a development in the south area, or a small development west/directly north of The Croft, is not considered suitable as it would create a highly visible, long and incongruous access road.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	At this stage, access to the site is considered to be achievable, however there are concerns around suitability of access from Bell Lane and/or the A286.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH173	Land south of Butchers Lane	East Dean	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is partly in Flood Zone 2 and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for chalk, 12km of the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC, and the East Dean Conservation Area. The site contributes significantly to the character of the settlement as an open undeveloped space as viewed from surrounding PRowWs. The site is surrounded on three sides – including its entrance - by Flood Zone 2, and the south area is in Flood Zone 2.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH177	Land at the Grange	Funtington	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its location in the conservation area and at the entrance to the settlement where the site marks the change in scale from an open large scale agricultural landscape. The existing oak tree has significant local amenity value.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sharp sand and gravel. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH179	Land south of Warrensidge	South Harting	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has medium-to-high landscape sensitivity owing to its location at the southern edge of the village in an exposed location visible from surrounding PRowWs, roads and properties. Development in this location would appear elevated above listed properties to the west that are within the conservation area.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk. The site is located in an elevated and exposed position visible from surrounding PRowWs and elevated above listed properties to the west that are within the conservation area. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH184	Land at Manor Farm, West Dean	West Dean	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its location within the conservation area, inclusion within the historic village core, highly visible location within the village fronting the River Lavant opposite the village green, and likely existing heritage assets within the site.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk. There are several listed buildings surrounding the site. The frontage of the site and Church Lane are within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and the site is within the watercourse buffer for the River Lavant. Given the above and findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH188	Midhurst Bowls Club	Midhurst	Rejected	The site is in active use as a bowls club and is not considered to be available or achievable.	The site has a low-to-moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is located within the townscape of Midhurst. The site is flat and relatively enclosed but is raised above June Lane. The site is within the Midhurst Conservation Area and is adjacent to the relatively recent development of St Margarets Way.	The site is sustainably located in proximity to Midhurst Town Centre. The site is flat and raised above June Lane and, therefore, any development would need to carefully consider the relationship with June Lane. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review (as it is in active use as a bowls club) but could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing and/or alternative community facilities (of equal or better quality) being identified, provided, and secured.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	Vehicular access is possible from St Margarets Way, however it is understood that the owner of St Margarets Way is not currently willing to provide access. The site could be achievable provided that the above access issue can be resolved.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH190	Land adjacent to Hollow Croft and Quince Cottage	Bury	Rejected	Development would result in a notable loss of trees and scrub, and would have a potential adverse impact on ecology, PRoW network, and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It is heavily wooded (as seen from A29) and is adjacent to (and within the setting of) a conservation area. Access to parts of the site is via a public footpath and this shows a dense area of overgrown trees and shrubs. The Coffin Trail PRoW is identified as a heritage asset in the Bury NDP (see Policy 8) and becomes a sunken footpath along the site's southern boundary. There are limited views of the site from public points, and it cannot be viewed or accessed from The Hollow. The Hollow is a sunken lane and the site rises away from the road. Several of the trees appear to be fine examples and those on the A29 provide a tree dominant landscape when using the road.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for chalk, within the Sussex North Water Resource Zone, and within 12,000m of The Mens SAC. The site includes deciduous woodland and traditional orchard priority habitat. The site is considered unlikely to be able to accommodate five dwellings or more due to impacts on trees and ecology. The site submission alleges that development could be undertaken without removing trees, but this seems unlikely. Development would inevitably lead to loss of scrub / young tree habitat. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site is available for development as evidenced by its promotion during the 2022 Call for Sites and in 2024.	Yes	There are limited opportunities to facilitate a safe and appropriate access from The Hollow and/or Coffin Trail PRoW. Even if achievable, development would have a negative impact on a sunken lane and a historic PRoW.	No
CH192	Bury Manor Farm	Bury	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, further investigation in relation to heritage, highways, and landscape consideration is required.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. The existing agricultural buildings are on the roadside but beyond the site, to the west, is open countryside with Bury Hill to the south. The site is surrounded by steeper, rolling chalk grassland, but sits at the base of the contours in a 'bowl'. The site is in the setting of a conservation area, includes a Grade II listed barn, and has archaeological potential.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk. The site comprises existing buildings and hardstanding. There are no pavements along the west side of the A29, and crossing the A29 into the village will need to be considered. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it is very sensitive and further heritage and landscape baseline work is required to demonstrate that residential development could be suitable. If sufficiently demonstrated, the site could come forward under existing policies.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation but, in October 2025, the landowner withdraw the site from the local plan review.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, subject to appropriate and safe access.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH193	Land north of Bury Manor Farm	Bury	Rejected	There is no access to the site and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It is an open field where topography is important. The east boundary is impacted by the A29 but the west boundary abuts open countryside. The site is adjacent to, and in the setting of, a conservation area and listed buildings.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no access to the site.	No
CH194	Land south of The Squire & Horse PH	Bury	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It is visible as one enters the village from the south. The site is in the setting of a conservation area and listed buildings. The gradient of the site slopes steeply towards the centre of the site. Development could have an impact upon the rural feel of the parish and an adverse impact on the views from Bury Hill.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk. The site is not considered to be suitable due to access issues, topography, and the impact on views and the rural setting of the village.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	The access is considered inadequate for residential development. The access is at the foot of Bury Hill on the A29 at the point which the road widens to three lanes.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH195	Land east of Village Hall and part of Copyhold	Bury	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would intrude into a sensitive landscape, result in the felling of numerous trees in a conservation area, and have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The proposal is for backland/infill development. It would intrude into the sensitive landscape to the east and be visible from PRow across the Glebe Field and from the Coffin Trail. Development would have a detrimental impact on the conservation area and the heritage character of the area, and could result in the felling of numerous mature trees.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk. The site lies within the curtilage of Copyhold (Grade II), Church Lane and is entirely within the conservation area. There are limited access points to the site and these are not considered adequate. Development could also impact upon a number of trees, including a small orchard.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is not a clear point of access. Even if access was proposed via the village hall, this is not considered to be suitable or achievable.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH196	Land at Houghton Lane	Bury	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and would have a potential adverse impact on ecology and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. A PRoW runs across the east boundary and the site is adjacent to the Arun Valley Local Wildlife Site which runs along the River Arun. The site is visible at the entrance to the village, detached from the village, and is surrounded on all sides by open countryside. Development would have an adverse impact on views from the Downs, River Arun and the PRoW that crosses the land, and would result in an unsympathetic development in the rural landscape and on a site that forms part of the setting of Bury.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk. The site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and adjoins the Arun Valley Local Wildlife Site that runs along the River Arun. The site is not considered to be suitable due to flood risk, proximity of the local wildlife site, and the impact on the landscape and views into the site.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	The site would be accessed from an existing access point on Houghton Lane. The access and potential flooding will impact on achievability.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH199	Land east of A286 and north of Mill Lane	Cocking	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on irreplaceable habitats of the chalk stream and ancient woodland, and a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its openness and visibility. The exposed chalk of Mill Hanger is adjacent to the east and a notable visual feature of the site context. Cocking has a nucleated settlement pattern and the site is in the setting of a conservation area, listed buildings, and the historic core of the village. Development of the whole site would be disproportionate to settlement scale, have a poor relationship with settlement pattern, and would extend the built form into the surrounding rural landscape. The south area is well related to – and a small-scale development in this area could be consistent with - settlement pattern.	The site is within 6.5km of the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC. The site is visible from Footpaths 946 and 947 and is bound by heritage assets (south); the Costers Brook chalk stream, Hoe Copse Local Wildlife Site, and areas of ancient woodland and deciduous woodland priority habitat (east); and A286 and a strong hedgerow boundary (west). There is some surface water flood risk at the base of Mill Hanger and the site's east edge is in Flood Zones 2 and 3. The trees on the south boundary, and hedgerow to the west, form important landscape and biodiversity features. The Authority previously considered a smaller developable area (circa 1.5ha) close to Mill Lane for small-scale landscape-led development in response to contours, settlement pattern, and views in, out and across the site, and with opportunities for physical buffering and potential enhancements to adjacent arboriculture, ecological, and hydrological features. However, further evidence was submitted on the ecological sensitivity of the Costers Brook and the river corridor, and the site is no longer considered to be suitable (either wholly or partly) due to potential adverse impacts on ecology, hydrology and the landscape, particularly in relation to irreplaceable habitats of the chalk stream	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	Access is not considered achievable from Mill Lane. However, access may be possible for development of part of the site, subject to a sensitive design which retains the rural character of Mill Lane and avoids the urbanisation of the A286.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
						and ancient woodland, and views to, from, and across the site to the Downs.					
CH200	Land west of Crypt Lane and south of Bell Lane	Cocking	Rejected	The access is not suitable and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate to high landscape sensitivity. The site is part of the undeveloped context of Cocking. The site is a relative high point and is visible from Cocking Hill to the south. The site sits well above the sunken Crypt Lane, which then further drops down to the watercourse along Crypt Lane.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk. Crypt Lane, due to height difference and topography, is not a suitable access. There is another access from the A286 which provides rear access and parking to existing properties along the A286. The A286 access is not suitable for use by a significant level of development. Due to the topography, visibility and openness of the site, a smaller parcel suitable for development using this access has not been identified. A historic memorial is located on the site. Potential impacts could occur on the water quality, quantity and experiential qualities of the brook running along Crypt Lane.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, although lack of suitable access for significant development is noted.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH204	Land south east of Easebourne Street	Easebourne	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets, and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its elevated position and its proximity adjacent to the conservation area and listed buildings on Easebourne Street.	The site is not well related to the settlement, with the focus of development on the other side of Easebourne Street. The elevated position of the site and its topography result in long views. The well used and historic footpath, the Race, and the designated Cowdray House Registered Garden are adjacent to the site and would be negatively impacted by development. Due to the elevated position above Easebourne Street, access to the site would not be possible without significant landscape character impact to Easebourne Street.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, whilst technically possible, it is considered gaining access to the site would likely cause significant landscape character harm to Easebourne Street.	Yes
CH205	Land north of Easebourne Primary School	Easebourne	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its elevated position and poor relationship to the settlement pattern of Easebourne.	The site is not well related to the settlement. Its scale is disproportionate to the size of Easebourne and due to the open character, topography and wide views, there is not a logical smaller parcel of this site that could be brought forward in a characteristic manner. The site is adjacent to the Easebourne Conservation Area. Access options from A286 are limited by the habitat corridor and topography, and access is not considered to be suitable from the narrow, winding Glaziers Lane.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH209	The Rectory	East Lavant	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its prominent location in East Lavant. The site is within the historic core of Lavant and the conservation area. Development extending back into the plot would not be consistent with the settlement pattern and character of East Lavant.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sharp sand and gravel. The site is adjacent to the River Lavant and within an Environment Agency Flood Alert Area. The south area is in Flood Zone 2 and the west boundary is in Flood Zone 3. The site is within zones for the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC, the Solent Coast SPA, and the Western Streams catchment of the Solent. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH211	Land south of Laxton Meadow and east of Church Lane	Funtington	Rejected	Development on, and access to, the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its location within the conservation area and adjacent to the historic Grade II* listed village church. The site provides an openness and setting to these heritage assets, and a transition at the edge of the settlement which is characteristic of Funtington. Access to the site is likely to impact the character of the rural lane and setting of the church.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sharp sand and gravel. The site is part of the setting of the Grade II* listed church. There is a row of trees and ditch across the frontage of the site which contribute to the character and perceptual qualities of the site, including the setting of the church. Access is currently via Church Lane which is very narrow and is an unmade track at the location of the site. Close to the site on Church Lane is an area of well used but undefined parking for visitors to the church. The track is a PRoW connecting to the wider countryside. Church Lane is identified as at risk of surface water flooding (1in100-1in1000). Given the above, the findings of the landscape assessment, and the need to ensure a soft settlement edge to Funtington, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	The site is subject to a Section 106 agreement for agricultural use and further information about access is required to understand if vehicular access is possible.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH213	Land north and west of Lodsworth Recreation Ground	Lodsworth	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and settlement pattern.	The site is of moderate landscape sensitivity. It is disconnected from Lodsworth village by the recreation ground and pavilion which form a clear edge to the settlement. Development of this site would extend the settlement significantly west and have a negative impact on the nucleated settlement pattern.	The site is within the 12km zones for both Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC and The Mens SAC, and the 6.5km zone for Ebernoe Common SAC. There is a pocket of surface water flood risk (1in100 and 1in1000) located immediately adjacent to the access of the site. The site is within Source Protection Zones 2 and 3. The site is within a mineral consultation area for building stone and is adjacent to a historic landfill site. The site is not suitable for development given it's disconnected nature, the extensive scale of the site including in relation to the settlement, and that there does not appear to be any logical means of sub-dividing the site for a smaller scale development to be accommodated.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH214	Land east of The Street	Lodsworth	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and settlement pattern.	The site is of moderate to high landscape sensitivity due to the elevated and open nature of the site and its contribution to the setting of Lodsworth village, particularly approaching from the south. Development would extend the settlement significantly south and have a negative impact on the nucleated settlement pattern.	The site is within Source Protection Zones 2 and 3. The site is within a mineral consultation area for building stone. The site is within the 6.5km zone for Ebernoe Common SAC and the 12km zones for The Mens SAC and Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC. The current access to the site is on a narrow track that is highly characteristic of Lodsworth and currently supports a small number of existing homes. Alternative access from the Street would be difficult to achieve sensitively and without impact to landscape character due to topography. The site is not suitable given the conclusions of the landscape assessment and impacts of access to the site.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH219	Land north of June Lane	Midhurst	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. This is a large and open site at the northern edge of Midhurst. The site has variable and apparent topography with some long-distance views. Historic Landscape Characterisation indicates a largely historic medieval landscape. The Woolbeding Estate Historic Parkland is adjacent to the site and wider estate lands and the New Lipchis Way wrap around the site.	The site is within the 6.5km zone for Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC and the 12km zone for Ebernoe Common SAC. There is ancient woodland within and adjacent to the site. The apparent topography combined with its nature as open fields which are characteristic to the rural setting of Midhurst makes it unlikely for a suitable landscape-led scheme to be possible. The site is open and exposed to long distance views. Vehicular access from June Lane would not be suitable for full development of the site. Due to topography, a logical smaller portion of the site could not be identified. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH220	Play Area at Holmbush Way	Midhurst	Rejected	The part of the site that is available is designated as a Local Green Space (LGS). The remainder of the site is not available and provides community and recreation facilities for the community.	The site has a low to medium landscape sensitivity. It is within the built-up area of Midhurst and part of the relatively newer development around Holmbush Way. The site is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.	The site is surrounded on three sides by deciduous woodland priority habitat. The majority of the site is in active use as a recreation ground that is also designated as a Local Green Space. The remainder of the site is in active use as a meeting hall and associated small car park. The site provides community and recreation uses for the surrounding community and it is currently unclear how these could be re-provided onsite or offsite. The north-east corner has some identified surface water flood risk (1in30-1in1000), and the entire north/north-west area is within Flood Zones 2/3 taking into account of climate change 2070-2125.	No	The whole site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites by a third party, while part of the site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites by the landowner.	Part	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH224	Land at Valentines Lea	Northchapel	Rejected	The site is in active use as informal open space / amenity space and is not considered suitable to yield 5 (net) dwellings or more.	The site has a low-to-moderate landscape sensitivity due to its location well within an area of relatively recent development. However, the site is highly visible as a central focal point in the development.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for brick clay. The site is a central point in the location of this development and is in active use as informal open space / amenity space and so development would not be suitable, nor appropriate, unless alternative provision of an equal or better quality is sought. Due to the shape of the site, it is uncertain if it could suitably accommodate 5 or more dwellings.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH225	Nyewood Timber Yard, Greenfields	Nyewood	Rejected	The site is not currently achievable. If achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on landscape character, settlement pattern and biodiversity.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is located between the settlement of Nyewood and an extensive area of woodland which provides a backdrop to Nyewood. Development would be visible and appear as an incursion into the woodland and into the gap between dwellings at this location.	Residential development would extend the settlement in a manner which is inconsistent with the linear settlement pattern and be an incursion into the woodland. Areas of the woodland in close proximity to the site are ancient woodland. Incursion into the woodland could have impacts on the habitat and species from urbanisation, disturbance and lighting, and erode the buffer between the existing settlement and the woodland at this location.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	Access is understood to be owned by a third party and so the site is not considered to be achievable unless suitable permissions are resolved.	No
CH227	Old Station Yard, Nyewood Road	Nyewood	Rejected	There is no evidence that the site is still available.	The principle of development has been established through planning permission ref. SDNP/18/00352/FUL. The committee report says: "Whilst there are notable elements on the site that do positively contribute to the character of the area (notably the former Station House and the former railway line) there are many elements of the site that have a negative impact (notably the ad hoc storage of materials and some of the later structures that have been built). This sets a low baseline with regard to the landscape qualities that the site currently contributes to the special qualities of the National Park."	The principle of development has been established through planning permission ref. SDNP/18/00352/FUL for 5 affordable dwellings and 4 market dwellings. The committee report says: "Whilst the positioning of the new dwellings extend away from the pattern of development in Nyewood (when it could potentially have clustered more around the western end of the site) this is considered acceptable as it both removes the existing harmful ad hoc development (at the eastern end of the site) and would reinforce the wider perception and understanding of the route of the former railway."	Yes	Planning permission ref. SDNP/18/00352/FUL has now lapsed and there is currently no evidence that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH228	Land at Hampers Green	Petworth	Rejected	The site is not considered to be achievable. If development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity and development would intrude into the undeveloped open landscape. The site forms part of a continuous tract of open countryside to the west of the road where the only visible change to the landscape is the existing cemetery. The cemetery is a peaceful part of north Petworth, set in open countryside and providing a welcome break to the urban residential development to the west.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for clay. The site is not considered to be suitable given that it is immediately adjacent to the cemetery, has limited access options, and has a high landscape sensitivity.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no direct vehicular access and the land is slightly elevated above the adjoining highway. Access would currently need to go through the cemetery, but this is not a viable option for residential development.	No

CH230	Bowling Green and Tennis Club	Petworth	Rejected	The site is not available and is allocated in the Petworth NDP for community and leisure use.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It is enclosed and situated between two areas of existing residential development. Topography is important as the land rises to the south from Sheepdown Drive.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for building stone and clay. The site is allocated in the Petworth NDP for community and leisure use and any development would require the existing uses to be relocated.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
-------	-------------------------------	----------	----------	---	--	--	----	---	----	---	-----

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH231	Midhurst Road Allotments	Petworth	Rejected	The site is in active use as allotments and is not available. Development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It is on the south facing slope of the upper rother valley and forms part of the setting of a registered park and garden and the adjoining conservation area. Development would have an unacceptable level of impact on the above and would impact on the wider views of the Downs.	The site is in active use as allotments and it is considered that this use is important in terms of the cultural landscape as perceived by the local community. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not suitable.	No	The site is in active use as allotments. There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH235	Land surrounding Rogate Recreation Ground	Rogate	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the heritage, character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate to high landscape sensitivity. The site is part of wider fields that are characteristic large open arable fields, with hedgerow boundaries and lack of woodland creating an open character with long views. The area within the site boundary is an area of high ground at the edge of the site, the land steeply slopes down to the area of wider fields. Due to the topography, the site is prominent and marks the edge of the settlement in this part of Rogate. The site is poorly related to the existing settlement pattern.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for building stone, and within the 12km zone for the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC. The topography of this site and its immediate context are not considered to be suitable. It is near to the conservation area and within the historic parkscape of the former parkland of Rogate Lodge, as well as falling within an archaeological notification area. There are potential landscape impacts regarding access from the A272 at this location.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH236	Land west of Village Hall	Rogate	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the heritage, character and appearance of the landscape due to access.	The site has moderate landscape sensitivity. The West Sussex Historic Landscape Classification identifies the site within a fieldscape of modern field amalgamation (late 20th century, 1845-Present). Views are possible towards the site from Slade Lane and the footpath 1160 which is relatively elevated to the east and is within the Rogate NDP Character View 14. The site is bounded in the east by a tall hedgerow along North Street and is within the Rogate NDP Character View 13. The site has formed the settlement edge to the north of Rogate for some time.	The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary and conservation area of the historic settlement of Rogate. The site is within the 12km zone for Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC, and the east area is within a mineral consultation area for building stone. The Parsonage Farmhouse and Parsonage Garden Railings are both listed and are located near the southern boundary. There is currently insufficient information that a suitable access could be delivered. North Street is a busy and narrow road of rural character that lacks pavement and would not suit standard forms of access design which would result in loss of a significant length of hedgerow. The western side of the site has an existing field access but would require a long access road to the site which would have an urbanising visual impact when entering the village on the A272 from the west.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH238	Land north of A272 and adjacent to Burial Ground	Rogate	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate to high landscape sensitivity. The site is part of a wider open arable field, with hedgerow boundaries and lack of woodland creating an open character with long views. Steeply rising topography to the north/west. The site is in a prominent location at the eastern entrance to Rogate. The site is situated the other side of a strong hedgerow and tree boundary of the cemetery which provides a logical settlement boundary to Rogate on this side of the A272. The site is more well elated to the wider countryside than of Rogate for this reason. The site is poorly related to the existing settlement pattern.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for building stone, and within the 12km zone of the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC. The site is a portion of a wider field and the boundary for the site does not reflect any existing boundary features. The site is adjacent to the village cemetery. It is near to the conservation area and within the historic parkscape of the former parkland of Rogate Lodge, as well as falling within an archaeological notification area. There are potential landscape impacts regarding access from the A272 at this location.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH239	Land south of Renault Garage	Rogate	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on ecology.	The site has a low-to-moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is located in the context of other development and is largely enclosed in nature. However, the north boundary has previously been identified as a historic landscape feature.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for building stone, and within the 12km zone of the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC. Much of the site is deciduous woodland priority habitat.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	The site appears to be land-locked and road access would be a key issue.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH242	Land south of Charlton Road	Singleton	Rejected	The site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and development on, and access to, the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate-to-high landscape sensitivity. It is large in scale at a prominent location at the east entrance of Singleton village. The site forms part of a wider field and landscape with notable open views to the south and part of the separation and transition from Singleton village to Charlton village.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk and is within 12km of the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC. Development would extend the relatively recent expansion of the settlement further along the south side of Charlton Road which is not characteristic or consistent with the nucleated settlement pattern. The majority of the site is in Flood Zone 2 and the north-east area is in Flood Zone 3. There are areas of surface water flood risk (1in100-1in1000) across the site. The River Lavant runs through Singleton on the north boundary. The existing access from The Leys development may not be sufficient for the scale of development proposed, and access from Charlton Road – which is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 - is likely to be urbanising and unlikely to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, although it is uncertain whether there is a suitable access.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH244	Land south of The Sorrels	Stedham	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and settlement pattern.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It is located within a wider parcel of land used for equestrian activity at the entrance to the village. The site has no boundary definition other than existing post and rail fencing and does not relate well to the settlement pattern. It is unclear how providing a characteristic edge to the settlement could be achieved.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for soft sand. The site is potentially within Notable View Area (v) identified in NDP Policy SINDP7 (Landscape and Views). It can be seen from The Street as well as the footpath along the western boundary. Access could be achieved from Stedham Sawmills (ref. CH123). Access from The Street should be avoided. The land on the opposite side of A272 is designated as SSSI and is a Local Nature Reserve.	No	There is currently no evidence the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH245	Land west of West Lodge	Stedham	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site has a poor relationship to the settlement and development would result in the loss of woodland and would have a potential adverse impact on the heritage, character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It forms the southern part of the historic garden and setting to Rotherhill House. Rotherhill House is a substantial country house that most likely dates from 1799. While it is not listed, it forms - together with the parkland - a locally distinctive and coherent historic landscape and an important and characteristic setting to Stedham village. The parkscape is noted on the Historic Environment Record. The trees within the site are historically coherent and mark an important historic boundary which contributes to their value and significance in landscape character terms. Whilst the site is currently used for equestrian activities and is somewhat bisected by post and rail fencing, its fundamental parkland character remains intact.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for soft sand. Development of the site would be out of keeping with the low density sporadic rural edge of the village. It is potentially within Notable View Areas (iv and v) identified in NDP Policy SINDP7 (Landscape and Views). The south boundary and the frontage along School Lane / track route has identified surface water flood risk. The south area includes priority habitat deciduous woodland. Access to the site would be unlikely to be achieved without loss of part of the woodland belt to the south.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH258	Land at Little Home Farm	West Dean	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is adjacent to the West Dean Conservation Area and is in the setting of various listed buildings. There are a number of trees onsite worthy of retention. The site is in a sensitive and prominent location on the crossroad adjacent to the primary school and Selsey Arms PH.	The site is in proximity to the Centurion Way and is within a mineral consultation area for chalk, Source Protection Zones 2 and 3, 12km of the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC, and an identified nature improvement area.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH260	Land east of River Street	Westbourne	Rejected	The site entrance is subject to flood risk. Development would not be consistent with settlement pattern and would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate to high landscape sensitivity. The site is adjacent to the Westbourne Conservation Area in a prominent location at the north-east entry to the village with moderately open views to the east, albeit separate from the historic core of the village.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel. The site is adjacent to Westbourne Conservation Area. Much of the site is within the watercourse buffer of the River Ems. The River Ems and Meadows Local Wildlife Site and associated priority habitat is adjacent to the south. The entrance and west area is within Flood Zones 2 and 3, EA Flood Alert and Flood Warning areas, and within 1-100 and 1-1000 surface water flood risk. Pylons bisect a small part of the north-east corner. The River Ems and River Street form a clear edge to the settlement at this location. Development would not be consistent with the settlement pattern of Westbourne. This area forms the transition from the village to countryside. Access would likely have an urbanising impact on the lane and result in loss of hedgerow.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH262	Land at Vintage Bentley and White Rose Garage	Hill Brow	Rejected	The site is in active employment use.	The site includes two existing commercial units, hardstanding, car parking, and one existing residential bungalow. The site has a low landscape sensitivity given that it is previously developed land and is bound on all sides by twentieth century built development.	The site is previously developed land accessed off B2070 London Rd. There is potential for contamination due to existing and previous uses. The hamlet of Hill Brow includes numerous care homes. However, these tend to be located further north (in less dense areas of the hamlet), set back from the road, and within larger plots bound by woodland. In comparison, this site is bound by built development on all sides (incl. adjacent employment uses) and is directly adjacent to B2070 London Road. The site cannot provide the level of tranquillity desired for a C2 care use. In terms of C3 residential use, the site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it is in active employment use. The site could come forward under existing policies, subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH263	Land adjacent to Paddock Lodge	Hill Brow	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity given that the protected boundary trees provide only glimpsed views over the relatively flat “scrubland” from the B2070 London Road. Notwithstanding the above, the site includes priority woodland habitat in its western corner and is within the Bats Movement and Bats Home Networks. The above would restrict development to the site’s centre.	The site would normally be excluded as it comprises a greenfield site outside of a defined settlement boundary. However, it has been considered further due to the opportunity to deliver 100% affordable housing. The linear hamlet of Hill Brow has limited facilities and the site is secluded (but not isolated) from the main core further to the south-west. The narrow footways are inconsistent and alternate between asphalt and dirt tracks making pedestrian movements difficult adjacent to 50mph road. The site is considered to be in an unsuitable location for affordable housing. Moreover, the dismissed appeal for 1 no. large, passivhaus dwelling (ref. SDNP/21/00910/FUL) noted that by infilling the centre of the site, development, by virtue of its mass and scale, would unduly erode the openness of the area and result in a notable intensification of residential development which would impact on the character and appearance of the area.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH264	Land west of Pitsham Lane	Midhurst	Rejected	The site is partly subject to flood risk and access is unlikely to be suitable. Development would have a potential adverse impact on the biodiversity, character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. As a whole, the site is a large and mostly open site at the southern edge of Midhurst. The site has gently sloping topography. The west of Pitsham Lane has a rural character. The northern most parcel has a more enclosed character, and the Historic Landscape Classification identifies this as a possible former recreation space and historic mapping (OS Six Inch 1888-1914) shows a cricket ground and pavilion no longer present on the site. Development west of Pitsham Lane would appear intrusive and poorly connected.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for soft sand and is adjacent to the defined settlement boundary. It is relatively open and there are local views from a bridleway along Pitsham Lane. The northern parcel is adjacent to New Pond Local Wildlife Site and deciduous woodland priority habitat, and part of this parcel has surface water flood risk. The site is within the 6.5km zone for Singleton & Cockings Tunnels SAC and the 12km zone for Ebernoe Common SAC. Vehicular access is poor along Pitsham Lane, and access along this bridleway should be avoided other than to non-motorised users.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, access to the site is unlikely to be suitable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH265	Land at Holmbush Way and Mead Way Estate	Midhurst	Rejected	The site is in active use and so further information would be required to confirm availability.	The site has a low to medium landscape sensitivity. The site is within the built-up area of Midhurst and part of twentieth and twenty-first century settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.	The site is located within the defined settlement boundary of Midhurst and it is noted that potential development of the site for additional affordable homes could be considered under existing planning policies. It is noted that part of the site comprises a recreation ground designated as a Local Green Space and a commercial unit containing a small convenience store. These are important local facilities for the surrounding community which would need to be re-provided through any redevelopment of the site. All parcels are adjacent to deciduous woodland priority habitat. The east area of the Mead Way Estate and the north-west area of the Holmbush Play Area are subject to surface water flood risk.	Yes	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites. However, the site is in active use and so further information would be required to confirm availability.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH266	Land south of Northchapel and east of A283	Northchapel	Rejected	Notable flood risk is identified and development would have a potential adverse impact on ancient woodland and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as high landscape sensitivity due to the assart fieldscape definition of the site. The site is located in a prominent location at the southern entrance to the village.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for brick clay and within zones for the Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SAC. There is Ancient Woodland and riparian corridor adjacent to the site along the north boundary and surrounding the site to the east. The site is close to sewage works to the north; any buffer zone required for the sewage works would need further consideration. The sewage works and ancient woodland provide a clear edge to the settlement on the east side of the A283, and so development on the site would be disconnected and not well related to the settlement pattern. Access is not considered suitable due to likely substantial loss of hedgerow and suburbanising impacts. The north and east areas of the site are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The NE Flood Map for Planning update shows that taking into account climate change (2070-2125), this area extends to take in a significant portion of the site.	No	The site was promoted in 2025 and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH267	Russett Court & Crossfield Shops	Fernhurst	Rejected	The site is in active use and so further information would be required to confirm availability.	The site has a generally low landscape sensitivity. The site is within the built-up area of Fernhurst and part of twentieth and twenty-first century settlement expansion in this area.	The site is located within the defined settlement boundary of Fernhurst and it is noted that potential redevelopment of the site for additional affordable homes and commercial provision could be considered under existing planning policies. There is opportunity for sensitive redevelopment to make a positive contribution to the street scene. The site is within zones for Ebernoe Common SAC and Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC. There is surface water flooding risk (1in30-1in1000) in two main pockets on the site. The site currently includes commercial shops used by the local community and reprovision of these should be incorporated unless there is evidence to support their loss.	Yes	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites. However, the site is in active use and so further information would be required to confirm availability.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH269	Land at Compton Recreation Ground	Compton	Rejected	The site is in active use as a public open space.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity given its regular shape, flat nature, open views, and modern use as a recreation ground. The site is adjacent to the medieval and nucleated settlement and conservation area of Compton in West Sussex. Although delineated by wooden fencing, hedgerows and mature trees, the site is still readily visible from the B2146, PRoW network, and wider landscape.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for chalk, in the dark sky core, and within 12,000m of the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC. The site is not considered to be suitable for residential development given that it is being actively used by the community as a public open space. As set out in existing planning policies, any proposed development would need to re-provide an equal or better quantity, quality, and accessibility of open space on or in close proximity to the site.	No	It is understood that the site may be available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH273	East Lodge, East Street	Rogate	Rejected	The site is in active use as older persons accommodation and is not considered to be available.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It is located in the context of the built-up area of Rogate. However, the site is within Rogate Conservation Area and to the west of the site is the Grade I listed St Bartholomew's Church.	The site is within the 12km zone for the Singleton & Cocking Tunnels SAC. There is a small area of surface water flood risk (1in30) in the middle of the site. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review because it is in active use as affordable rented flats for older people. However, due to its location within the defined settlement boundary, the site could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, suitable evidence regarding the affordable housing needs. Development proposals for the site would need to demonstrate that the conservation area and setting of the Grade I listed church are preserved and enhanced.	No	There is no evidence that the site is currently available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
CH281	Land north of Treelands	Bury	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets, PProW network, and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity but has a higher heritage sensitivity by virtue of its location adjacent to (and within the setting of) a conservation area, and its access from a single driveway (part of the Coffin Trail PProW) in between two listed buildings in the conservation area. The PProW has also been identified as a heritage asset in the Bury NDP (see Policy 8) and becomes a sunken footpath at the site. Development would create an incongruous extension to the defined settlement pattern and core of the conservation area, especially when compared to the density, set back distances, and plot sizes of existing development.	The site is within a mineral consultation area for chalk, within the Sussex North Water Resource Zone, and within 12,000m of The Mens SAC. The site is adjacent to deciduous woodland priority habitat (north) and is within 80m of traditional orchard priority habitat (south). Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted in 2025 and is available for development.	Yes	The site is accessed via a single driveway – part of the Coffin Trail PProW - in between two listed buildings in the Bury Conservation Area. There are limited (if any) opportunities to facilitate a safe and appropriate access. Even if achievable, development would have a negative impact on the sunken and historic PProW.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA005	Land at Greenways Lane and Kiln Lane	Buriton	Rejected	There is existing localised surface water flood risk and development would also impact landscape character by virtue of potential levelling requirements and hedgerow removal to facilitate access.	The site has a high/medium landscape sensitivity. It rises to the west and north and is large and disproportionate to the scale of Buriton. Impacts of traffic, highway design and activity of a large housing development would be detrimental to local character. The site is bound by mature hedgerows which screen the site from close view. Development of a small area could potentially be consistent with the nucleated settlement pattern and with lesser highway and transport impacts.	There is a railway line along the west boundary with Ancient Woodland and historic landfill beyond. The whole site is not suitable for development. However, a small amount of development either (a) along Kiln Lane - focused alongside, and equal in depth to, existing properties and extending development in a linear form - or (b) in the parcel adjacent to Greenway Lane, could be appropriate. The latter (b) is considered to better relate to the nucleated settlement pattern, focusing built form nearest to the settlement. This would require careful consideration due to likely loss of a significant section of mature established hedgerow and highway levelling requirements. The government Flood Map for Planning (updated 2025) shows surface water flood risk of 1in100 and 1in1000 year. There is understood to be a significant localised issue of surface water flooding along Kiln Lane effecting existing properties. The topography and relative height of the site (compared with properties along Kiln Lane) are factors. It is understood that water from the site is contributing to localised flooding. In the absence of evidence (i.e., infiltration rates) to demonstrate how this issue can be resolved, the site is not considered suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA006	Land at Buriton House	Buriton	Rejected	This site is not available. If available, the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It does not relate well to the surrounding character features or settlement pattern and development would affect the enjoyment of the public right of way which runs along the south side of the site.	The site is opposite a conservation area and adjacent to Grade II listed buildings located along North Lane. There is a public right of way along the southern edge of the site. The site is elevated in relation to adjacent residential properties along North Lane and is in a prominent location. The site does not have any shared boundaries with, and is not well related to, the settlement. Development would extend built form south of North Lane in an uncharacteristic way. Given the above and findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	A graded access would need to be achieved as the land is raised above North Lane. There are no other reasons to indicate why development on the site would not be achievable.	Yes
EA008	Land adjoining Winchester Road	Chawton	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity due to its location at the entrance of the settlement; its location adjacent to the Chawton Conservation Area and three Grade II listed buildings; and its scale in that development would be dominant in relation to the existing settlement and its features. There is also an Area TPO adjacent to the site's southern boundary.	The site is in a prominent position along Winchester Road. The site is visible in glimpsed (and some open) views from both Winchester Road (north) and the A32 (west) and is open to views from the PRow network. The latter includes views from St Swithun's Way which delineates the site's southern boundary. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA009	Land west of North Lane	Clanfield	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site does not relate to the settlement pattern and highway access would have negative impact on the rural lane alongside the site. The site would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding downland.	The site rises up to the north and development of the site would be inconsistent with the surrounding character and settlement form which consists of mostly dispersed dwellings and farmsteads. The site is adjacent to a Grade II Listed Building (located to the south of the site). Given the potential detrimental impact on the landscape character and the relationship with the settlement, the site is not considered suitable for development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA010	Land east of Little Hyden Lane	Clanfield	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site does not relate to the settlement pattern and highway access would have negative impact on the rural lane alongside the site. The site would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding downland.	The site rises up to the north and development of the site would be inconsistent with the surrounding character and settlement form. The site does share boundaries with surrounding residential development, but it is not considered to relate well to the settlement pattern. Therefore, given the potential detrimental impact on the landscape character and the relationship with the settlement, the site is not considered suitable for development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	The site access would be via Little Hyden Lane, which is a narrow lane. Further advice on potential for safe access point and impact of additional development would need to be sought.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA011	Land north of Hambledon Road	Clanfield	Rejected	The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site does not relate to the settlement pattern and highway access would have negative impact. The site would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding downland.	The site rises to the east and development of the site would be inconsistent with the surrounding character and settlement. The site does share a boundary with adjacent residential development along Hambledon Road, but it is not considered to relate well to the settlement pattern. Therefore, given the potential detrimental impact on the landscape character and the relationship with the settlement, the site is not considered suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA012	Land east of East Meon Road	Clanfield	Rejected	The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site does not relate to the settlement pattern and highway access would have negative impact on Little Hyden Lane, the rural lane alongside the site. The site would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding downland.	The site rises up to the north and development of the site would be inconsistent with the surrounding character and settlement form which consists of mostly dispersed dwellings and farmsteads. The site does share boundaries with surrounding residential development, but it is not considered to relate well, more so along East Meon Road which lacks footpath connection and has a character of leaving the settlement towards surrounding countryside. Therefore, given the potential detrimental impact on the landscape character and the relationship with the settlement, the site is not considered suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA013	Land west of East Meon Road	Clanfield	Rejected	The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site does not relate to the settlement pattern and highway access would have negative impact on the rural lane alongside the site. The site would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding downland.	The site rises up to the north. The site is not well contained and a new boundary would need to be created along the western edge of the site. The site shares a boundary with settlement along the eastern edge, but it is not considered to relate well to the existing settlement pattern. Therefore, given the potential detrimental impact on the landscape character and the relationship with the settlement, the site is not considered suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA014	Land north of Coombe Road and west of Duncombe Road	East Meon	Rejected	The site is not considered to be achievable. If achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. This broadly aligns to the medium landscape sensitivity concluded in the 2015/16 SHLAA. Conversely, the NDP Group previously assessed the site as having a high landscape sensitivity due to its scale and visual prominence from higher ground to the north and west.	The site is large-scale, open, predominantly flat, and is visually exposed from all sides by higher ground, especially to the north and west. Development would create an incongruous western extension to the nucleated, grid/cluster pattern of East Meon. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is an existing narrow access which connects the site to Coombe Road (a rural and narrow country lane). This is not considered to be sufficient to accommodate an appropriate and safe vehicular access. In addition, it is understood that Workhouse Lane has sewerage capacity issues.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA016	Land east of Chapel Street	East Meon	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a medium/high landscape sensitivity due to the quality and character of the existing settlement edge. The site is raised above the adjacent sunken lane and development would interrupt the existing landscape structure to a significant degree.	The site is adjacent to the Grade II listed Sebastopol Cottages (to the north) and is raised above Coombe Road. The site is not currently visible from the highway given its well established boundary trees and other vegetation. However, development would be visible from the highway and the wider open countryside and would be imposing and detrimental to the sunken lane qualities of Coombe Road. Given the above and the previous landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no existing safe vehicular access. The previous assessment alluded to the creation of a new access via the existing access to Coppice Cottages. However, in June 2023, planning officers visited the site and concluded that the above was not achievable, appropriate, nor safe given the raised topography, sunken lane qualities, and location on the corner of a bend.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA017	Land at Farringdon Mill	Lower Farringdon	Rejected	The site is in active employment use and is not available for residential redevelopment.	The site is assessed as having a low landscape sensitivity given that it is previously developed land. Redevelopment would provide an opportunity to reduce visibility in the wider landscape by reducing the height and scale of existing buildings.	The site is within 250m of historic landfill, is opposite a Grade II listed building, and includes Area TPOs on the south, south-eastern, and south-western boundaries. There is a PRow running through the site and there is potential for contamination due to the existing and previous uses. Although any potential impacts arising from the above could be avoided and/or mitigated through land remediation and careful and sympathetic design and layout, the site is still in active employment use. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review (as it is in active employment use) but could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing.	No	The site is in active employment use and there is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for residential redevelopment.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to retaining a suitable access to the adjacent business park.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA024	Land north of Longmoor Road	Greatham	Rejected	The site is not available and part of the site is within 400m of the Wealden Heaths Phase II Special Protection Area (SPA). If available, development on the remainder of the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. The site comprises deciduous woodland priority habitat. The woodland is contiguous with the western extremity of the Woolmer Forest SAC and SSSI to the east, which is also part of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA. The site would require tree felling which would significantly affect local amenity, the character and appearance of the area, and the enjoyment of the adjacent PRoW network.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel and is adjacent to the PRoW network. The south-east area is within 400m of the Wealden Health Phase II SPA. Even if the south-east area is excluded, the site is still not considered to be suitable for development given the findings of the landscape assessment.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA026	Land between Downhouse Lane and Hinton Manor Lane	Catherington	Rejected	The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape including adjacent topography.	The site has a medium/high landscape sensitivity. The site is exposed to high levels of visibility in a valley side location. The site is inconsistent with surrounding development patterns and would introduce a large visible site which would appear isolated and remote.	The site rises to the south west and is in a prominent position along Downhouse Road. The west of the site is bounded by significant topography. There are power lines which run through the site. There is a grade II listed building to the north. The eastern edge of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding. As the landscape assessment concludes, the site is not well related to the existing settlement pattern is detached from it by the road. Therefore, the site is not considered suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA027	Anchor Meadow, east of London Road	Horndean	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a medium/high landscape sensitivity overall. The lower part of the site has a medium/high sensitivity due to connection with surrounding development, while the higher part of the site has a high sensitivity.	The site slopes steeply to the west and is visible from the other side of the valley. There is a public right of way running along the north of the site. The south west corner abuts the conservation area. There is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) adjacent. The south east corner is adjacent to a group of trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order. There is an area of ancient woodland adjacent to the site (north east corner).	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. An appropriate and safe access to the site would need to be achieved.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA040	Land north of Hill Brow Road, west of Woodlands Lane, and south of Huntsbottom Lane	Liss	Rejected	The site is wholly within a protected gap and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It is an assorted fieldscape and has a rural, secluded, and tranquil character. The site is above the 75m contour and is part of a transitional area between two landscape character areas and the settlements of Liss and Hill Brow. The former has a nucleated pattern while the latter has a low density and scattered settlement pattern. The site is surrounded by the PRoW network on three sides which provide open and intermittent views into the site.	The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA and its south-eastern corner is in a contaminated land buffer. The site is adjacent to the listed Clarks Farm and is bound by priority habitat, protected trees, woodland corridors, and historic and sunken lanes. The site is wholly within the Liss and Hill Brow Protected Gap (Policy 2, Liss NDP). It is considered that development would create an incongruous extension which would not be well related to Liss and would adversely impact on the rural, secluded, and tranquil character of the area.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development is not achievable per se. However, it is unclear if an appropriate and safe access could be achieved from Hill Brow Road without impacting the rural character of the area, see suitability above.	Yes
EA041	Land at Hilliers Nurseries, west of Longhill Cottage, Hill Brow Road	Liss	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site does not relate well to existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is in a prominent undeveloped area, is (in some places) raised above the road, is on the opposite side of the road compared to the existing settlement, and is above the 75m contour. The site is detached and has a poor relationship with the settlement pattern and is highly visible in distant views of Liss given that it is part of an elevated, larger fieldscape on a north-west facing slope. Access to the site would create openings through which to view development and would be detrimental to landscape character.	The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA. The site is physically detached from the settlement boundary and development would create an incongruous southern extension to the nucleated village pattern of Liss. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, Highway Authority input would be required given the proximity of, and vehicular movements associated with, Liss Primary School.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA042	Land at Hilliers Nurseries, west of Hangery, Hill Brow Road	Liss	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site does not relate well to existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is in a prominent undeveloped area, is (in some places) raised above the road, is on the opposite side of the road compared to the existing settlement, and is above the 75m contour. The site is detached and has a poor relationship with the settlement pattern and is highly visible in distant views of Liss given that it is part of an elevated, larger fieldscape on a north-west facing slope. Access to the site would create openings through which to view development and would be detrimental to landscape character.	The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA. The site is physically detached from, and is not considered to be well related to, the settlement boundary. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	The east area is raised above, while the west area is on a similar level as, Hill Brow Road. There is no reason to indicate why development on the site could not be achieved subject to a safe access being created at the north-west end of the site.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA046	Land south of Larcombe Road, west of The Causeway, and north of Horse Chestnut Farm	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern, its eastern area is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. Although it is seen in long distance views, the site is relatively flat and screened by mature trees and hedgerows. Its boundaries are delineated by the A3/railway transport route (west), the PRoW network (south and east), and a tributary stream of the River Rother (east). The site is isolated and not well related to existing settlement pattern. Development would create an incongruous extension to the distinctive, nucleated, and planned settlement pattern of Petersfield. The site also comprises priority habitat.	The site is adjacent to a Grade II listed building (No.211 The Causeway). The site is situated between the A3/railway transport route (west) and a tributary stream of the River Rother (east). The west is susceptible to noise while the east (including vehicular access) is in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	The site is accessed over culverts on its east boundary via third party land. The accesses are in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and the existing culverts are unlikely to accommodate additional vehicular movements.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA047	Land rear of 115 Sussex Road	Petersfield	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on an area of special housing character.	The site has very low landscape sensitivity as it comprises enclosed residential garden, amenity and pasture land. The properties along Sussex Road – including 115 Sussex Road - are identified in an area of special housing character given the important contribution they make to the streetscene.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel and there are protected trees along its eastern boundary. The existing dwellinghouse is in an area of special housing character – see Policy BEP5 of the Petersfield NDP. The NDP Examiner previously stated that the formation of a new access off Sussex Road would be damaging to the character of the area and would set an undesirable precedent in respect of this section of Sussex Road as a whole.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	The site promoter has stated that vehicular and pedestrian access would be achieved via the demolition of No.115 Sussex Road. Although this would have a potential adverse impact on an area of special housing character, there is no reason to indicate that development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA053	Land at Kingsfernsden Lane	Sheet	Rejected	The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. Although relatively flat and enclosed by mature trees and hedgerows, the site is unrelated to Sheet Village and appears to be more closely associated with the north-east settlement edge of Petersfield. Development would negatively impact on the rural hinterland of Petersfield, create an incongruous north-east extension to Petersfield, and coalesce the settlements of Petersfield and Sheet.	The site is rural in character and development would negatively impact on a narrow, rural, and historic sunken lane (Kingsfernsden Lane). The lane has no pavements and the site is bounded by protected trees. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	Kingsfernsden Lane is a narrow, rural and historic sunken lane bound by trees and hedgerows. There is an existing gated access close to Fernsden Lodge and so development is technically achievable. Development and hard engineering solutions would destroy the historic and rural character of the lane. This raises questions regarding the site's suitability – see above.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA061	Land at Horse Chestnut Farm	Petersfield	Rejected	The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity and is in a transitional area between two landscape character areas. It is located between the B2070 Causeway (east) and the A3 and railway line (west) and is visible from the elevated highway and PRow network. Development would create an incongruous southern extension to the distinctive, nucleated, and planned settlement pattern of Petersfield.	The whole site comprises floodplain grazing marsh priority habitat. The site is dissected by a tributary stream of the River Rother. The eastern area of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and the watercourse buffer associated with the stream, while the western area is in the contaminated land buffer associated with the A3 and railway line. The site is affected by noise given its confinement between two transport corridors and a number of trees on its eastern boundary are protected. Given all the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential or employment development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA063	Land north west of Tilmore Road	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not considered to be achievable. If achievable, the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The western area includes the Tilmore Brook and associated local green space, whilst the eastern area includes, and is in proximity to, the Hangers Way and Shipwrights Way respectively. Development would be a dominating influence which would negatively impact on the existing semi-rural character, and would create an unrelated, isolated, and incongruous northern extension to the nucleated and planned market town of Petersfield.	The noise of the A3 is noticeable when on site. The site is in a contaminated land buffer, is in mineral consultation area for sand and gravel, and is in proximity to historic landfill. The site includes some, and is surrounded by, priority habitat – this includes its access off Tilmore Road. Although mitigation could be explored for the above, this would not overcome the findings of the landscape assessment.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	The proposed accesses off Bell Hill, and via Steep House Nursing Home off Tilmore Road, are not considered to be achievable nor suitable.	No
EA065	Land west of Upper Tilmore Road	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. It has an apparent topography and is very characteristic of its landscape character area. The site is bound by, and includes, the Hangers Way PRoW. The site has a poor relationship with the settlement pattern and so development would create an incongruous northern extension to the nucleated and planned settlement pattern of Petersfield.	The northern area is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel and also includes historic landfill. Although raised above the motorway, the site is still subjected to noise disturbance from the A3 which would negatively impact potential future residents. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to the delivery of a safe and appropriate access off Tilmore Road.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA073	Land rear of 219-249 The Causeway	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and is not available for development.	The site was previously assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. The site has intervisibility with Butser Hill and is adjacent to priority habitats. The site was previously rejected due to concerns around its relationship to existing settlement pattern. However, upon review, it is considered that development may not be entirely incongruous given existing residential development and recently permitted development in the wider area.	The site is adjacent to a Grade II listed building (No.211 The Causeway). The site includes a stream and pond and a vast proportion of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3. It is also dissected by an existing PRoW which runs north-south across the site. Given the above, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA084	Land west of Church Cottages	Blackmoor	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. It comprises the residential garden land of a long row of dwellinghouses, some of which are non-designated heritage assets. The site is in the Blackmoor Conservation Area which has the character and appearance of a Victorian country estate village. The site is in proximity to a number of listed buildings including, but not limited to, the Grade II* listed Church of St Matthew. The site is also partly visible from the PRoW to the west.	The site is in a mineral consultation area and is within 5km of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA. The south area is in a contamination land buffer due to historic oil storage adjacent to the south boundary. The site is in a very sensitive area in terms of heritage and landscape. Development would be contrary to the existing appearance, built form, character, and pattern of the conservation area. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to demonstrating that existing power cables along the western edge would not affect or prevent potential development.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA088	Land under the Hill	Selborne	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. It is in a conservation area and in the setting of various listed buildings. It is also in proximity to, and partially visible from the Wakes Registered Park and Garden, East Hampshire Hangers SAC, and Selborne Common SSSI. Although the site is relatively flat, the surrounding topography is apparent and so the site is readily visible from the B3006 (when approaching from the south) and the Hangers Way long distance walking route (which is on higher ground to the west). Moreover, the site forms part of the rural setting of the historic and predominantly linear village of Selborne.	The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA and there may be potential for archaeology. A proposal for 10 dwellings (with associated car parking, open space, and footpath) was refused in May 2014 and dismissed at appeal in March 2015. The Inspector concluded that development would fail to: conserve the landscape, scenic beauty, and cultural heritage in the National Park; and preserve and/or enhance the character and/or appearance of the conservation area. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	An appropriate and safe access to the site would need to be achieved. The previously proposed (and refused) access was from the B3006 via an adjacent field.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA094	Land east of Hays Cottages	Steep	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Further investigation is required to understand if a safe vehicular access is achievable.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity due to its dominant and undulating topography, and its exposure to local and distant views from the PRow network and wider landscape. It is also considered to be part of the historic field pattern and is poorly related to the settlement pattern.	The site sits on the head of a dry valley on land which slopes away from the settlement. The site is highly visible from the PRow network and wider landscape and is not well related to the existing settlement. Given the above and the finding of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	The existing access points are via a garage court off Hays Cottages and a grassed narrow track on the dry valley side off Mill Lane. It would need to be demonstrated whether a safe vehicular access point could be created.	Uncertain
EA103	Land adjacent to Holmwood Lane	Stroud	Rejected	The site is not available, the impact to settlement pattern, and the site is not achievable due to access constraints.	The site is assessed as having a moderate landscape sensitivity due to open views to the south and part of land forming a transition from Stroud village to open countryside.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel. The site is not well related to the settlement pattern. Access to the site appears to be the track adjacent north. The track is not currently wide enough to allow for suitable access.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	The access is not currently suitable. The access entrance and early length is bounded by the primary school and playground and there does not appear to be scope to widen.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA104	Land at Holly Wood	Liss Forest	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on protected trees and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. It includes protected trees and is in proximity to Longmore Inclosure SSSI which forms part of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA. The site is within an area of woodland that forms part of the former Longmoor railway line – this is now a PRow (Shipwrights Way), LNR and SINC. Development of the whole site would be detrimental to the landscape character of the adjacent PRow, LNR and SINC. The east area relates more to Forest Road and is less sensitive due to surrounding residential character.	The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA. It comprises a large house and its garden land to the west of two residential properties off Forest Road. The site is within an area of woodland that is part of the former Longmoor railway line - this is now a PRow (Shipwrights Way), LNR and SINC. The site's entrance and frontage is set within a line of large trees and hedgerows. The site contains a number of protected trees, including an Area TPO in the western third of the site. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA108	Lower Tilmore, Tilmore Road	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site is assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity. The area is semi-rural in character but the site constitutes previously developed land given that it comprises a dwellinghouse and its residential curtilage. The site is screened by well-established and mature trees and hedgerows on all sides and is only visible from its existing vehicular access off Tilmore Road. Development may have a significant impact on the local and semi-rural character of this part of Petersfield, and so only scall-scale development should be considered.	The site is accessed via Tilmore Road and is bound by large mature trees and hedgerows on all sides. The site is in Flood Zone 1 but is susceptible to groundwater flooding and is within a watercourse buffer. It is considered that the site may only be suitable for small-scale, sympathetically designed, residential development focused around the existing building footprint.	Yes	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA111	Land at Honey Lane	Selborne	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. Although the site itself is relatively flat, it is part of a larger field which is raised above its proposed access and the village, on the opposite side to the East Hampshire Hangers SAC. The site is partly within a conservation area and its access is in the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets. The site is visible in both glimpsed and whole views from the PRow network along its southern and western boundaries.	The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA and there may be potential for archaeology at its access off Honey Lane. The site is not considered to be suitable for development given: the findings of the landscape assessment (above); the potential impact on heritage assets; and the potential impact of creating a new vehicular access on rising topography. If development was to be considered further, then it would need to be very small-scale.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	A safe and appropriate access point off Honey Lane would need to be achieved. There are potential highway and landscape issues associated with the access point and junctions onto Honey Lane and the B3006.	No
EA112	Council Depot off Paddock Way	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site is assessed as having a low landscape sensitivity given that it is previously developed land within the defined settlement boundary, and that redevelopment would be consistent with surrounding residential land. The site is allocated in the Petersfield NDP and the NDP Examiner concluded that the site was "clearly an appropriate allocation, should the site become available".	The site is allocated in the Petersfield NDP under Policy H9 for 42 dwellings, subject to the relocation of the existing depot use elsewhere in the town. The NDP allocation has established the principle of redevelopment.	Yes	The landowner confirmed in May 2024 that the site is not available.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA115	Community Centre, Love Lane	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site is assessed as having a low landscape sensitivity given that it is previously developed land, it is within a defined settlement boundary, and redevelopment would be consistent with surrounding residential development.	The site is allocated in the Petersfield NDP for 10 dwellings under Policy H10, subject to the relocation of the existing community use elsewhere in the town. The NDP alludes to a possible relocation of the existing community building to the Love Lane Recreation Ground - see NDP Policy CP2. The NDP allocation has established the principle of development, and so the site is considered to be suitable subject to an alternative community centre location being identified.	Yes	The landowner confirmed in May 2024 that the site is not available.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA122	Land south of Shirnall Hill	Farringdon	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has high landscape sensitivity owing to its dominant topography and its prominent location above the historic, rural, and sunken lane on Shirnall Hill. There are glimpsed views of the site from its immediate surroundings, and the site is readily visible in distanced views from the PRow network to the south and south-west. The site is not directly adjacent to the defined settlement boundary, but instead is located in the “gap” between Lower and Upper Farringdon. The former has developed around the A32 transport corridor, whilst the latter is of Anglo-Saxon origin and is broadly delineated by the conservation area. Development within this gap would coalesce two distinct areas of settlement which would conflict with the historic settlement pattern in that the separate historic areas would no longer be legible in the landscape.	The site is adjacent to historic landfill and is in proximity to the Upper Farringdon Conservation Area and the “Jordans” listed building to the east. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	It is expected that significant works would be required to achieve access.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA124	Land at Place Farm (1)	Binsted	Rejected	The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity due to its open and exposed nature, and high visibility from a local public right of way. It has a poor connection with the settlement.	The site is not considered to be well related to the settlement. It is bounded by a mature hedgerow and sits higher than the road. The site is visible from the footpath network. The site is somewhat remote from the village core. Development of the site would continue the line of development along the Street.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA128	Land rear of Coombe Road Terrace	East Meon	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is not considered suitable to yield 5 (net) dwellings or more.	The site is assessed as having a low landscape sensitivity due to the existing suburban character and its location within the defined settlement boundary.	The site is located within the defined settlement boundary and comprises (parts of) the rear gardens of a row of semi-detached houses. Given the need to retain the existing trees onsite, it is unlikely that development would yield 5 dwellings or more.	No	The site was recorded as available in the East Meon NDP but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA136	Land at Manor Farm, Clanfield	Clanfield	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The area of the site within the National Park - which extends beyond the settlement edge into the wider downland mosaic - is considered to have a high landscape sensitivity due to its poor relationship with the settlement pattern and the intrusion caused by development into the wider landscape which would result from development of this site.	The part of the site within the National Park is of high landscape sensitivity (including low density modern farm buildings). There are non-designated heritage asset agricultural buildings on the part of the site outside the National Park.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA137	Land at Observatory House	Clanfield	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. The site is exposed to views in the wider landscape due to its hilltop location. The site's poor relationship with the settlement pattern means that development would intrude and expand the perceived extent of the settlement into the wider landscape beyond the valley in which it sits. The impact of increased density of built form in this sensitive location would be inconsistent with the low density and dispersed nature of settlement in this location.	Given the findings of the landscape assessment, development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA140	EuroTec, Petersfield Road	Greatham	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is partly within 400m of the Wealden Heaths Phase II Special Protection Area (SPA) and the remainder of the site is in active employment use.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity. The site is predominantly flat and has an active frontage on Petersfield Road. The east area is previously developed land (PDL) and comprises two-storey buildings of red brick construction, while the west area relates strongly to the surrounding field pattern and wider countryside character. The north-west and north-east boundaries are well screened by existing trees.	The west area is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel, and the north area is within 400m of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA. Even if the north area is excluded, the east area is in active employment use (Classes B1 and B8) and development in the west area may have a landscape impact. Given the above, the site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review (as it is in active employment use) but could come forward (in part) under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA141	Former Apple Packing Station, Blackmoor Estate	Blackmoor	Rejected	The site is in active employment use and is not available for residential redevelopment.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity. The site is previously developed land comprising a former apple packing facility, offices, and storage, with some existing residential uses. The site is surrounded by deciduous woodland priority habitat and the south is within the Blackmoor Conservation Area which has the character and appearance of a Victorian country estate village. The site is in proximity to a number of listed buildings including, but not limited to, the Grade II* listed Church of St Matthew, and the Grade II listed Old School House and War Memorial.	The site is in a mineral consultation area and is within 5km of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA. The site is in a very sensitive area in terms of heritage and landscape. Large-scale redevelopment on the site could be contrary to the existing appearance, built form, character, and pattern of the conservation area. Notwithstanding the above, the site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review (as it is in active employment use) but could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA142	Land at Hatch Lane	Liss	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is within a large tract of assart fieldscapes and is bound by priority woodland habitat. The site is distinctive of its landscape character area and forms an important visual gap between the edge of Liss, the wooded slopes of the Greensand Hill, and the dispersed settlement of Hill Brow. The site is visible from Hatch Lane and contributes to the rural character of the area. Development would extend the village into open countryside, in an isolated manner, creating an incongruous eastern extension.	The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA. The site is poorly connected (both physically and visually) to Liss Village and development would create an incongruous eastern extension to the nucleated village pattern. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA145	Land at Tilmore West	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not considered to be achievable. If development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity and forms part of the valley and setting of the Tilmore Brook. Bell Hill Ridge has a semi-rural character comprising low density development off a single-track lane. The western parcel rises notably in comparison to Coxes Meadow whilst the central and eastern parcels undulate down towards the Tilmore Brook. The site is readily open to views from the adjacent PRow which also delineates the site's southern boundary.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel. The site boundaries and internal subdivisions are delineated by mature trees and hedgerows. The site it is not considered to be suitable for development given the findings of the landscape assessment, and the potential impact on the semi-rural character of Bell Hill Ridge and the valley and setting of the Tilmore Brook.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	The site is not considered to be achievable given the access issues associated with Bell Hill Ridge and Coxes Meadow which are both narrow roads with limited opportunities for widening. The promoter has alluded to an access appraisal, but no such appraisal has been submitted to demonstrate that the site is achievable.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA146	Land rear of Queens Hotel / Dowlings Little Mead	Selborne	Rejected	The site is a Local Green Space (LGS). If not an LGS, development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity and is adjacent to two priority habitats. The site is in a conservation area, in the setting of various listed buildings, and in proximity to a registered park and garden. The B3006 and Huckers Lane are two of the five main areas of interest in the conservation area. The combination of a strong landscape setting between the steeply rising wooded hangers, many historic buildings, narrow winding streets, use of local materials, and varied viewpoints and spaces, all combine successfully to create an attractive character, setting and sense of enclosure within the conservation area and wider village. The village is predominantly linear, and this area includes built development which addresses the road and has limited development at depth.	The site is a Local Green Space (LGS), within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA, has archaeological potential, and is partly in a contaminated land buffer. Development would be inconsistent with the predominantly linear form of the village and would be incongruous to existing settlement pattern and development depths. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA158	Land at Rake Road	Liss	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium/high landscape sensitivity. The site is part of a wider assarted field pattern with mature wooded field boundaries. The site slopes down from the road. The rear of the site comprises uncultivated land associated with a watercourse/spring and part of the Wyld Green Woodland SINC. The site is visible from the field entrance off Rake Road, but otherwise public views are limited due to heights of existing banks and vegetation, and views from the Greensand Hills are largely shielded by woodland. Development would have a detrimental impact on the increasingly rural character of wider landscape.	The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA. It is accessed via a rural, sunken lane with banked and hedged edges. The site is adjacent to a large dwelling to the south-west and there are further larger dwellings to the north-east. The existing dwellings form a dispersed pattern and a highly filtered settlement edge. Development would need to be sited close to Rake Road. However, this is above the 75m contour and development of any depth would be inconsistent with the surrounding character and settlement pattern of large dwellings on generous plot sizes. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA163	Land at Glencairn, Winchester Road	Chawton	Rejected	The site is not considered suitable to yield 5 (net) dwellings or more.	The site has a very low landscape sensitivity as it comprises a dwelling and garden land bound by A31 and Winchester Road. Notwithstanding the above, the site is a visual gateway to Chawton and the National Park and has a high heritage sensitivity given that the dwelling and its driveway are within the conservation area, and the garden land is within the setting of the conservation area. The special character and significance of the conservation area and nearby listed buildings are derived from the well-preserved street layout and period buildings.	The site is in a source protection zone and bound by A31 and roundabout to the north and west. The dwelling and driveway are in the defined settlement boundary and Chawton Conservation Area, while the garden land is outside of the defined settlement boundary and in the setting of the conservation area. A development of 5 dwellings or more would create a density, building form, and position that would be out of keeping with the existing low-density pattern of development and, as such, would fail to preserve or enhance the conservation area and its setting.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA178	Land at Golds Farm	Greatham	Rejected	The site is not considered suitable to yield 5 dwellings or more.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity given that it is flat, small-scale, and includes previously developed land (PDL). The latter is in the form of an existing barn and hardstanding which are used for a fruit and vegetable distribution facility. The site has a very high heritage sensitivity given that it is directly adjacent to the Greatham Conservation Area. The conservation area is the historic core of the village and includes various listed buildings of 17th and 19th century origins which all surround the listed 13th century old church of St John.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel and is within 5km of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA. The site includes or is adjacent to priority habitat, mature trees, and hedgerows, and is within 250m of historic landfill. The site has a very high heritage sensitivity given its archaeological potential and its location adjacent to a conservation area and listed buildings. Redevelopment may potentially help to conserve and positively contribute to the appearance, character, setting and significance of adjacent heritage assets by removing the exiting barn and hardstanding. However, in considering surrounding built form and density, any redevelopment would need to be less than 5 dwellings and would need to respect the details, form, and materials of, and views to and from, heritage assets.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA179	Land at Langrish House	Langrish	Rejected	The site is not considered to be suitable due to its relatively isolated location.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It sits within a wider landscape of early enclosure fields. The site is relatively enclosed with limited views. The house, driveway access, walls and landscaping are previously developed land and are distinctive features in this location.	The site is not well related to the settlement of Langrish and is in proximity with farmstead and cottages that sit within, and are characteristic of, the wider countryside in this area. The site is adjacent to a SINC. The site is not considered suitable for significant residential development due to the relatively isolated location. Conversion of the existing buildings could potentially be achieved in accordance with existing planning policy.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA180	Land between The Cottage and The Wheels	Lower Farringdon	Rejected	The site is not considered suitable to yield 5 dwellings (net) or more.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It is small-scale and relatively flat and was previously enclosed but is now open to A32 Gosport Road following recent clearance. The site is bound by two detached dwellinghouses within generous sized plots. The historic settlement pattern is simple, linear and focused around the A32 and crossroad unlike more recent atypical developments at Farringdon Business Park (west) and the Shirnall Meadows Estate (east). A development of 5 dwellings or more would reinforce an atypical and incongruous settlement pattern.	The site is in the setting of the listed Street House Farmhouse, is within 120m of historic landfill, is in a contaminated land buffer, and is susceptible to surface water flooding. Although the above could be potentially addressed through remediation and the design and layout of development, the landscape assessment indicates that 5 dwellings or more would reinforce an atypical settlement pattern.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA181	Lower Yard, Selborne Road	Newton Valence	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site was previously part of the dairy and arable farming activities of Newton Valence Farm. The site comprises a range of 10 large and medium sized agricultural buildings of no architectural or historic value, as well as large areas of concrete hard standing, gravel tracks, and debris mounds. The highest point is on Selborne Road in the south-east corner; from here, the site slopes down towards the north-west. Vegetation on site is scarce except for some overgrown areas and an established hedgerow along three boundaries. The site is visible from Selborne Road and immediate footpaths (incl. Footpath 10a) and is also visible (albeit more limited) from other PRow to the north and on higher ground. There are no views of the site from the church, conservation area, and/or registered park and garden.	The principle and quantum of development was established in August 2021 through outline planning permission (ref. SDNP/19/03160/OUT) for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of 10no. dwellings, 6no. double car ports, parking area, and upgraded access.	Yes	The outline consent has lapsed and there is no recent evidence to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA183	Land at Buckmore Stables, east of A3	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is part allocated for a new cemetery. Otherwise, site is not considered to be achievable and, if shown to be achievable, the site is not well related to the settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and PRow network.	The site has high landscape sensitivity due to its dominant topography and open views from the PRow network and Butser Hill. It is adjacent to the A3 and so is subject to noise disturbance which detracts from the tranquillity of the area. The proposed intensification of land use would negatively impact on the use and rural character of the PRow network and the northern unmade, access track off Bell Hill. Finally, development would be detached, secluded and incongruous to the existing built settlement pattern and edge.	The noise of the A3 is noticeable. The site is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel, is surrounded by deciduous woodland priority habitat, and is in a contaminated land buffer. The Petersfield NDP allocates 0.4ha of the site for a new cemetery. Although integration and/or mitigation could be explored for all the above, this would not overcome the findings of the landscape assessment.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The site is accessed via an unmade, single-lane, narrow track which also forms part of the PRow network. The above is appropriate and sufficient for the existing, private paddock use, but any intensification would impact on the use and rural character of the PRow network. Moreover, the existing width is unlikely to accommodate intensification, and it is not considered possible to widen.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA184	Land east and south of Russell Way	Petersfield	Rejected	The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site (including all previous smaller submissions) has a high landscape sensitivity. The site includes a listed building within an assarted fieldscape on the rural edge of Petersfield. The site has a poor relationship with the existing settlement pattern and is open to views from Sussex Road and the wider countryside.	The site has TPOs on its northern boundary and is entirely within a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel. The site includes, and comprises the setting of, the Grade II listed building of Mallards Mere / Wealth Lodge. Development in the north would impact on the character, setting and significance of the listed building, whilst development in the south would create an incongruous south-eastern extension to the nucleated and planned market town of Petersfield. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted in 2025 after the Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA189	Land at Buckmore Stables, west of Bell Hill	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is part allocated for a new cemetery. Otherwise, site is not considered to be achievable and, if shown to be achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and PRoW network.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It is visible in local views and wider views from Butser Hill. Development would have a dominating influence which would negatively impact the existing semi-rural character of the area, as well as the use and character of the PRoW network.	The noise of the A3 is noticeable. The site is in a mineral consultation area, is in the setting of a listed building (north), is in a contaminated land buffer (north), and includes and is surrounded by deciduous woodland priority habitat (south and west). The site access is a single and narrow PRoW which – at its junction with Bell Hill - is adjacent to an area of special housing character and an Area TPO. The Petersfield NDP allocates 0.4ha of the site for a new cemetery. Although integration and/or mitigation could be explored for all the above, this would not overcome the findings of the landscape assessment.	No	The site was promoted after the Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	The site access is a single and narrow track which is part of PRoW ref. 189/31/1. The PRoW is sufficient for the existing house and private equestrian uses, but intensification would have an adverse impact on use and character of the PRoW. The promoter has alluded to an access appraisal and potential for widening, but no such information has been submitted to demonstrate that the site is achievable.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA191	Royal Mail Sorting Office, Swan Street	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site is previously developed land within a defined settlement boundary. It comprises a Royal Mail sorting office (and associated car parking) and is located within Petersfield Town Centre and Conservation Area. The site has low landscape sensitivity but is likely to have high heritage sensitivity given its location within the conservation area and its proximity to nearby listed buildings.	The site is allocated in the Petersfield NDP - under Policies H6, RP1 and MU1 - as a town centre opportunity area for 5 dwellings and 360sqm of retail space. The NDP allocation has established the principle of redevelopment for residential and retail uses should the site come forward for redevelopment in the future.	Yes	The site is allocated in the Petersfield NDP. The NDP Examiner raised doubt and uncertainty as to the delivery of this site. There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA192	BT Exchange, Charles Street	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site is previously developed land within a defined settlement boundary. The site comprises a three storey, L-shaped, building used as a telephone exchange. The building is sited on the junction of Charles Street and Swan Street (with access from the former) in Petersfield Town Centre and is adjacent to (and surrounded by) the Petersfield Conservation Area. The site has low landscape sensitivity but is likely to have high heritage sensitivity given its relationship to the conservation area and nearby listed buildings.	The site is allocated in the Petersfield NDP - under Policies H6, RP1 and MU2 - as a town centre opportunity area for 11 dwellings and 1,000sqm of retail space. The NDP allocation has established the principle of redevelopment for residential and retail uses should the site come forward for redevelopment in the future.	Yes	The site is allocated in the Petersfield NDP. The NDP Examiner raised doubt and uncertainty as to the delivery of this site. There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA193	Petersfield Infant School, Hylton Road	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site is previously developed land within a defined settlement boundary. The site is in Petersfield Town Centre and partially in Petersfield Conservation Area. Although the site has low landscape sensitivity, it is likely to have high townscape sensitivity given its (partial) location within, and relationship to, the conservation area.	The site is allocated in the Petersfield NDP - under Policies H6-1, RP1 and R1 - as a town centre opportunity area for 20 dwellings and 400sqm of retail space. The NDP allocation has established the principle of redevelopment for residential and retail uses should the site come forward for redevelopment in the future.	Yes	There is no indication that the site is available for redevelopment. At the NDP Examination, the Education Authority and other parties raised that there is no current intention that the present use would cease.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA196	Land at Springfield Nursery, Latchford Lane	Oakhanger	Rejected	The site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and is not considered suitable to yield 5 dwellings or more.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity. It comprises a car park (associated with a former nursery) and is bound by a PRoW, public highway and vegetation. The site is surrounded by local wildlife sites, woodland corridors and priority habitats. There are glimpsed views into the site from the public highway.	The site is outside any defined settlement boundary in the open countryside with limited access to facilities and services. The site is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel, is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and is within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA. There may be potential for contamination associated with current and previous land uses on and adjacent to the site. The development of 5 dwellings would be incongruous when compared to emerging plans for the wider redevelopment of the former nursery – see withdrawn application ref. 20936/012.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA197	Land off Farnham Lane, Church Field	Sheet	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has very high landscape sensitivity as it forms a transitional area between the Ashford Stream (north) and the Sheet historic village core (south). In terms of the former, the site includes the watercourse, its valley sides, riparian vegetation, and space for flood alleviation. As for the latter, the site is in, and positively contributes to, the Sheet Conservation Area and its listed buildings.	The site includes the Ashford Stream and its valley sides. The northern half of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and is susceptible to ground and surface water flooding. The southern half of the site slopes up towards and contributes to the setting of the Sheet Conservation Area and various listed buildings – most notably the Church of St Mary Magdalene. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA201	Land at Broadlands Meadow (North)	Sheet	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity due to its intact field pattern, raised position, dominant topography, and sensitivity to settlement pattern.	The site is surrounded by mature tree belts and hedgerows. The site does not relate well to the surrounding settlement pattern and is prominent due to its raised position. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The landowner confirmed in August 2023 that the site is not available.	No	It is expected that significant works would be required to achieve access.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA202	Land at Broadlands Meadow (South)	Sheet	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity due to its intact field pattern, raised position, dominant topography, and sensitivity to settlement pattern.	The site is surrounded by mature tree belts and hedgerows. The site does not relate well to the surrounding settlement pattern and is prominent due to its raised position. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	It is expected that significant works would be required to achieve access.	No
EA203	Land south of School Lane	Sheet	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity given its intact field pattern, raised position, and undulating, apparent, and (in some places) dominant topography. The site is readily visible from School Lane and residential development would create an incongruous extension to the nucleated pattern of Sheet.	The site is bound by mature trees and hedges and is in proximity to the Sheet Conservation Area. The site is accessed off School Lane which is a narrow lane used for on-street parallel parking to facilitate the primary school and existing ribbon residential development on its northern side. The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and is prominent due to its raised position. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted in 2023 and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, the site's topography and the width of School Lane may limit the capacity for development.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA206	Land off Downhouse Road	Catherington	Rejected	The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape including adjacent topography.	The site has a medium/high landscape sensitivity. The site is exposed to high levels of visibility in a valley side location. The site is inconsistent with surrounding development patterns and would introduce new development on the opposite side of Downhouse Lane that would appear incongruous with the settlement pattern and landform.	The site is in a prominent position along Downhouse Road. The west of the site is bounded by significant topography. There is a grade II listed building to the north. The eastern edge of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding. As the landscape assessment concludes, the site is not well related to the existing settlement pattern is detached from it by the road. Therefore, the site is not considered suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA211	Land east of Langrish Primary School	Stroud	Rejected	The site is not achievable and development would have an adverse impact to settlement pattern.	The site has a low-moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is part of a wider landscape of early enclosure. It shares some historic landscape character features such as the wooded field margins. The site has low visibility. The site is within the setting of a Scheduled Monument (a Roman Villa) and is within the archeology alert zone surrounding the monument.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel. The site is not well related to the settlement pattern, separated from the built form of the settlement by school playing fields and with a character more related to the wider countryside surrounding. Some surface water flood risk (1in30 – 1in1000) identified across the north area, and a small area around the entrance at the south boundary. The site includes the Seven Stars Meadow South biosite in the north. There are four protected trees on the west boundary. Access to the site would be from the track adjacent south. The track is not currently wide enough to allow for suitable access.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The access is not currently suitable. The access entrance and early length is bounded by the primary school and playground and there does not appear to be scope to widen.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA213	Land south of Winchester Road and east of Seven Stars PH	Stroud	Rejected	The site is not available and development would have an adverse impact to settlement pattern and character.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is part of a wider landscape of early enclosure. It shares some historic landscape character features such as the wooded field margins. The site has low visibility. The site is within the setting of a Scheduled Monument (a Roman Villa) and is within the archeology alert zone surrounding the monument.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel. The site is not well related to the settlement pattern, separated from the built form core of the settlement by the Seven Stars Public House, car park and landscaping. The south area is adjacent to a watercourse and is subject to surface water flood risk (1in30 – 1in1000). Access to the site is indicated from the A272 but via a ‘drive’ skirting round other land.	No	The site was promoted in 2019, but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA214	Land south and west of Gunns Farm, Hollycombe Close and South Road	Liphook	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a very high landscape sensitivity given its strategic scale, open nature, and elevated position. The site is on the boundary of the National Park and is exposed to local and long-distance views which are currently rural and largely unaffected by views of Liphook. Development – either on both fields or the north field only – would negatively impact on the rural character of the area, and would create a large-scale and incongruous extension to the south-west of Liphook.	The site comprises two arable agricultural fields – dissected by a historic and sunken byway – surrounded by priority habitat and local wildlife sites. The site has been re-submitted for residential development in the northern field, safeguarding for future residential development in the southern field, and SANG within the surrounding deciduous woodland priority habitat. The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA, is located between two registered parks and gardens, and is surrounded by the PRow network (including the Serpent Trail). It is also adjacent to, and visible from, the railway line which is a source of noise disturbance and potential contamination. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	The proposed accesses off Hollycombe Close and South Road are not considered to be achievable to accommodate the level of proposed growth.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA220	Land south of Riverside Close	Liss	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on recreation, and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity. It is below the 75m contour and is not characteristic of its landscape due to the existing golf course use. Although it can be seen in distant views from Farnham Road, it remains relatively enclosed on its northern and eastern boundaries by existing rear gardens and the railway line respectively. Notwithstanding the above, development would create an incongruous extension to the existing settlement pattern.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for sharp sand and gravel. The site has high recreational value given its current use as part of a 9-hole golf course. It is unclear if the site is required for the continued operation of the golf course. The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA, and the south and east boundaries are in Flood Zone 2 and a contaminated land buffer, respectively. If a vehicular access could be created, then development would create an incongruous extension to the existing settlement pattern. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	The site is bound by the railway and the rear gardens of properties along Riverside Close. At present, there is no option for a vehicular or pedestrian access and so development is not considered to be achievable.	No
EA221	Land east of Oak Cottage, Forest Road	Liss	Rejected	Development would result in the loss of priority woodland habitat and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity given that its relatively flat and contained by existing priority woodland habitat. The existing trees make a strong contribution to local landscape character, especially when viewed from Forest Road. Any loss of trees to facilitate development would impact on biodiversity, and on the appearance and character of the area.	The site is in a mineral consultation area and comprises priority woodland habitat. The site is within 5km of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA, and the south boundary is in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Although existing woodland/tree cover helps to contain and screen the site, development would erode the tree cover and the relatively rural and wooded character, and sense of enclosure, of the area. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable.	No	The landowner has previously indicated that the site is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA222	Liss Business Centre	Liss	Rejected	The site is in active employment use.	The site comprises existing commercial units, car parking, hardstanding, and a courtyard within the existing settlement boundary of Liss. The site has a low landscape sensitivity given that it is previously developed land, predominantly flat, and is bound by recent twentieth century development on three sides.	The site is in an existing settlement boundary and within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA. The site is previously developed land, is in active employment use, and has potential for contamination from previous and existing commercial uses. Given the site's importance to the local community and economy, the site is subject to an Article 4 Direction which removes permitted development rights for changes of use from office or light industrial uses to residential use. Moreover, the site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review (as it is in active employment use) but could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for redevelopment.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA224	Land north of Rowlands Castle	Rowlands Castle	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is within an area of open arable land that runs through the centre of the landscape character area where 18th and 19th century field patterns predominate. A variety of archaeological features are noted in the landscape. Development at this scale would be a significant extension to Rowlands Castle, extending the settlement beyond the farmsteads which provide the natural edge and contribute to the transition from settlement to countryside. Development into this landscape character area would impact the tranquil, rural character of the landscape.	The site is located between two woodland areas designated as ancient woodland, accessible woodland, and SINC. Development would impact a significant and well used PRow that is gateway route into the National Park – the Sussex Border Path which connects to the Shipwrights Way – which bisects the east parcel. Woodhouse Lane and the surrounding network of roads north of Rowlands Castle are relatively rural in character. Development would impact on the setting of this lane which is a gateway to the National Park. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA226	Land at Heath Farm / Land east of Heath Road East and Harrier Way	Petersfield	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on archaeology, ecology, settlement pattern, the setting of the Heath and heritage assets, and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has high landscape sensitivity given its strategic scale and strong landscape distinctiveness forming a transitional area between two landscape character areas. The area is rural and open providing a setting to the Heath, heritage assets, and Petersfield. The site is open to views from wider countryside and higher ground. Large-scale development would not conserve or enhance the landscape, and would create an imbalanced and incongruous strategic extension to the distinctive, planned, and nucleated market town of Petersfield.	The site is in a mineral consultation area and surrounded by ecology designations, priority habitats, heritage assets, and contaminated land. The site is dissected by a regional gas pipeline. There are opportunities to deliver green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain (incl. connections between the Heath and River Rother) and active travel connections (incl. Petersfield-to-Midhurst cycle route). The Authority explored the potential for a smaller developable area in the west area, closer to existing development and away from the gas pipeline and wastewater treatment works, and flooding and ecological areas. However, upon further investigation, it is not considered that this smaller area can overcome both identified ecology, archaeology, and hydrology concerns and overall landscape impacts.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, there are existing capacity and safety concerns associated with local highways in this area, and ground water is an issue in this area.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA234	Jolly Farmer PH	Binsted	Rejected	The site is to be reopened as a public house.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is prominent on the edge of the settlement of Blacknest but the current use of the site as a Public House is read in the context of the settlement. Views are predominantly from Binsted Road / Frith End Road, with potential for some longer views to the east of the site.	The site is located within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA and is within a HCC Green Archaeological Alert Buffer. Access to the site is via the Public House Car Park from Binsted Road. It is noted that the access is close to the four-way junction with Frith End Road which is a busy well used road. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it is understood to be in use as a Public House / community facility. However, it could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing.	No	The site was promoted by a member of the public to the 2024 EHDC Call for Brownfield Sites. The site has been recently purchased. It is understood from local press that the site is intended to be reopened as a public house and, as such, is not available for residential redevelopment.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA236	Petersfield Laundry, Rushes Road	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is in active employment use, is part of a safeguarded principal employment area, and is in Flood Zone 2.	The site has moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is previously developed land within a defined settlement boundary and is visible from all sides. The building (including brick chimney) is distinctive of the industrial architecture of Petersfield and, as such, is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.	The site is in a sustainable location adjacent to Petersfield Railway Station and within walking distance to Petersfield Town Centre. The site is in Flood Zone 2, is in active employment use, and has potential for contamination from previous and existing commercial uses. The site is part of the safeguarded Bedford Road principal employment area which is the main employment area in Petersfield. Given the importance to the local community and economy, the site (and wider area) is subject to an Article 4 Direction which removes permitted development rights for changes of use from office or light industrial uses to residential use. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review (as it is in active employment use) but could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for redevelopment.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA237	1 Penns Road	Petersfield	Rejected	The site has a longstanding commercial use and may not be suitable to yield 5 dwellings (net) or more.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity. The site is previously developed land within the defined settlement boundary of Petersfield and is visible from all sides. It is adjacent to Petersfield Conservation Area and the listed railway signal box.	The site is in a sustainable location adjacent to Petersfield Railway Station and within walking distance of Petersfield Town Centre. There is potential for contamination from previous and existing commercial uses and the adjacent railway line. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it has a longstanding commercial use. A proposal could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing. Notwithstanding the above, it is unclear whether the site could accommodate 5 dwellings or more.	No	The site is available for development as confirmed by planning application ref. SDNP/25/0334 1/FUL.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA240	Land rear of Old Stocks Oak	Liss	Rejected	The site is not suitable or achievable.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity given its existing garden use and relatively flat and enclosed nature. Development would create an incongruous northern extension to the existing settlement boundary, extending the built-up area further around the Liss Cricket Club Ground towards the West Liss Conservation Area.	The site is below the 75-contour line, in a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel, and within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA. There is a protected oak tree on the west boundary and there is potential for contamination associated with adjacent previous uses. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed access would “punch through” and negatively impact the existing PRoW which delineates the site’s eastern boundary. Given the impact on the PRoW and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	The site would require access over an existing PRoW and over third-party land. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate existing access arrangements.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA241	The Angel Hotel, Gosport Road	-	Rejected	The site is in active use as a hotel.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity. The site comprises twentieth century hotel accommodation (with associated car parking) to the west of the Privett Conservation Area. The hotel is outside any defined settlement boundary and is a prominent feature on the western side of the A32 Gosport Road.	The site is outside any defined settlement boundary in the open countryside with limited access to facilities and services. The site is previously developed land, is in active use as a hotel, and has potential for contamination from historic land uses in the area – i.e., former petrol filling station and the landfill of the old railway line. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review (as it is in active use as a hotel) but could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing and/or evidence of finances, occupancy rates, anticipated future trends, and how partial residential redevelopment could help to sustain the main hotel business.	No	The site is available for redevelopment as confirmed by planning application ref. SDNP/23/0546 1/FUL.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA243	Land at Rakelands	Rake	Rejected	The site is not considered suitable to yield 5 dwellings or more	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It includes a former car park which is surrounded by deciduous woodland priority habitat in the setting of Rakelands (a non-designated heritage asset). The site is adjacent to protected trees and further priority habitat which connect to ecological designations in the wider area.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for building stone and is within 5km of the Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA. There may be potential for contamination associated with current and previous land uses on and adjacent to the site. The developable area should be limited to the footprint of the car park (given existing built development and to avoid any impact to onsite and adjacent priority habitat) which would limit the development quantum to less than 5 dwellings. As the size threshold for consideration in the local plan is 5 dwellings or more, the site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review. Development may still be able to come forward under existing planning policies in the development plan.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	The site is accessed off a shared drive with Jem Lodge and Rakelands. It is unclear whether the drive (whole or part) is in third party ownership or subject to rights of access. There is also concern about potential conflict with the adjacent nursery.	Uncertain
EA244	Land rear of Jordans, Shirnall Hill	Upper Farringdon	Rejected	The site is not achievable. If development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It has a dominant topography and is in a prominent position raised above, and in the setting of, the conservation area, listed buildings, and the historic, rural, and sunken lane on Shirnall Hill. The site is visible in glimpsed views from all above and in distanced views from the PRoW network. Development would create an incongruous extension to a historic settlement and would contribute to the coalescence of two distinct areas of settlement.	The site is adjacent to the Farringdon Conservation Area and the Grade II listed Jordans. It is within 150m of historic landfill, its western area is in a contaminated land buffer, and its northern area has archaeological potential. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	It is expected that significant works would be required to achieve access.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA246	Land east of Anvil Close	East Meon	Rejected	The site is not considered to be achievable and development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets, key views, and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. The village (100-110m AOD) lies within the well-defined valley of the River Meon between the higher chalk downs (200m AOD). Although the site is surrounded by built development on three sides, it is readily visible from the PRow network (incl. South Downs Way), higher ground, and within valued views, including views to, and from, Park Hill and the spire of the Grade I listed Church of All Saints. The church (and its spire) is a dominant building and key focal point in the village.	The site is in a source protection zone and is in the setting of a conservation area and listed buildings. There is archaeological potential around the north boundary and a contamination buffer and protected trees along the east boundary. A PRow runs along the south boundary. The Authority has explored whether a careful and sympathetic infill development - informed by historic grid and cluster settlement pattern, PRow network, and key views to the listed church – could be suitable in the north area. However, upon further investigation and given the findings of the landscape assessment, it is considered that a smaller developable area would still have a potential adverse impact on the landscape, key views and heritage assets.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	Temple Lane is a narrow and single-track lane. The site promoter has proposed road widening and passing bays on the north boundary of EA247. Notwithstanding the impact on the PRow network, this would not overcome the confined and narrow junctions at Chapel Street and High Street. Sewerage infrastructure, local flooding, and highway safety concerns are highlighted in Parish Priorities Statement.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA247	Land south of Temple Lane	East Meon	Rejected	The site is not considered to be achievable and development would have a potential adverse impact on the integrity of an existing PRoW and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity given its distinctive landscape character and visibility from the PRoW network and wider landscape. The site can also be seen within valued and local views.	The site is in a source protection zone and in proximity to the Grade II listed Sebastopol Cottage. Notwithstanding the above, the site is raised above Temple Lane and development would “punch through” and negatively impact the existing PRoW which delineates the site’s northern boundary. Given the impact on the PRoW and the site’s landscape sensitivity, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	Temple Lane is a narrow and single-track lane. The site promoter has proposed road widening and passing bays on the north boundary of EA247. Notwithstanding the impact on the PRoW network, this would not overcome the confined and narrow junctions at Chapel Street and High Street. Sewerage infrastructure, local flooding, and highway safety concerns are highlighted in Parish Priorities Statement.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EA248	Land south of Marelands	Lower Farringdon	Rejected	The site has planning permission for a new village hall and public open space.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It rises gently to the west and is enclosed by the defined settlement boundary on three sides. The site provides an opportunity for a logical infill development within a nucleated settlement.	The site includes a protected Horse Chestnut (centre), is in a contaminated land buffer (west), and is in proximity to listed buildings. Planning permission (ref. SDNP/22/01621/FUL) was granted in October 2024 for a new village hall with parking and public open space in the form of a wildlife walk and pond. The east area is submitted for residential development to finance and deliver the permitted village hall, but this would result in the whole or partial loss of the permitted public open space. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as a residential allocation but could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, justification of the loss of public open space and the impact on, and delivery of, the permitted village hall.	No	The site was promoted in 2025 and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EB001	East Dean Extension	East Dean and Friston	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. This is because it is prominent within the contours of the land, and because development would appear as an intrusive extension of the built form into the wider downland.	Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EB002	Land at Paradise Drive	Eastbourne	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. This is because of its location adjacent to a conservation area, its location within a continuous belt of woodland along the scarp slope, its prominence in views from the South Downs Way and Open Access Land upon entering the town, and the intrusion in views from the town towards the scarp slope.	The site is part of the golf course and is completely covered in trees. It is physically adjacent to the conservation area and is not well related to the existing settlement pattern.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EB003	Land bound by Peppercombe and Longstone Roads	Eastbourne	Rejected	The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. The site is also not considered to be available or achievable.	The site was previously assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. The site is part of the continuously wooded scarp which forms the setting of Eastbourne. It is elevated on a promontory above existing development and is inconsistent with the adjacent development line. Access is likely to be detrimental to the PRow network and local amenity.	The site is mainly woodland (with a clearing to the west) and is located circa 70m from the nearest point of an ancient woodland. The site is not well related to the existing settlement pattern. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	The site rises steeply to the west and it is not clear if access could be achieved.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
EB006	Land at Burown Down Close and Priory Heights	Eastbourne	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. The site is also not considered to be available or achievable.	The site was previously assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. It is open downland below the continuously wooded scarp which forms the setting of Eastbourne. It is elevated above existing development and is inconsistent with the adjacent development line. Access is likely to be detrimental to the PRoW network and local amenity.	Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	It is not clear if access could be achieved as the site rises steeply to the west and there are a number of changes in levels.	No
HO001	Annington Farm and St Mary's House	Bramber	Rejected	The site is in not available. If available, the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity due to the exposed nature of the river floodplain. Development would be visible from the PRoW network and would interrupt views to the River Adur and South Downs.	The north and east boundaries are delineated by the PRoW network and the site is adjacent to the conservation area and in proximity to listed buildings. The site is wholly within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
HO006	Land at Kingsmead Close	Steyning	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, and result in the loss of the valued and characteristic woodland habitat.	The site slopes southwards and sits above Annington Road which forms the boundary to the east, and in this location has the characteristics of a sunken lane. Annington Road is a historic rural lane from which bostal tracks run up onto the downs. The whole site is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order ref. TPO/1310. As woodland, the site contributes positively to the immediate and wider landscape.	Development would uncharacteristically extend the nucleated settlement southwards along Annington Road; generate significant intrinsic harm to landscape character; and result in the loss of a valued and characteristic woodland habitat. Development would also negatively impact on the landscape amenity value and character of Annington Road - which is a historic rural road and gateway into the National Park from Steyning - and negatively impact on longer views from the South Downs Way.	No	The site was available at time of planning application and appeal see ref. SDNP/21/0289 2/OUT.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
HO008	Land north of Brook Lane / Land at Bridge Nurseries	Coldwaltham	Rejected	The site is not considered to be achievable. If development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is exposed to views from the river valley and is in close proximity to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a Ramsar Site and Special Protection Area (SPA). The site forms part of the rural character, setting and buffer between modern development and Brook Lane.	The site is well contained and bounded by adjacent residential development, roads and the railway line. The site is in close proximity to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a Ramsar Site and Special Protection Area (SPA) to the south. The opening up of the access could impact on the rural setting and may result in the need to remove parts of hedgerows and trees. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	Access via Brook Lane is not considered achievable nor acceptable due to its narrow nature, rural character, and poor visibility over the railway bridge. Access could be achieved via existing development, but would require third party land.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
HO010	Coldwaltham Glebe, Church Lane	Coldwaltham	Rejected	Development would result in the loss of woodland and would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity due to the existing woodland setting, the proximity of the listed church, access problems, and poor relationship with the settlement pattern.	The site is within 5km of a Special Protection Area and in a mineral consultation area for soft sand. The majority of the site is wooded with a variety of mature trees. The site is not well related to the existing settlement pattern and is more rural in character. The site is adjacent to the Parish Church of St Giles, a Grade II* listed building. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	It is not clear how the site will be accessed and this could include accessing the site via land in third party ownership.	No
HO011	Houghton Bridge Caravan Site	Houghton Bridge	Rejected	The site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is very open, prominent and visible, adjacent to the River Arun. The existing use is noted but this is not considered comparable with housing development due to scale and permanence.	The site is wholly within Flood Zones 2 and 3 so would not be suitable for permanent residential development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
HO013	Land north of River Lane	Watersfield	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets, water meadows, and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to the relationship between the historic core of Watersfield and its surrounding historic fieldscape (which includes this site). The site is considered to be an important gap between Coldwaltham and Watersfield. The site does not relate well to the settlement pattern. The site is highly visible along the A29 (despite significant trees on the A29 boundary) and there are extensive views along the river valley towards the chalk ridge from the public footpath. The site is adjacent to the conservation area and in proximity to listed buildings.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for soft sand. There are limited priority habitats on the site although bats have been recorded. Development would have a detrimental impact on the protection area around the Water Meadows. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to further investigation about whether access off A29 would be suitable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
HO014	Land west of Besley Farmhouse	Watersfield	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity due to its size, relationship with adjacent development, and potential for screening. It is adjacent to a listed building and further advice and details are needed to assess the impact.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for soft sand and is within 5km of a Special Protection Area (SPA). The site is in close proximity to a conservation area and is adjacent to a Grade II listed building. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) covers two trees in the north-western area.	Yes	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	The site appears to be achievable although gaining suitable access will require assessment and confirmation. There appears to have been a previous access from A29, perhaps for agricultural use. This would likely lead to the loss of a substantial amount of mature hedgerow to gain necessary widths and visibility. Access might be achievable from Chapel Close, but this is an unadopted access road with garages and could impact an electricity substation and TPO trees.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
HO023	Brookgate Farm	Pulborough	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity with open views across to Pulborough Brooks. The site also forms part of an important gap between the urban area of Pulborough and the farmstead of Brookgate Farm.	Development would truncate and reduce open views across to Pulborough Brooks and the wider landscape. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
HO025	College Road	Upper Beeding	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity owing to its location on a steeply sloping flank of Windmill Hill where development would appear dominant and intrusive due to its elevation and length along the hill.	The site comprises open downland at a higher level than College Road and there is no development on this side of the road at present. The site is considered to be unsuitable due to landscape impacts and breaching the defensible boundary of College Road.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
HO027	Land east of London Road	Coldwaltham	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site has views across the Arun valley and is adjacent to one part, and in proximity to another part, of the Coldwaltham Conservation Area.	The site is visible as one enters Coldwaltham from the north. The open and rural nature of the site immediately before the historic part of the settlement is important. It is also read in connection with the areas on the other side of the A29. Originally these were one field before the construction of the A29.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to an acceptable and safe access.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
HO028	Land west of River Lane	Watersfield	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to the relationship between the historic core of Watersfield and its surrounding historic fieldscape (which includes this site). The site also forms part of a larger field structure and is located within an open part of Watersfield. It is accessed via a rural and narrow lane and is visible from the rear gardens of properties along A29.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for soft sand. The site is not directly connected to the settlement boundary and is in close proximity to the conservation area. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	Development is not considered to be achievable due to the narrow and rural character of River Lane.	No
HO029	The Priory	Coldwaltham	Rejected	The site is not considered to be achievable. If development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. Whilst there is noise from the A29, the site (when viewed from public footpaths) feels rural in character with open views inland to the west. The site is located close to the conservation area and historic core of the settlement and development would detract from this character. The route of the Roman Road lies to the north of the site.	There are no priority habitats and protected areas located within or adjacent to the site. The site is not well located to the defined settlement boundary. The site reads as part of the historic core of Coldwaltham being located abutting the conservation area and to the north of the A29. The site is not considered to be suitable due to potential adverse impacts on heritage assets and wider landscape.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	Access onto A29 may not be possible and further transport evidence would be required, while access onto Kings Lane is not suitable due to potential impacts on the conservation area and listed buildings.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
HO032	Land at Sweetland, Newham Lane	Steyning	Rejected	Access is not considered to be achievable via Newham Lane, and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a very high landscape sensitivity owing to its openness and visual sensitivity, and being in close proximity to the chalk scarp.	There is a PRow along the east boundary, a listed building to the north-west, and an area tree preservation order adjacent to the caravan site to the west. Given the findings of the landscape assessment and the proposed access via Newham Lane, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	Access is proposed via Newham Lane which is narrow at this location and unlikely to accommodate the scale of proposed development. In addition, connection into High Street via Sheep Pen Lane is constrained by historic fabric.	No
HO033	Land west of Chantry Lane	Storrington	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its distinctiveness and sense of place. The PRow crossing the western area provides an opportunity to appreciate the scale and presence of the chalk escarpment. The site is prominent on the foot slope when viewed from Chantry Hill.	The PRow network crosses the site from west to south and delineates the north-eastern boundary with the River Stor. The northern tip of the site is within Flood Zone 3. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
HO043	Former Army Training Camp, Barns Farm Lane	Sullington	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is remote from any settlement and is in an unsuitable location for residential development.	The site is remote from any settlement in area of dispersed development. Development would have an urbanising effect on the countryside.	The site is in an unsuitable location for residential development away from any settlement.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
HO046	Land adjoining the Rising Sun PH	Upper Beeding	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, most of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is in a sensitive landscape within the open floodplain of the River Adur. The site is on the edge of a settlement and falls away to the south with no enclosure from the wider landscape.	The majority of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3. The remaining area outside of the flood zones is likely to be below the capacity threshold for the LAA. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was considered in the preparation of the Upper Beeding NDP but there is no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
HO047	Beeding Court Farm	Upper Beeding	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would be poorly related to the village and would be out of character with the farmstead settlement pattern.	The site is detached from Upper Beeding and is within the open landscape of the Adur floodplain.	A planning application (ref. SDNP/16/06133/OUT) for 5 dwellings was refused and dismissed on appeal in March and November 2017, respectively. The Inspector considered that “replacing one house with five houses would be disrespectful of the farmstead character that has been maintained following the business park’s establishment”. Moreover, the introduction of a more intensive / high density residential enclave would not be suitable as it would be poorly related to the village, and would be out of character with the farmstead settlement pattern.	No	The site was considered in the preparation of the Upper Beeding NDP but there is no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
HO053	Land at Castle Farm	Amberley	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is open to views from the railway line, PRow network, and wider landscape. The site is in the setting of Amberley Castle (a scheduled monument), as well as the Amberley Conservation Area and the Grade II listed Castle Farm Barn.	The site is adjacent and in proximity to SSSI, local geological sites, local wildlife sites, and priority habitats, and is surrounded by Flood Zones 2 and 3. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	The site is accessed via private tracks and it is unclear if these are owned by the site promoter or a third party.	Uncertain
HO054	The Old Tollgate, The Street	Bramber	Rejected	The north area is in active use as a hotel and the south area is in Flood Zones 2 and 3.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity especially towards the southern area as, despite existing trees and shrubs, it is open to the wider landscape.	The south area is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and the north area is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it is in active use as a hotel. The north area could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing and/or evidence of finances, occupancy rates, anticipated future trends, and how partial residential redevelopment could help to sustain the main hotel business.	No	It is understood that the site may be available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
HO056	Land south of Mare Hill Road	Pulborough	Rejected	Development would interrupt valued public views across the site to Pulborough Brooks and would conflict with the existing settlement pattern.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site slopes down towards the river valley with high points adjacent to the road. Access to the site is currently through the White Horse Car Park to the west.	The site currently offers extensive public views from the road across the river valley to Pulborough Brooks, which would be lost through development. The road provides a strong boundary to the settlement area of Marehill to the north and development south of it would conflict with this settlement pattern.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE005	103a Lewes Road	Ditchling	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development above the LAA threshold would conflict with the settlement pattern and have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. The lower area closest to Lewes Road has medium landscape sensitivity, while the north area has higher landscape sensitivity due to visibility from the scarp. The landscape and settlement pattern is relatively recent, local visual sensitivity is limited, and impact on PRoW is limited.	The site is within 250m of an Historic Landfill Site. The north area is in a mineral safeguarding area, while the rest of the site is in a mineral consultation area. The settlement pattern along this area of Lewes Road is linear and low density, reflecting the edge of settlement location. Any significant in-depth development would conflict with this settlement pattern and be out of character with the area. There may be an opportunity for 1-2 dwellings in the south area but this would fall below the threshold of the Land Availability Assessment (LAA).	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, although there is limited opportunity to widen the existing access.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE010	Southerham Grey Pit	Lewes	Rejected	The site is disconnected, has restricted access, and has potential high value ecology. There is no current evidence that an acceptable scheme would be achievable.	Southerham Chalk Pit is a disused chalk quarry to the south of Lewes between the A27 and the Lewes-Eastbourne railway line. Some of the site has the character of previously developed land including the internal site access road and concrete hard standings. However, much has naturally regenerated over time which has resulted in potentially sensitive habitats. The chalk cliff to the south is a geological site of special scientific interest (SSSI) in favourable condition. Whilst much of the site is hidden by topography, especially at the west end, towards the east it becomes much more open to long distance views across the Ouse valley and out towards Firle Beacon. This end of the site is also more tranquil with less road noise from the A27.	The site is challenging due to location. It is disconnected from the town of Lewes. There is potential for Open Mosaic Habitats (high value and difficult to replace), and restricted access. Any development would require a very high-quality and innovative scheme to overcome these challenges. There is no current evidence that an acceptable scheme would be achievable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, albeit there is likely to be viability challenges.	Yes
LE011	Land west of North Kingston Ridge	Kingston near Lewes	Rejected	The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its location on the edge of the settlement next to a major PRoW route. The PRoW would be significantly affected by the proposed access in terms of physical change in structure and character together with the impact of vehicular movements on users of the PRoW network and in views from land to the west, including the scarp slope.	There is a PRoW to the south of the site and there are protected trees on the east boundary. The site is not considered to be well related to the existing settlement pattern.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The site is potentially achievable. Access to the site is along narrow lanes which are unlikely to be considered suitable for higher volumes of traffic.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE016	Land at North End	Ditchling	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development (including access) would have a potential adverse impact on biodiversity and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. It is in a prominent location and is related to the historic core of the village. The access is not clear. A new access off North End – or access to Macs Farm - would require the removal of woodland. This would be potentially detrimental to landscape character and residential amenity.	The site is adjacent to a conservation area, is in close proximity to a Grade II listed building, and is partially within a mineral consultation area. There are protected trees adjacent to the west boundary and there is a wooded area in the centre of the site. A pond occupies a portion of the site and there are likely to be ecological constraints.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, removal of woodland to facilitate access would be potentially detrimental to landscape and residential amenity – see landscape assessment.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE018	Land south of Folders Lane / Land east of Wellhouse Lane	Burgess Hill	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is poorly related to the nearest settlement of Burgess Hill and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is within the Adur-to-Ouse Scarp Footslopes and comprises open farmland with small fields surrounded by, and including, mature hedgerows and trees (a mixture of medieval and post-medieval, with some later field systems) and pockets of ancient and priority woodland. The site gently slopes from the ridge adjacent to Wellhouse Farm down to small watercourses to the north and south. A PRoW crosses the site east-to-west connecting Wellhouse Lane and Ditchling Common. The site has medium potential for archaeological findings, is within 260m of Ditchling Common SSSI, and is within 155m of Brambleside Meadow LWS.	The site is tranquil and part of the open countryside despite recent planning permissions and development at Burgess Hill resulting in the urban area encroaching closer to the National Park boundary. The site is large-scale, poorly related to Burgess Hill and, given the findings of the landscape assessment, is not considered to be suitable.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable per se. However, the only obvious means of access would be via Wellhouse Lane which is not adequate for the scale of development, and any highway improvements would likely detract from landscape character.	Yes
LE020	Land on Church Lane, opposite Tennis Courts	Kingston near Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is adjacent to, and in the setting of, heritage assets and is accessed via a bridleway.	Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable as development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets, and the character and appearance of the landscape.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	Development is not considered to be achievable as access is via a bridleway.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE021	Land at Phoenix Causeway Car Park (All)	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site is considered to have a moderate landscape sensitivity given its location near to the river and sensitive views to nearby heritage assets.	The site has likely archaeological potential, is wholly within Flood Zone 3, within a conservation area, and is close to a number of listed buildings including a Grade I listed chapel. The site is in active use as a car park serving Lewes Town Centre and redevelopment would have to be part of an overall parking/transport strategy for the town.	Yes	The landowner confirmed in June 204 that the site is not available.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to suitable flood mitigation measures.	Yes
LE024	Land north of Wellington Road	South Heighton	Rejected	The site is not wholly available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its scale and location in open downland on the boundary of the National Park. The boundary would not be enhanced by development in this location and would intrude further into the open downland. Any structure/mitigation planting is likely to be detrimental to existing character.	Given the findings of the landscape assessment, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	No	LE024 was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the whole of LE024 is still available for development. An amended site boundary was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 consultation – see LE187.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE028	Land north of Palmerston Avenue	Newhaven	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a very high sensitivity due to the distinctive and open nature of the site and proximity to the PRoW network. There is limited potential for mitigation.	The site has archaeological interest and wildlife value. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no existing access. An access could potentially be created although this would impact landscape character.	Yes
LE029	Lewes Garden Centre, Kingston Road	Kingston near Lewes	Rejected	The site is in active use as a garden centre and is not considered to be available for residential redevelopment. The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and residential redevelopment would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is considered to have a low landscape sensitivity. This is largely due to the existing use being incongruous to the landscape character.	The site is in active use as a garden centre which has recently obtained planning permission for an extension. The site does not relate to the settlement pattern. Any sizeable development would extend the built-up area east of Kingston Road, which is sensitive in terms of both landscape and biodiversity.	No	The site was promoted in 2019 but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for C2 or C3 redevelopment. A planning permission (ref. SDNP/21/00020/FUL) for an extension to the garden centre also suggests that the site is no longer available for residential redevelopment.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE031	Land off Vicarage Way	Ringmer	Rejected	The site is not available for residential development. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, and the setting of heritage assets.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. The site is visible as an extension to the settlement over the brow of an existing rise which would be inconsistent with the extent of the existing settlement.	The site has high potential for archaeology. The site is adjacent to a Grade II* listed building and access is through a conservation area. The realignment of road junctions would be required. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site is not considered to be available for residential development as it was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites for renewable energy development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE034	76 Rookery Way	Seaford	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. The site is visually sensitive given its wide-open location on the edge of downland and a settlement expansion area. The latter is already detrimental to landscape character.	The site is in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and there is a PRoW running through the site. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE035	Former Southern Water Works, Ham Lane	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, the site is in Flood Zone 2 and development would not relate well to settlement pattern.	The site has a medium landscape sensitivity. It is a large and open site within a wooded framework. It is well screened although very separated from the settlement. There is poor vehicular access. Development of height could be visible and intrusive in views from surrounding high ground.	The site is not considered to relate well to the settlement (it is over 800m from town facilities and services) and residential development may not be compatible with neighbouring uses. The site is within 250m of historic landfill and half of the site is in a waste consultation area. The site is entirely within Flood Zone 2. The site is within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and there is moderate archaeological potential on the site.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	Development is not currently considered to be achievable. Access is not considered suitable and there are potential significant contamination issues.	No
LE045	Land at Middleham	Ringmer	Rejected	The site is not available for residential development. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. The site is visible as an extension to the settlement over the brow of an existing rise which would be inconsistent with the extent of the existing settlement. There are protected trees on the southern boundary.	There are two groups of protected trees along the south-western boundary, and there are further protected trees between this area and the road. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site is not considered to be available for residential development as it was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites for renewable energy development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE047	Land west of A26 Malling Down	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It is visually prominent and is an old field pattern which provides time depth in the landscape adjacent to recent modern development.	The site is within 250m of historic landfill, within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, adjacent to Flood Zones 2 and 3 to the west, and has potential for archaeology. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable although access is expected to require significant highway improvements.	Yes
LE048	Land east and south of Hill Rise (1)	Newhaven	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development is not considered to be achievable due to access arrangements and subsequent impact on PRow network.	The site has a medium landscape sensitivity. The site is part of a valuable tract of open land which extends into Denton and includes an extensive PRow network. Access is affected by the steep slopes of the valley side which also make the site visible from the rising land to the north of Denton. The site is small in scale and in proportion with adjacent recent development.	There is a footpath along the north boundary. The site has unknown archaeological potential. The site has several biodiversity constraints and will require further ecological investigation.	Yes	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	The access is unclear and appears to be via a PRow which is narrow and has potential gradient issues. The road would need upgrading to achieve required widths and visibility, and this would have a detrimental impact on the PRow.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE051	Landport Club and Garages, Landport Road	Lewes	Rejected	The site is wholly within Flood Zone 3 and part of the site is in active community use.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity comprising previously developed land on the river flood plain.	The site is within 250m of historic landfill, within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone, and is wholly within Flood Zone 3 requiring flood mitigation. The site comprises garages and a youth club of which the latter is in active community use.	No	There is no recent evidence that the youth club is available, but the garage area is available as confirmed by planning application ref. SDNP/24/0358 5/FUL.	Part	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable per se, although costs of necessary flood mitigation measures may affect achievability.	Yes
LE054	Land at Buckwell Court	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is wholly covered by a Tree Preservation Order and is partially within Flood Zone 2.	The site comprises mature trees which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) Area.	The whole site is covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and the majority of the site is in Flood Zone 2. The site is in close proximity to a SSSI and associated SSSI Impact Risk Zone.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE059	St Mary's Social Centre, Christie Road	Lewes	Rejected	The site is in active community use and is not available for development.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity given that it is previously developed land within the defined settlement boundary.	The site has unknown archaeological potential and there are protected trees along the west boundary. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it is in active use as a community centre. The site could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, an appropriate re-provision or replacement of the existing facility, or robust marketing or needs assessment to demonstrate that there is no market demand or need for the existing facility.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE061	Land at Kirby Farm	Peacehaven	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It comprises a large arable field within an area of open downland between Telscombe Cliffs and Saltdean. The site rises from a low point (around the 40m contour) near its entrance in the east to its highest points (around the 65m and 70m contours) in the north-west and west.	The site has archaeological potential and there is a PRoW on the west boundary. The east area is on lower ground but, on balance, it is considered the landscape sensitivity would make this lower area (along with the rest of the site) unsuitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE081	Land at Park Barn Farm / Long Park Corner	Ditchling	Rejected	The site access is not available.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to intervisibility with the scarp slope, and proximity to Beacon Road and the Sussex border path.	The site is allocated in the Ditchling, Westmeston and Streat NDP for 12 dwellings with access via a garage court off Long Park Corner. The site is bordered by deciduous woodland (with ancient woodland in close proximity), includes a PRoW along its south boundary, has unknown archaeological potential, and is likely to have ecological value as it has been left unmanaged for several years.	Yes	The access via a garage court off Long Park Corner is not available because Lewes District Council has withdrawn proposals to demolish the garages.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, subject to a safe and appropriate access being demonstrated.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE086	Land adjacent to Sunnyside and Ouseside Cottages (1)	Rodmell	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential unacceptable impact on the integrity of the village form and on the conservation area.	The site has a medium landscape sensitivity. It is in a conservation area and is located on the edge of, at the entrance to, Rodmell Village. The site includes important trees and is a tourist destination (Monks House). The existing settlement character and important trees would limit layout options, and screening would be difficult.	The site is within a conservation area and close to listed buildings. The surrounding area is characterised by low density development. Part of the site is within the medieval village core, and there is unknown archaeological potential on the remainder of the site. Taking into account the Conservation Area Appraisal and advice from the Conservation Officer, it is considered that development would have a potentially unacceptable impact on the integrity of the village form and on the conservation area.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. A shared access is preferable and is considered to be achievable subject to the relocation of the bus shelter.	Yes
LE089	Land off Normansal Park Avenue	Seaford	Rejected	Development would result in the loss of public open space without provision of alternative public open space of equal or better quantity, quality and accessibility.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity with views of Seaford Head, Downs, sea, and woodland, and connections to the PRoW network to the north.	The site is more than 1500m from Seaford Centre and there are protected trees along the western boundary comprising priority habitat. The site is currently used as public open space. Development would not be appropriate or suitable unless alternative replacement public open space provision (of equal or better quality) is identified, provided, and secured. The proposed alternative / replacement provision is not considered to be as well located, or as accessible, as LE089.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE092	Land east and south of Hill Rise (2)	Newhaven	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development is not considered to be achievable due to access arrangements and subsequent impact on PRow network.	The site has a medium landscape sensitivity. The site is part of a valuable tract of open land which extends into Denton and includes an extensive PRow network. Access is affected by the steep slopes of the valley side which also make the site visible from the rising land to the north of Denton. The site is small in scale and in proportion with adjacent recent development.	There is a footpath along the north boundary. The site has unknown archaeological potential. The site has several biodiversity constraints and will require further ecological investigation.	Yes	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	The access is unclear and appears to be via a PRow which is narrow and has potential gradient issues. The road would need upgrading to achieve required widths and visibility, and this would have a detrimental impact on the PRow.	No
LE093	Land at Holmdale Road	Newhaven	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its scale, location, high visibility, and proximity to the PRow network. There is limited potential for mitigation.	There is unknown archaeological potential. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE095	Land adjacent to Abergaven ny Arms PH	Rodmell	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is on the edge of, and at the entrance to, Rodmell Village and has a poor relationship to settlement pattern. It is in a conservation area, adjacent to listed buildings, and exposed to long distance views to the north and east.	There is a PRoW to the west of the site. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE096	Land north of Lewes Garden Centre	Kingston near Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potentially adverse impact on a SSSI and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its scale, its poor relationship with the settlement pattern, and the openness of the landscape.	The site is adjacent to a PRoW and is close to the Lewes Brooks SSSI, both to the east. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, development would have a potential adverse impact on a SSSI and the character and appearance of the landscape.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE100	Land at Swanborough Farm	Kingston near Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available and is outside a defined settlement boundary with no access to local facilities. If available, the commercial elements are in active employment use (rejected), while the agricultural and equine elements are not previously development land (excluded).	The site has a medium landscape sensitivity due to its previously built status. The site is visually sensitive to views from the valley side and the South Downs Way (SDW). The existing agricultural buildings are very prominent in these views.	The site is outside a defined settlement boundary with no access to local facilities. The parts of the site that are in agricultural and equine uses are not considered to be previously developed land and should be excluded, while parts in commercial use should not be considered further as they are in active employment use.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE102	Land off Hayward Road and Landport Road	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site has a medium landscape sensitivity. The site is on the Ouse Valley sides where the landscape is sensitive to visible development rising above the valley. The site is well contained (and its layout relates well to surrounding development) by woodland to the north and existing residential development to the south and east. While the site is visible from several viewpoints, these are seen largely against the backdrop or in the foreground of existing development. The relationship of the site with the listed farmhouse is important and heritage advice will be needed.	The site has an existing access and is surrounded by development to the south and east. There is a significant wooded area along the west boundary and the site is open to views across / from countryside to the north.	Yes	The landowner has confirmed in June 2024 that the site is not available.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE106	Land off Coxwell Road	Seaford	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium landscape sensitivity. The site is visually sensitive owing to its extent and elevation in the landscape. The existing downland character would be lost to development, although adjacent existing development and the sloping topography do mean that the site is less sensitive. There is no defensible boundary to the wider (and highly sensitive) open downland to the north.	The site is visually sensitive and plays a key role in the transition from built development to open downland at this point. This would be compounded by the lack of natural features in the landscape to provide a logical, defensible boundary to the site. The site is also more 1500m from Seaford Centre and the east area is in a waste consultation area for the Cradle Hill Industrial Estate.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE107	Land north east of Coxwell Close	Seaford	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is wholly contained within a larger site – see ref. LE106. This smaller site is considered to have the same medium landscape sensitivity as EA106. The existing downland character would be lost to development, although adjacent existing development and the sloping topography do mean that this site is less sensitive. There is no defensible boundary to the wider (and highly sensitive) open downland to the north.	The site is visually sensitive and plays a key role in the transition from built development to open downland at this point. This would be compounded by the lack of natural features in the landscape to provide a logical, defensible boundary to the site. The site is also more 1500m from Seaford Centre and the east area is in a waste consultation area for the Cradle Hill Industrial Estate.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE108	Land at Princess Drive	Seaford	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its visual sensitivity in a vulnerable location on the edge of the settlement, and the contribution that its undeveloped state makes to overall character.	Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE109	Land at Seaford Golf Club, Firle Road (Parcel B) / Land north east of Firle Road	Seaford	Rejected	The site is not considered to be achievable for residential development because, at this location, Firle Road is a single lane with a narrow access and limited passing bays. If achievable, further information would be required to understand the impact of development on the existing golf club.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity. The site is relatively well contained, but new roof lines and built form will be visible in wider views from nearby PRow.	The site is over 1500m from Seaford Centre and there is an informal footpath along the south boundary. Development would result in the loss of overflow car parking and junior golf provision. At present, insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the site is truly suitable for residential development and that the operation of the existing golf course would not be impacted.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The site is not considered to be achievable for residential development because, at this location, Firle Road has a narrow access and is a single lane with limited passing areas.	No
LE110	Land opposite Martens Field	Rodmell	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its undeveloped nature within the Rodmell Conservation Area, and the visual sensitivity of the site at the edge of the settlement. Development would have urbanising impacts on the settlement edge within the conservation area and would affect the amenity of the adjacent PRow.	The site is open and exposed on the western edge. It sits outside of the settlement boundary on the western edge of the settlement. The site is highly visible to/from surrounding open countryside and higher ground to the south. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to connecting to utilities and achieving a safe and suitable access.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE114	Land rear of 49-53 St Anne's Crescent	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not wholly available.	The site has a medium landscape sensitivity. The site includes existing mature trees, is within a conservation area, and is adjacent to a historic PRoW, a Local Wildlife Site (LWS), and Lewes Cemetery (a local green space). Development could be very prominent due to onsite and surrounding levels.	The site is considered to be suitable. The existing mature trees on site should be incorporated into any potential future development.	Yes	A landowner confirmed in January 2026 that the site is not wholly available.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to an appropriate and safe access via County Hall (ref. LE039).	Yes
LE115	Malthouse Field	Cooksbridge	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. It has an undeveloped and open character. Development would have a negative impact on the rural setting of the settlement and would extend the influence of the settlement into the wider countryside between Cooksbridge and Lewes.	The site is adjacent to listed buildings. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE119	Land at Cut Hole / Land south of Mount Road and east of Seaford Road	Newhaven	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is considered to have moderate distinctiveness due to the diluting effect of existing development on the edge of the settlement. However, the site is highly visible given its open and undulating topography, increasing its overall landscape sensitivity.	A PRoW crosses the south area, although this does not appear to be well used. Development in the north area would impact perceptual qualities and views from popular PRoW to the north-east. The site is cut off from the centre of Newhaven by several busy A-roads. The south area is prone to surface water flooding.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The current access is via the Strategic Road Network and so there may be access issues which need to be resolved.	Uncertain

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE120	Land at Stud Farm	Seaford	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is visually sensitive given its wide-open location on the edge of downland and a settlement expansion area. The latter is already detrimental to landscape character.	There is unknown archaeological potential given nearby heritage assets. The site is in an unsustainable location and detached from local facilities in Seaford. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	It is unclear where the site access will be created.	Uncertain
LE121	Land at Wayfields and Grand Avenue	Seaford	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its visual sensitivity in a vulnerable location on the edge of the settlement, and the contribution that its undeveloped state makes to overall character.	There are two PRoWs which cross the site and connect to Bishopstone and downland, with long distance views to Seaford Head and the sea. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, this site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE122	Land west of Winterbourne Hollow and The Gallops / Land south of Lewes Old Racecourse	Lewes	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on recreation, wildlife, and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity as undeveloped countryside on the edge of Lewes Town and the Downs. The PRoW network crosses and borders the site. The site has intervisibility with Kingston Downs.	There are protected trees along the south boundary. The site is within an archaeological notification area, the registered Lewes Battlefield, and a Local Wildlife Site (LWS). Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable although access from Hawkenbury Way may require third party land.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE123	Jakes Acres, Wellgreen Lane	Kingston near Lewes	Rejected	The site is not achievable as the existing access is not considered to be suitable.	The north area has a moderate landscape sensitivity due to its topography and relative enclosure. The south east area has a high landscape sensitivity as the land rises, is on the sensitive southern edge of the village, and is open to views including from Swanborough Hill.	The site is adjacent to Kingston Conservation Area. Given the landscape sensitivity of the south-east area, only the flat land in the north area may be suitable.	Yes	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The existing access is not suitable. Third party land would be required to widen the access, and such widening would have a potential adverse landscape impact.	No
LE126	Land east of Telscombe Road / Hoddern Farm	Peacehaven	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. The south-west area is on lower ground and is removed from some longer distance views, while the north area is considered to have a higher landscape sensitivity as it is on higher ground and exposed to longer distance views. There is a clear and very strong settlement edge along the west boundary of the site.	The site is not considered to be suitable due to the landscape sensitivity, very strong settlement edge, and views.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE127	Land north of Seaford	Seaford	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, and potential unacceptable impacts on the local road network.	The site is considered to have a moderate landscape sensitivity at its southern edge, increasing to a very high landscape sensitivity in its northern area. The site has a strong sense of place, historic time-depth and coherent landscape. The visual sensitivity increases as land rises to the north. Given there is no defensible boundary to the more sensitive land to the north, development is considered to have an unacceptable impact on landscape character.	The site is a large area of downland on the northern edge of Seaford. The site is visually sensitive and plays a key role in the transition from built development to open downland at this point. This would be compounded by the lack of natural features in the landscape to provide a logical, defensible boundary to the site. A PRoW crosses the site, there is a PRoW to the east, and there may be potential to improve PRoW connection to downland. The site is more than 1500m from Seaford Centre and part of the site is in a waste consultation area for the Cradle Hill Industrial Estate.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The site access would potentially be along narrow estate roads which would be unsuitable for substantial additional traffic.	No
LE129	Land at Seaford Golf Club, Firle Road (Parcel A)	Seaford	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity given its location, transition to open downland, and visual sensitivity. Development would extend much further than the existing settlement edge and would appear incongruous and unconnected to the surrounding settlement pattern. New roof line and built form would be visible in wider views from nearby PRoW.	The site is poorly related to the existing settlement boundary and would have a potentially adverse impact on the landscape.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to gaining access via the existing golf club access.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE130	Lewes Railway Station Car Park (East)	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is previously developed land within the defined settlement boundary of Lewes. It is visible from surrounding land, is in proximity to various listed buildings, and is partly in a conservation area.	The site is previously developed land in the defined settlement boundary of Lewes.  The site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and is susceptible to surface water flooding. The site is currently used as a car park for the railway station. Any redevelopment would be subject to re-providing car parking provision onsite or nearby.	Yes	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites by a third party. There has been no evidence provided since this time to suggest that the site is available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, subject to flood mitigation, improved access, and confirmation of third-party access rights across the site.	Yes
LE131	Land at Phoenix Causeway Car Park (East)	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site is considered to have a moderate landscape sensitivity given its location near to the river and sensitive views to nearby heritage assets.	The site has likely archaeological potential, is wholly within Flood Zone 3, within a conservation area, and is close to a number of listed buildings including a Grade I listed chapel. The site is in active use as a car park serving Lewes Town Centre and redevelopment would have to be part of an overall parking/transport strategy for the town.	Yes	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites by a third party. The landowner confirmed in June 2024 that the site is not available.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to suitable flood mitigation measures.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE132	36-38 Friars Walk	Lewes	Rejected	The site is partially in Flood Zone 2 and was recently used as office accommodation.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity given its location and prominent frontage within the Lewes Historic Core, Lewes Conservation Area, and setting of various listed buildings.	The site is in an archaeological notification area. Its road frontage is in Flood Zone 2, and it is accessed via Broomans Lane which is part of the PRoW network. The site is in a sustainable location in Lewes Town Centre and within walking distance of Lewes Railway Station. Despite the above, the site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it is a purpose-built office building. A proposal could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, the preservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their setting, and robust marketing of the existing use.	No	The site was promoted by a third party during the 2022 Call for Sites. It is understood that the site may be available by virtue of marketing boards observed on site in May 2025.	Possible	There is no reason to indicate development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE134	The Shelleys Hotel, 136 High Street	Lewes	Rejected	The existing lawful use is a hotel and redevelopment could come forward under existing policies subject to appropriate evidence and robust marketing to justify the loss of visitor accommodation.	The site is considered to have a high landscape sensitivity due to its historic continuity and prominent position on the High Street.	The site comprises a Grade II listed building within the conservation area and historic core of Lewes. There are several protected trees within the site. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review given its lawful use as a hotel. However, it could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, evidence to show that the lawful use is financially unviable, and robust marketing to show that there is no market demand for the existing use or an equivalent tourism use.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites by a third party and the landowner confirmed in May 2024 that the site is available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE135	Old Barclays Bank, 190-191 High Street	Lewes	Rejected	The site is a listed building, was recently used as a bank, and may not be suitable to yield 5 dwellings (net) or more. It is uncertain whether it is achievable for residential use.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity as it comprises two Grade II listed buildings within the conservation area, historic core, and town centre of Lewes. The buildings are on a prominent position on the High Street and are seen in key views to the war memorial.	The site has archaeological potential and comprises Grade II listed buildings in the defined settlement boundary, conservation area, historic core, town centre and secondary shopping frontage of Lewes. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it comprises listed buildings recently in use as a bank. A proposal could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, the preservation and enhancement of the heritage asset and robust marketing of the existing use. Notwithstanding the above, it is unclear whether the site could accommodate 5 dwellings or more.	No	The site is available for development as confirmed by application references SDNP/24/0530 4/FUL and SDNP/24/0530 5/LIS.	Yes	Access to the site is to the front directly from the High Street at street level; there is no rear or side access.	Uncertain
LE137	Southover House	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It is a prominent building within the defined settlement boundary, historic core, and conservation area of Lewes, and is in proximity to listed buildings.	The site has potential archaeological interest and is in the defined settlement boundary, historic core and conservation area of Lewes. Although not a listed building, the site comprises a prominent and good quality building. The suitability of the site will be subject to appropriate conversion of the existing building.	Yes	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites by a third party. In June 2024, the landowner confirmed that there are no plans to develop the site.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE138	Sackville House, Brooks Close	Lewes	Rejected	The site is in active use as offices and is not available for residential development.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity given that it is previously developed land within the defined settlement boundary.	The site is within 250m of historic landfill, is wholly within Flood Zone 2, and is partially within Flood Zone 3. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it is a purpose-built office building in active use as offices. A proposal could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing of the existing use.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites by a third party. There has been no evidence provided to suggest that the site is available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE140	Lewes Prison	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its scale and prominence on the valley slope.	A large-scale site comprising a Grade II listed Victorian prison adjacent to Lewes Conservation Area. There are protected trees along Brighton and Neville Roads.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites by a third party. There has been no evidence provided to suggest that the site is available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE142	Land at Friars Walk Car Park	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity. It comprises a car park in the conservation area, historic core, and defined settlement boundary of Lewes.	The site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and has archaeological potential by virtue of its location within the historic core and conservation area of Lewes. The site is in active use as a car park with public toilets and changing facilities serving the town centre. Any redevelopment would have to be part of an overall parking / transport strategy for the town.	Yes	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites by a third party. There has been no evidence provided to suggest that the site is available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE148	Land rear of 71 East End Lane	Ditchling	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity with limited views and a relatively flat topography. However, the site has a higher heritage sensitivity given that it is part of the historic core of Ditchling, is partially within a conservation area, and is in the setting of a conservation area and various listed buildings. This includes Walnut Tree Cottage which is adjacent to, and has a historic relationship with, the site from when it was originally used as a farmhouse. The site is also part of the wider rural setting of the listed Pardons and East End House.	The site is in a mineral safeguarding area and mineral consultation area for soft sand. It is also within an archaeological notification area and there is a PRoW adjacent to the east boundary. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not suitable due to potential impacts on the setting of heritage assets.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE152	Land west of Nye Lane	Ditchling	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to open views across the site to escarpment, and general rural and tranquil character of the site.	The site is in a mineral consultation area. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was considered in the preparation of the Ditchling, Westmeston and Streat Neighbourhood Development Plan. However, there is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE169	Land at The Course Garage Site	Lewes	Rejected	The site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity given that it is previously developed land within the defined settlement boundary.	The site is wholly within a conservation area and Flood Zones 2 and 3.	No	The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable per se, although costs of necessary flood mitigation measures may affect achievability.	Yes
LE170	Land north of the Pells and east of River Ouse	Lewes	Rejected	The south and west areas are in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and development (either whole or part of the site) would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is wholly within (and comprises a large proportion of) the Lewes Malling Deanery Conservation Area. It also includes listed buildings and is within the setting of the listed Church of St Michael.	The south and west areas are in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, this site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted in 2021 and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE171	High & Over Car Park	Seaford	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is in a remote and unsustainable location and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its visibility on Alfriston Road.	The site is remote from any settlement and is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site is in active use as a car park. The site was considered in the preparation of the Seaford Neighbourhood Development Plan. However, there is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE172	Land at Newhaven Road and Bishopstone Road	Seaford	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is in Flood Zone 3 and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is considered to have a high landscape sensitivity.	The site is wholly within Flood Zone 3, is in a highly sensitive location, and was previously rejected in the Seaford Neighbourhood Development Plan.	No	The site was considered in the preparation of the Seaford Neighbourhood Development Plan. However, there is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development of the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE173	Seaford Head Golf Course / Land south of Chyngton Road	Seaford	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is considered to have a high landscape sensitivity owing to visual sensitivity along existing settlement edge (Chyngton Road).	The site is part of the Heritage Coast and it was rejected by the Seaford Neighbourhood Development Plan working group.	No	The site was considered in the preparation of the Seaford Neighbourhood Development Plan. However, there is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE174	Land at corner of Southdown Road and Chyngton Road	Seaford	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is within Flood Zone 3 and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is considered to have a high landscape sensitivity owing to visual sensitivity along existing settlement edge (Chyngton Road).	The site is part of the Heritage Coast and it was rejected by the Seaford Neighbourhood Development Plan working group. A PRoW crosses the site and the north area is within Flood Zone 3.	No	The site was considered in the preparation of the Seaford Neighbourhood Development Plan. However, there is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE179	The Old Library, 12 Albion Street	Lewes	Rejected	The site is a listed building, was recently used as office accommodation, and may not be suitable to yield 5 dwellings (net) or more.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It comprises a gothic-style, Grade II listed building within the defined settlement boundary, conservation area, and historic core of Lewes Town. The building appears to be currently vacant but has been previously used as a school and library and, more recently, offices.	The site is in a source protection zone and an archaeological notification area, and there is a protected tree on the south-west corner. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it is a listed building which was recently in use as offices. A proposal could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, the preservation and enhancement of the heritage asset and robust marketing of the existing use. Notwithstanding the above, it is unclear whether the site could accommodate 5 dwellings or more.	No	It is understood that the site may be available by virtue of marketing boards observed on site in May 2025.	Possible	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE182	Land at White Hart Hotel, 55 High Street and 30 Station Street	Lewes	Rejected	The site was last used as a hotel leisure suite and redevelopment could come forward under existing policies subject to appropriate evidence and robust marketing to justify the loss of visitor use.	The site has moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is previously developed land within the defined settlement boundary, conservation area and historic core of Lewes. The site is in the setting of various listed buildings.	The site is in a poor condition. It detracts from the quality of the surrounding area, offers very little townscape value, and negatively impacts on the conservation area. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review given its current use as part of visitor accommodation. However, it could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, evidence to show that the current use is financially unviable, and robust marketing to show that there is no market demand for the current use or an equivalent tourism use.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, subject to access and highway arrangements.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE183	Gorrings Auction House, 14-15 North Street	Lewes	Rejected	The site is in active commercial use and redevelopment could come forward under existing policies subject to appropriate evidence and robust marketing to justify the commercial loss.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity and falls towards the north. The townscape of Lewes at this point is largely commercial in character. However, this is due to change as the proposed development of LE040 (which has a resolution to grant planning permission) includes a mixed-use residential and commercial block of 3-4 storeys high at the existing Spring Gardens Car Park immediately north of the site.	The site comprises a collection of linked buildings and associated hardstanding in the defined settlement boundary, historic core and conservation area of Lewes. The submission states that the existing buildings are too small to meet the current occupier's needs and that they have aspirations to relocate to a modern premises in Lewes. The site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review given its current commercial use. However, a proposal could come forward under existing policies subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing and flood risk. The north area is in Flood Zone 2.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
LE184	Land at Convent Field	Lewes	Rejected	The site is not available, is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and is designated as a Local Community Space (LCS) in the Lewes NDP.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It is an open sports field that has a positive impact on the character of this area on the southern edge of Lewes. The site is in the Lewes Conservation Area and is in the setting of scheduled monuments and listed buildings. There is a line of poplars on the south boundary which helps to screen the site from the Cockshut Stream and A27 beyond.	The site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and is designated as a Local Community Space (LCS) in the Lewes NDP – see Policy SS3, Site 35. NDP Policy SS3 explains that such spaces will be protected from development, except where there is an existing building/structure and the works are needed to maintain its viability/future use, or where development will be for the benefit of the community and will preserve the particular local significance for which the space has been designated. No evidence has been submitted to justify why such circumstances exist or why an arena would provide greater public benefit than the current open sports field.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 consultation by a third party but there has been no evidence provided to suggest that the site is available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE187	Land east of Heighton Road	South Heighton	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its scale and location in open downland on the boundary of the National Park. The amended site boundary (compared to LE024) would still intrude further into the open downland and be higher than adjacent housing. Any structure/mitigation planting is likely to be detrimental to existing character.	Given the findings of the landscape assessment, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. The offered benefits of public open space and links to the PRoW network are not considered to outweigh this harm.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
MI001	Land at Clappers Lane	Fulking	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the landscape and settlement and would adversely impact views from the scarp slope.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to the high visibility of the village from the scarp slope, and the proximity of destination viewpoints on the downs to the village. There is significant potential for inappropriate development to intrude on the underhill setting of the village. A modest development which mirrors the semi-detached cottages opposite (not a cul-de-sac) could be a possible solution.	The site is not well related to the settlement and is large in scale in relation to the adjacent settlement. The site is in close proximity to the conservation area and listed buildings. Mature hedgerow along the boundary with Clappers Lane would need to be removed to replicate the settlement pattern opposite which would cause significant harm to biodiversity and landscape character.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
MI006	Land west of Lodge Lane	Keymer	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. The site is also not available or achievable.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to the connections to the wider countryside and the remote nature of the site. It is poorly connected to the settlement pattern and would be seen as an intrusive suburban development in the wider countryside. Development of the site is dependent on further development to the east of the site to gain access.	There is a parcel of ancient woodland which abuts the site on the south-western boundary. The north-western area is a designated local green space. A public right of way runs through the site. The site is not considered to be well related to the existing settlement pattern.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	Access is dependent on the development of MI003 (Land at Southdowns Farm).	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
MI009	23 The Crescent	Keymer	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, there are access concerns, and development would have a potential adverse impact on ecology and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity to large-scale housing estate development owing to the sensitive entrance within the Keymer Conservation Area, together with the edge of settlement location, existing trees, and proximity of nature conservation interest (SNCI) along the northern boundary. The SNCI is fed by the watercourse along the northern boundary.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for soft sand. The site is not considered to be suitable due to access concerns and potential impacts on surrounding areas of landscape and nature conservation interest.	No	The landowner has previously confirmed that the site is not available.	No	The existing access may not be suitable for further residential development. Further investigation is required.	Uncertain

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
MI010	Land north of School Lane	Pyecombe	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and would over dominate the existing village.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its scale and topography. The site is visible from the surrounding roads and PRow network as a steeply sloped pasture field at the north edge of Pyecombe. The views over the site from the east valley side are open and expansive. Development of the whole site in these views would be excessive and of a scale that would be overly dominant in these views of Pyecombe. The South Downs Way runs along the east and south boundaries and views into the site (if developed) would be incongruous in this location. Moreover, development would appear overly dominant to the existing layout and scale of Pyecombe within the valley. The north area in particular extends for a significant length beyond the existing settlement envelope and extent of influence. A smaller area along the south boundary to the east of existing houses may be less sensitive.	Development would have significantly harmful landscape impacts and would over dominate the existing village which is largely at a lower level. Although some development along the road frontage may be acceptable, this is not considered suitable to yield 5 dwellings or more.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
MI015	Land east of Ockley Lane and south of Mill Lane	Hassocks	Rejected	The site is wholly within a local gap and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to the expansive views of the chalk ridge and the well-used PRow connection to Ditchling. There are significant trees on the road boundary. There are extensive and wide-open views across the site to the north and south, and there are views of the existing church.	The site is a prominent and visible site on the edge of the settlement. The site is wholly within a local gap and there is a PRow running through the site. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. The existing footpath would need to be diverted.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WE001	Land adjoining The Vicarage, east of Gilberts Drive	East Dean and Friston	Rejected	Development in the eastern area would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, and the western area is not suitable to yield 5 dwellings or more.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity, especially the eastern area which is on higher ground. The site's position in the lower part of the valley adds to the tranquillity in this part of the village. Development of 5 dwellings or more on the smaller western area on the lower slope would be inappropriate and out of keeping with the scale and character of existing residential development.	Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development. The higher eastern area has a high landscape sensitivity and the lower western area is not suitable to yield 5 dwellings or more.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to creating improved access.	Yes
WE002	Land behind The Fridays, west of Gilberts Drive	East Dean and Friston	Rejected	The eastern (lower) area has been built out and development on the remaining western (upper) area would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. The eastern (lower) area was previously assessed as having medium sensitivity and potential for development, while the western (upper) area was previously assessed as having high sensitivity as it relates to the setting of the village.	Planning permission (ref. SDNP/14/03936/FUL) was granted for 11 dwellings in October 2015 in the eastern (lower) area and this has now been built out. The remaining area has high landscape sensitivity and relates to the setting of the village. This area is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The eastern (lower) area has been built out. The western (upper) area was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that this area is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the remaining western area is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WE005	Land at West Street	Alfriston	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and would have a detrimental impact on the settlement edge and pattern.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity. Development on this open and exposed edge of Alfriston is likely to be detrimental to the townscape and surrounding landscape character. It would create infill development where the settlement edge is visibly becoming dispersed in character. The land provides a transitional function between the open arable landscape to the north and the village to the south. The loss of this function would be detrimental to landscape character.	The site is relatively well screened, but there is potential for impact on the residential amenity of the properties to the south and wider views from the north. The visibility from the existing access is relatively poor and any development on the site would be subject to access improvements. Due to the archaeological potential of the site, mitigation through planning condition may be required.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to creating a safe access off West Street.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WE011	Former Allotments	Alfriston	Rejected	The north area (available) is not achievable without access from the south area (unavailable).	The site was previously assessed as having a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. The site is within the medieval core of Alfriston and is located adjacent to the riverside in a sensitive and high-profile location. The existing agricultural buildings detract from the setting of the river and the public right of way along the riverside.	The site is allocated in the adopted South Downs Local Plan under Policy SD58. The site is located on the eastern edge of Alfriston. It is within the conservation area, adjacent to a Grade II listed building, and has archaeological potential. The site does not appear to have direct access onto a public highway and the eastern edge of the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Given its sensitive location and the findings of the landscape assessment, the form and layout of development needs to be carefully considered.	Yes	The site has two landowners who previously indicated it was entirely available. The north area is still available as confirmed by application ref. SDNP/24/0244 0/FUL. However, there is currently no evidence that the south area is still available.	Part	A recent application for 5 dwellings in the north area (ref. SDNP/24/0244 0/FUL) was refused and dismissed at appeal for reasons of highway safety and poor design. An improved scheme which incorporates the south area (and the access intended by Policy SD58) may help to overcome the reasons for refusal but is unavailable.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WE016	Land at Bramley Farm (Site 1)	Willingdon	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and would have an adverse impact on settlement edge and pattern.	The site has moderate landscape sensitivity. This is partly due to the historic layout of the fields and boundaries, otherwise the site would be considered to have a lower sensitivity. The site is enclosed and has low visibility in some longer distance views, for example from the top of Combe Hill to the south. Development of the site would be a departure from the current form of settlement. Wannock Road is the boundary and extend of – and creates a severance from the site to – the existing settlement. Development would be an encroachment at a sensitive edge of the National Park.	As set out in the landscape assessment (above), development would change, and depart from, the current form of settlement. This would have a significant adverse impact on wider landscape character.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
WE017	Land at Bramley Farm (Site 2)	Willingdon	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. Although there are established hedgerows and tree boundaries, the site is very open in long distance views to the west and south, for example from Combe Hill. The site is also higher than existing residential development to the south further increasing the visibility of the site.	Development would have a significant adverse impact on landscape character due to the openness of the site, and the likely prominence of development in views.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WE018	Land north west of Jevington Road	Willingdon	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and would have an adverse impact on settlement edge and pattern.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site slopes upwards to the north-west and the higher ground is seen in longer distance views, for example from PRowWs on downland to the south-east. Development would expand the settlement to the west which would intrude into downland, be out of keeping with existing settlement pattern, and have a significant adverse impact on landscape character.	The necessary expansion of the access to facilitate development is likely to have an adverse impact on the area of adjacent ancient woodland. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to access improvements.	Yes
WI001	Land adjacent to Swanmore Primary School and Church Car Park	Swanmore	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. The site is relatively secluded and enclosed by existing woodland and boundary vegetation. The above – alongside the topographical changes and the condition and location of the existing access - limit the developable area.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for clay. The site is an uncultivated field which is well contained, screened, and enclosed by mature trees and hedges, although glimpsed views from the PRow network are possible. The existing woodland/vegetation, topography, and access limit the developable area. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	The existing access is narrow, heavily wooded, and topographically lower than the main developable area. There is concern that an appropriate and safe vehicular access from Hampton Hill cannot be achieved to accommodate built development.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI006	Land end of Bourne Fields	Twyford	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is not considered suitable to yield 5 (net) dwellings or more.	The site slopes gently to the north and comprises part driveway and part woodland at the rear of Bourne Fields. The existing trees make a strong contribution to local landscape character and help to separate the existing employment and residential areas to the north and south, respectively. Any loss of trees to facilitate development would impact on biodiversity and the character and appearance of the area.	The SHLAA (2016) stated that the site had planning permission for 10 dwellings and that these were being built out. No record of planning permission can be found, and the officer site visit in June 2023 confirmed that no dwellings have been constructed. The SHLAA (2016) recommendation is, therefore, considered to be an error. In terms of the suitability, the site is not considered suitable to yield 5 dwellings or more given the surrounding residential density, and the need to retain the existing driveway and woodland.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI009	Land at Meadow House	West Meon	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site is assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity. The site comprises the front residential garden land of Meadow House, which is a large, detached, modern, 2.5 storey dwellinghouse of brick and tile construction. It is relatively flat and comprises open mown lawn and boundary shrubs which is uncharacteristic of its landscape. The site is highly visible from the road and PRow network, and is bounded by key landscape features, i.e., disused railway to east, River Meon to south, and conservation area to west. Although heavily constrained and visible, the recent changes on, and adjacent to, the site suggest that there is an opportunity for small scale, sensitive, and sympathetically designed, residential development which respects the built form, character, and density of the area.	The site comprises a large part of the residential garden land at Meadow House. The south of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and so development would need to be restricted to the central and north areas of the site. Development would also need to be carefully designed to consider any potential impact on the setting of the adjacent conservation area and the need to retain important mature trees within, and adjacent to, the site.	Yes	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to a Flood Risk Assessment.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI010	Land at Meonwara Crescent	West Meon	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on amenity, informal community use, and the setting of heritage assets.	The site is assessed as having a low-to-medium landscape sensitivity given its peri-urban character, its location within the defined settlement boundary, and that it is bounded by existing residential development on three sides. The site is not representative of the local landscape character. However, the site is readily visible from adjacent properties and has high community value given that it is used as public open space. The officer site visit in April 2023 confirmed the presence of children's play equipment and temporary goal posts.	The site is located within the defined settlement boundary of West Meon and is bounded by residential development on three sides. Although not representative of the local landscape character, the site comprises existing public open space and so development would not be suitable, nor appropriate, unless alternative provision of an equal or better quality was sought. Even if alternative public open space provision was secured, development would create an overall density which would be uncharacteristic to the area, notwithstanding the likely impacts on existing residential amenities and non-designated heritage assets to the south.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
WI014	Land west of Floud Lane	West Meon	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a very high landscape sensitivity due to its open and rural character, topography, lowland meadow priority habitat, high visibility from the PRoW network, and its contribution to the setting of (and views to and from) the West Meon Conservation Area and the Grade II listed Church of St John, the Evangelist. The landscape framework means that the site has low capacity (if any) to absorb development.	The site does not relate well to the defined settlement boundary of West Meon. Development would create an incongruous western extension which would significantly impact on the setting and views to / from the conservation area and listed historic church. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI016	Phoenix Car Centre, Chilcomb Lane	Chilcomb	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is not suitable for residential development due to its poor relationship with the defined settlement boundary.	The site is previously developed land and currently in use as a car sales centre. It is bound by vegetation on all borders but open to views from the wider landscape.	The site is within 185m of historic landfill. There is potential for development but not residential development. This is because the site is disconnected from the defined settlement boundary and other development uses may be more appropriate given its location and previous uses.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for residential development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI018	Land east of Rectory Lane	Corhampton	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity given its elevated position above the highway and its limited containment / open views from surrounding higher ground. The topography is apparent onsite and the site forms part of a wider field pattern of undulating countryside to the east and south. The site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and would make a noticeable impact on the largely open and rural character of the area to the east.	The site is not considered to be suitable for residential development as confirmed by the dismissed appeal for 2 dwellings under ref. SDNP/12/02464/FUL. The site sits above the settlement and existing highway, and is highly visible to views from all sides, especially from the wider, open, and undulating countryside to the north, east and south, which also includes the South Downs Way (SDW).	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	The dismissed appeal concluded that the presented highway scheme would unacceptably increase the risk to users of the highway. However, this was in relation to the highway scheme proposed at the time. The site has an existing access and there is no reason to indicate why a more appropriate, acceptable, and safer highway scheme is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI021	Land at Corhampton Lane	Corhampton	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity given that its relatively flat and contained by existing woodland. Any loss of trees to facilitate development would impact on the character and appearance of the area, especially in relation to adjacent heritage assets to the north and east, and the designed landscape adjacent to the south. Development would expand the village to the west, when the natural evolution and growth of the village has been north-south owing to the strong influence of the A32, disused railway line, and the River Meon.	The site is within (albeit only slightly) the Corhampton & Meonstoke Conservation Area, and is within the setting of the Grade I Listed Corhampton Church. Although existing woodland / tree cover helps to contain and screen the site, built development would erode the tree cover and the relatively sparse and rural character of this area. In addition, development would expand the village to the west when the natural evolution of the village has been north-south. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI023	Land at Union Lane	Droxford	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity given its large scale, dominant topography, and visibility within open and unfiltered views from the Wayfarers Walk PRoW. Development would create an incongruous extension to north-west Droxford and would be out of scale with the existing settlement.	The east boundary is adjacent to existing residential development, whilst all other boundaries face onto open countryside. Although there is some existing and well-established boundary vegetation, the site is visible and comprises a large open field adjacent to the settlement boundary and priority habitat. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, existing highways, vegetation, and topography may limit the scale of development given that a safe and appropriate access would need to be created.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI024	Land adjoining Droxford Primary School	Droxford	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. The site is readily visible from all sides and comprises a dry, bowl valley with limited access. Development would create a poor relationship and incongruous extension to the settlement pattern, and would impact on local views from the PRoW network.	The site is an open field with no distinct boundaries and so is open to views from all sides – including the Wayfarers Walk which is a long-distance way marked trail. This is exacerbated by the bowl-shaped valley in which the site is located. The site is not considered to be well related to the existing settlement pattern. The site is adjacent to a SINC at its north-west corner. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	Park Lane is used to access the recreation ground, school, and residential development. At this location, the lane is narrow and it is not considered to be suitable and achievable to accommodate the level of proposed growth beyond existing and allocated sites. In addition, development is likely to require a design which would have a potential adverse impact on the existing character of the area.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI025	Land at Northend Lane	Droxford	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable.	The site is assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity. The site is small, well hidden, and is not characteristic of its wider landscape. However, there may be some potential negative landscape impacts from gaining vehicular access.	The site is a long and narrow parcel of land which is adjacent to the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. The site is relatively flat and is not widely visible given that it is largely contained by existing built form to the south and undulating topography to the north. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is considered suitable for small-scale residential development providing that the layout and design is in keeping with the adjoining residential properties, and does not adversely impact existing residential amenities and other usual development management considerations.	Yes	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	The site appears to be landlocked and it is not clear if the existing access track off Northend Lane is available, nor able, to accommodate and achieve a sufficient and safe vehicular access solution.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI028	Warnford Farm, Lippen Lane	Warnford	Rejected	The site is in active employment use.	The site has a moderate-to-high landscape sensitivity due to its prominence on the valley side of the River Meon. The site includes two former agricultural buildings over a stepped hardstanding. The first is single storey (moderate) and the second is larger in mass, scale, and height (high). The west boundary is delineated by a PRoW which continues up the valley. The site is partly screened in views from north-west and west, but is open to views from south and east and is seen from Lippen Lane in between existing homes. The topography means that development has potential to impact on landscape and visual character, and a residential scheme may introduce a suburban character into an agricultural landscape.	The site is in Source Protection Zones 1-3, a mineral consultation area for sand and gravel, and the watercourse buffer and catchment of the River Meon which drains to the Solent. The above could be potentially addressed and a sensitive redevelopment (i.e., farmstead or courtyard style) could potentially help improve the appearance and character of the site and wider area. Notwithstanding the above, the site is not suitable for further consideration in the local plan review as it is in active employment use. The site could come forward under existing policies, subject to, amongst other considerations, robust marketing.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
WI029	Land south of Five Bridges Road	Winchester	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and settlement pattern.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity due to its prominent, rural, and well-used location. The site slopes down to, is in proximity to, and is part of the valley side of, the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. The site is readily visible from both its north and east boundaries which are adjacent to the Winchester Conservation Area and PRoW network respectively. The site is adjacent to existing ribbon development, off St Cross Road, to the west.	The site is in a mineral consultation area and adjacent to existing ribbon residential development along St Cross Road. Development would create an incongruous extension to the existing ribbon / linear form of development. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI031	Land south of Dodds Lane	Swanmore	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has high landscape sensitivity due to its topography and poor relationship with the settlement pattern. The site is open and visible from wider views to the east. Development would create an isolated development and an incongruous extension to the predominantly contained and nucleated pattern of Swanmore.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for clay. The site is of significant size and scale in relation to the surrounding settlement pattern. The central and eastern areas are highly sensitive given their open nature. Although the more enclosed west area is less sensitive, development would still involve substantial tree loss and scrub clearing which would increase its visibility. Even if reduced, development would still be unacceptable in landscape terms as it would be inconsistent with surrounding (and transitional) settlement character. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI034	Dykes Farm, Easton Lane	Winchester	Rejected	The site is not considered to be suitable or achievable, and development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has high landscape sensitivity and is on the National Park boundary. It has an elongated shape due to the PRoW and Old Railway Line to the west and east, respectively. It is on the valley side of River Itchen SAC and SSSI and part of a transitional area between the river and surrounding landscape. The site is adjacent to Flood Zones 2 and 3. The south area is on a raised plateau, while the north area is the same level as the river. The north area includes priority habitat associated with the nature reserve. The south area has views of the Cathedral and Guildhall.	The site is in a mineral consultation area and the north area has some potential for archaeology associated with the water meadow. The site is near historic landfill, employment uses, and transport infrastructure. Development would need to remediate any land contamination and be designed with noise in mind. The site is in a highly sensitive area in terms of landscape and ecology. The site is not considered to be suitable for development. However, if continued to be explored for development, then this should be focused in the south area around existing agricultural buildings, leaving the north area for green infrastructure, PRoW, biodiversity, and water quality and management improvements.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The site is not currently considered to be achievable. It would need to be accessed via the planning area of Winchester City Council. All access options would need to be appraised to ascertain the safest and most appropriate access onto the site, while also considering flooding, ecology, and landscape constraints.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI036	Little Vicarage Farm	Swanmore	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. The site is prominent within the wider landscape due to its large scale and apparent topography. The site has a poor relationship with the existing settlement pattern, and development would impact on surrounding views and the PRoW network.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for clay. The site is large and located on the edge of the settlement within a rural and low-density character associated with the surrounding countryside. There are two PRoW which cross the site. Although the site is physically adjacent to the settlement boundary at its south-east corner, it is not considered to be well related to the settlement nor its development pattern. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI037	Land at Hoe Road and Suetts Lane	Bishops Waltham	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity due to its relatively small-scale and its relationship with existing built development to the north and west. The site is linked in character and function to the pasture / equestrian fields to the south, and is in proximity to priority habitat, environmental and heritage designations to the south and south-east – the latter includes a scheduled monument. The site is also in the setting of four listed buildings on the northern side of Hoe Road.	The site is in the setting of four listed buildings and is surrounded by, and visible from, the PRoW network to the east and west. The site forms part of the eastern gateway to the town and is on the boundary of the National Park. The site may have potential for a linear development of circa 5 dwellings. However, this would be subject to further investigation and preserving the setting of heritage assets. Any development would need to be carefully and sympathetically designed, drawing inspiration from the existing design, form, massing, materials, pattern and set back distances of adjacent and surrounding built development.	Yes	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. Suetts Lane is unlikely to provide the appropriate / required visibility splays, and so the existing access off Hoe Road in the north-west corner of the site may be preferable. This would require the removal of - and the onsite delivery of compensatory - scrub and hedgerow. Further highway investigations are required.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI038	Land off Rareridge Lane	Bishops Waltham	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its large, open, and elevated nature. The site is adjacent to priority habitats, ancient woodland, and local environmental designations. It is considered that built residential development would be visually intrusive and create an incongruous northern extension to the well-defined, nucleated, and medieval market town of Bishops Waltham.	The site is a substantial and visually prominent site on the edge of an existing town. The site is in close proximity to a conservation area, has some archaeological potential, and is crossed at various points and locations by the PRow and permissive path networks. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. The existing access off Butts Farm Lane is single track with limited scope for widening. This would influence development type and capacity.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI040	Hoe Road Sports Ground	Bishops Waltham	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is not suitable given the need to protect existing amenity, community, and recreational uses.	The site is assessed as having a medium landscape sensitivity. The site is adjacent to residential development on its north and west boundaries, and is enclosed by mature hedgerows, and surrounded by the PRoW network, on both its east and south boundaries. The site slopes down to the south and is near to the Moors SSSI/LNR (south) and the Moors Meadow Wildlife Trust Reserve (east).	The site has a peri-urban character due to existing community buildings, sports pitches, recreation space, and play equipment. If development was located in the north, then this could help to reduce potential landscape impacts and harm to the adjacent SSSI/LNR and PRoW users. However, notwithstanding the above, the site has a high community value. Development would not be appropriate or suitable unless alternative replacement community and open space provisions (of equal or better quality) are identified, provided, and secured.	No	The landowner confirmed in November 2022 that the site is not available for development and should only be considered for recreation use.	No	The site is accessed via a one-way system with entrance and exit via Hoe Road and Hamble Springs, respectively. There may be potential scope to widen the exit, but no scope to widen the single-track entrance. The one-way system would limit development capacity and creation of a new access is likely to lead to the loss of amenity, community, and play facilities, as well as isolate the village hall. Although development could be achievable, the existing access would limit capacity and uses.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI043	Land at and rear of Hinton Arms PH	New Cheriton	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the north area is in active community use and development in the central and south areas would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high community value owing to its current public house use, which also includes a car park, garden, and play equipment. The site also has a very high landscape sensitivity due to the historic public house, its early enclosure, its smoothly rounded rising topography associated with the valley sides of the River Itchen, and the adjacent Hinton Ampner designed landscape. At present, a field buffer has been retained between built development and the Hinton Ampner Parkscape. Development would contravene this good design principle. The site is also surrounded by priority habitat on three sides.	The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary of New Cheriton by virtue of site allocation SD63 adjacent to the west. However, this allocation is yet to be built out. Regardless of the adjacent allocation, development on this site would create an incongruous eastern extension to New Cheriton which would encroach closer to the Hinton Ampner designed landscape. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI045	Land at Abbots Worthy House	Abbots Worthy	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would be disproportionate in scale compared to the existing settlement, and would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity as it includes a large dwellinghouse and its enclosed grounds (distant views from Long Walk are noted). The site is adjacent to the River Itchen SAC and SSSI, and is considered to have a very high heritage sensitivity. The Abbots Worthy Conservation Area Technical Assessment explains the house and grounds contribute to the conversation area's overall setting due to the quality of its design, materials, and overall form. The listed flint and brick wall along its north and east boundaries also provide a "striking" feature in the streetscene contributing to the setting of adjacent listed buildings.	The site is in a mineral consultation area and includes deciduous woodland priority habitat and trees which are protected in the Abbots Worthy Conservation Area. The site is outside a defined settlement boundary and is located between the A33, B3047 and M3 which are all noise sources. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, development beyond the footprint of the existing dwelling would be disproportionate in scale to – and be out of keeping with – the existing village size, pattern and built form. Development would need to be small-scale and restricted to the reconfiguration and/or alteration of the existing dwellinghouse.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
WI046	Land at Down End, Bourne Lane	Twyford	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is not considered suitable to yield 5 (net) dwellings or more.	The site has a very low landscape sensitivity. It is enclosed, used as residential garden land, and is sandwiched between built development to the north and south. The site is more sensitive to the north and east due to the existing PRoW, priority woodland habitat, and its narrowing triangular shape. Development would need to be focused to the west. Any loss of trees and impact on the historic and sunken nature of Bourne Lane (to facilitate development) would have an impact on the appearance, biodiversity, and character of the area.	The site comprises residential garden land enclosed by well-established trees, hedgerows, and other vegetation. Although the site has a very low landscape sensitivity, the site is not considered suitable to yield 5 (net) dwellings or more given the surrounding density, and the need to retain existing trees and woodland.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, there are some concerns over the impact of development on the historic and sunken nature of Bourne Lane.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI047	Land at Garrison Hill	Droxford	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. The site is highly visible due to its rising topography. Development would create a poor relationship and incongruous extension to the settlement pattern.	The site is located to the north of the settlement and is both large and prominent. The site slopes up to the north, is readily visible, and is not considered to be well related to the settlement. Development would result in an incongruous urban extension to the existing nucleated settlement pattern. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to creating a safe and appropriate access.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI048	Land at Worthy Park Home Farm (South)	Abbots Worthy	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, the site is not considered suitable to yield 5 (net) dwellings or more.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is open to views from the B3047 and PRoW network and is adjacent to priority habitat and the River Itchen SAC and SSSI (and associated flood zones). The site includes an existing dwellinghouse, a single storey brick building, and an agricultural barn. The former two constitute previously developed land, and the latter two are dilapidated and vacant. The buildings are surrounded by uncultivated pasture land which contributes to the rural setting of the conservation area and adjacent listed buildings.	The site is in a mineral consultation area and the Abbots Worthy Conservation Area, and is in the setting of numerous listed buildings along Mill Lane. The north area is part of a TPO Area, whilst all other trees are protected given their location in the conservation area. The site includes some elements of previously developed land, and contamination may be likely from historic land use and operations. It is appreciated that small-scale development may have the potential to positively contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area compared to the existing dilapidated structures. However, development of 5 net dwellings or more would be incongruous to the density, form, and pattern of the existing settlement and conservation area.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI055	Land east of Floud Lane and south of Church Lane	West Meon	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. The site is in proximity to, and contributes to the setting and views of, the West Meon Conservation Area and the Grade II Listed Church of St John, the Evangelist. The site is on rising topography and is prominent in views from the PRoW and road networks. Development would impact on the perception of the village and the setting of heritage assets.	The site is adjacent to, and within the setting of, the West Meon Conservation Area and Grade II Listed Church of St John, the Evangelist. The site is prominent in views from the wider landscape, road, and PRoW networks. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI059	Land at Marriners Farm	Cheriton	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity overall. The landscape sensitivity varies across the site due to its large scale, vertical alignment, and rising topography. The north area has a high landscape sensitivity owing to its higher location, proximity to the PRow network, and relationship to areas beyond the influence of the settlement. In comparison, the existing dwelling and garden area in the south have a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity depending on development density. The Marriners Farmhouse is not listed but considered worthy of retention.	The site entrance is in proximity to Flood Zones 2 and 3. The site is enclosed by a PRow on its west boundary and mature trees and hedgerows on all boundaries. All trees (whether subject of a TPO or not) appear to provide significant landscape value, especially along the east boundary as viewed from the A272. The significant removal of trees, especially on the north and east boundaries, would be harmful to the appearance of the countryside. Given the above and the landscape assessment, the site may only be considered suitable for small-scale development in the south area subject to arboricultural, flooding, and transport considerations.	Yes	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. The site is accessed off a 30mph bend used by pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Further investigation into visibility splays, interactions with neighbouring properties, and HGV movements needs to be explored. This may limit development capacity.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI070	Land at Underdown Farm and Feed Mill	Owslebury	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would create an incongruous extension into the countryside and would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has high landscape sensitivity due to its stepped (but overall dominant) topography and high visibility from the PRoW network and wider undulating countryside. Even if development was limited to the western access area, development would still create an incongruous southern / eastern extension to an otherwise linear village which is orientated north-east-to-south-west.	Development could potentially comprise the demolition of large agricultural buildings in place of small-scale, sympathetically designed, residential development in the western access area of the site. However, this would create an incongruous extension to the settlement boundary and may impact the future operation of the existing agricultural uses. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable for residential development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI071	Land at Grey Farm House, Kilmeston Road	New Cheriton	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable.	The site has a medium-to-high and high landscape sensitivity in the west and east, respectively. The site is in the setting of the Hinton Ampner Designed Landscape, within 20m of the River Itchen SAC and SSSI, and in proximity to priority habitat and ancient woodland to the east and south-west. Kilmeston Road is characterised as semi-rural and the site includes a two-storey dwelling within an “L-shaped” land parcel which wraps around Grey Farm Close. The land rises to the east and is visible from the highway. The site has the kept appearance of wider garden space and is enclosed by mature hedgerows and protected trees. A field buffer has been retained between built development and the Hinton Ampner Parkscape.	A proposal for 6 dwellings was dismissed at appeal (SDNP/16/04957/OUT). The Inspector concluded that the scheme was an unimaginative and urbanising form of development in a sensitive rural area, and would represent intrusive development in both design and landscape terms. In reviewing the above and the landscape assessment, it is considered that a very modest scheme (5 dwellings or less) could be suitable. However, this would need to be informed by sufficient evidence and contextual analysis to achieve an acceptable high-quality design and rural village edge, positively responding to the River Itchen and Hinton Ampner Parkscape.	Yes	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA. However, no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that it is still available. Planning permission (SDNP/23/041 62/FUL) for solar panels suggests it is no longer available.	No	A highway objection was raised at the dismissed appeal due to lack of adequate visibility. Improvements to the south are necessary to provide a safe access but require tree removal which would be harmful to the appearance of the landscape.	No
WI073	Land south of Alresford Road	Cheriton	Rejected	The site is not considered suitable to yield 5 dwellings or more, and development would have a potential adverse impact on the River Itchen and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is adjacent to, and is part of the shallow sloping valley side of, the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. The site is adjacent to, and may include, priority habitat associated with the River Itchen.	The site is adjacent to, slopes down to, and is associated with, the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. The site is visible from the public highway and the south boundary is in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Development of 5 dwellings or more would create an incongruous extension at an inappropriate density to the south of Alresford Road.	No	The site was promoted in 2024 and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI077	Land at Stakes Farm, east of Winchester Road	Bishops Waltham	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. It comprises a large-scale arable field at the westernmost point of Bishops Waltham and is bound by B2177 Winchester Road, Ashton Lane, and PRoW network. The scale and location of development would create an incongruous western extension to the medieval and nucleated town of Bishops Waltham.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for brick clay and has potential for some archaeological finds. The Southampton-to-London Aviation Fuel Pipeline has recently been delivered in the west area, reducing the developable area. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
WI078	Land north of Battery Hill	Bishops Waltham	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has an overall high landscape sensitivity due to its scale, elevated position, and apparent topography. The sensitivity reduces to moderate in the south. The site is dissected by a PRoW and can be seen in distanced views from the wider network. The site is good-quality semi-improved grassland priority habitat and is adjacent to deciduous woodland priority habitat to the east. Whilst on plan the site's extent appears logical, the marked rise/undulation in the centre visually separates the site. Only the south/south-west area (0.8ha) could be considered further subject to priority habitat compensation and onsite biodiversity net gain.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for clay and is bound by protected trees on its south and west boundaries, and by Claylands LNR on its east boundary. The site is adjacent to former historic landfill (east). Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable for large-scale development. Although the assessment highlights the south and south-west area for further investigation, this is also not considered to be suitable given the loss of priority habitat and the need to create a brand-new settlement edge, as well as the engineering works required to facilitate an appropriate access.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites by a third party. There has been no evidence provided to suggest that the site is available for development.	No	The site is accessed off Battery Hill in the south-east via a single-track. It would be difficult to widen this track to facilitate an appropriate access given the mature trees and adjacent residential development. The potential for a new access in the south-west is limited by existing residential development and protected trees.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI079	Land at Pondsides Lane	Bishops Waltham	Rejected	The site is not available or achievable. If available and achievable, development would have a potential adverse impact on adjacent uses and the character and appearance of the bridleway.	The site has a low landscape sensitivity. Despite its elevated position above the existing town, the site is relatively flat, is visually contained on three sides, and is somewhat domestic in character due to the existing allotments surrounded by mown grass. There is a distinct separation and lack of visual unity with the surrounding landscape. Development could provide an opportunity to expand allotment provision, improve boundary treatments, improve the settlement edge, and achieve an appropriate countryside transition.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for clay and is bound by a vineyard (north), a metal recycling centre [former quarry] (east), residential development (south), and Pondsides Lane (west). The site is within a transitional area moving from the built-up character of the settlement to open countryside. There may be amenity issues associated with the adjacent recycling centre which is on lower ground. The engineering works required for vehicular access via Pondsides Lane (a bridleway) would have a likely adverse impact on the character and appearance of the bridleway, and it is unclear how development would impact on consented SuDS and open space to the west, and the existing vineyard adjacent to the north.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	The access is via a single-track bridleway known as Pondsides Lane. Development – including widening of the bridleway for vehicular access - would adversely impact on the rural character and use of the bridleway.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI090	Land at Church Lane	Hambledon	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has high landscape sensitivity due to its elevated position, topography, low-level boundary vegetation, and location in the setting of the Hambledon Conservation Area and the listed church of Sts Peters and Paul. The church is the main landmark of the village. The site is visible in glimpsed views from the PRoW network and is openly visible from the recreation ground and Church Lane. The lane is historic, single-track, and partly sunken and its rural character would be impacted by built development and increased traffic generation. Development would be detached from the defined settlement boundary and would not be in keeping with the distinctive linear and “T-shape” form of the village (which is dictated by the location of the adjacent scarps), nor its historic “one-deep” building pattern (as identified in the conservation area character appraisal).	The site is adjacent to the Hambledon Conservation Area and in proximity to listed buildings, including the church of Sts Peter and Paul. Church Lane is narrow, single-track, and partly sunken. Development would increase traffic through the conservation area and to the primary school and is likely to impact the rural character and appearance of the historic lane. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, the capacity of development may be limited given the access and potential traffic safety issues associated with Church Lane.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI094	Land at Down House, south of B3047	Itchen Abbas	Rejected	The site is not considered suitable to yield 5 (net) dwellings or more.	The site has varied landscape sensitivity. The north area (existing dwellinghouse and its residential curtilage) has moderate landscape sensitivity, whilst the south area (grazing land) has high landscape sensitivity due to its open nature and more apparent topography as part of the valley sides of the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. The site is bound by the PRoW network on two sides which has contributed to its unusual triangular shape. The site is outside the defined settlement boundary, and is part of the linear, scattered, and low-density settlement pattern evident in the west of the village. This area is characterised by large dwellinghouses (within generous sized plots) which are generally “one plot deep” and accessed off the B3047. A development of 5 net dwellings or more would be contrary to the density and pattern of existing built development.	The site is in a mineral consultation area. There is a TPO Point in the north-east corner, and the south boundary is adjacent to a TPO Area. The site is on the valley sides of the River Itchen SAC and SSSI and is in proximity to the Avington Conservation Area and Avington Park (Grade II*) Registered Park & Garden. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable to yield 5 (net) dwellings or more.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI097	Land north of B3047	Itchen Abbas	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets, and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity due to its scale, openness, and elevation on the valley side. The site is bound by, and is readily visible from, the PRow network on its northern and western boundaries. The site is in an area where the settlement pattern is becoming more dispersed into the surrounding rural landscape. Moreover, development would create an incongruous eastern extension to the defined settlement boundary.	The site is in a mineral consultation area and is adjacent to historic landfill. The site is in the setting of the listed Abbey House and is in proximity to both the River Itchen SAC and SSSI, and the Avington Park (Grade II*) Registered Park and Garden. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for residential development.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
WI098	Land north of Itchen Abbas House	Itchen Abbas	Rejected	The site is not available. If available, development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets, and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site was previously assessed as having a medium-to-high landscape sensitivity. The National Park boundary and the site's north boundary are delineated by the former railway line. The site is part of the distinctive Itchen Valley landscape and is elevated on the valley sides of the River Itchen. It can be seen in distant views from higher ground to the south on the other side of the river, including from the Avington Conservation Area and (Grade II*) Registered Park and Garden. The site is surrounded by the PRow network on three sides and is in an area where the settlement is becoming more dispersed into the surrounding rural landscape.	The site is in a mineral consultation area and is adjacent to historic landfill under the former railway line to the north. The site is surrounded on three sides by the PRow network and is bound by the defined settlement boundary to the south and west, and by a mature tree belt to the north. The east boundary is open to views from the wider landscape, including intervisibility with the listed Abbey House, whilst the north area is visible in distant views over the river valley due to its topography and elevated position. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was recorded as available in the 2015/16 SHLAA but no recent evidence has been provided to suggest that the site is still available for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI101	Land at Whites Hill Farm	Owslebury	Rejected	The site is (partly) in active commercial and residential use. Further development may have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, and the safety and efficient operation of the highway network.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity. The site is in an elevated position on the ridge of a dry valley. Although it is bound by mature vegetation, glimpsed views are possible from Whites Hill, and from the bottom and other side of the dry valley. The site is located at the south-western end of a linear and historic village.	The site is in an elevated position in the catchment of the River Itchen. It is surrounded by the bridleway network (south), local wildlife sites and priority habitats (north and west), and listed buildings (east). The site was previously used as a poultry farm but is now used for commercial, equestrian and residential uses. There may be potential for contamination associated with current and previous land uses on and adjacent to the site. The former poultry farm buildings are either vacant or used for commercial uses. The proposed commercial redevelopment of these buildings could be considered under existing planning policies. Otherwise, the scale and type of proposed development across the remainder of the site is not considered to be suitable due to potential landscape and highway impacts.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	The site is accessed on a bend off Whites Hill which is a narrow lane with limited scope for widening. The site is not considered to be achievable for the scale of proposed development given highway safety concerns and the cumulation of existing and potential traffic movements at the site's access and along Whites Hill.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI103	Land at Vicarage Lane	Swanmore	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has moderate landscape sensitivity given its small-scale and predominantly flat topography. The site has a poor relationship with the existing settlement pattern. Development would further extend existing ribbon development into the surrounding countryside creating an isolated development and an incongruous extension to the predominantly contained and nucleated village of Swanmore.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for clay. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The proposed access would be via Fullegar Cottages outside the National Park. There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, subject to an assessment of adjacent land and a suitable access through the planning authority area of Winchester City Council.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI104	Land at Orchard Close	Twyford	Rejected	The site is not available.	Orchard Close is set within substantial grounds off the historic and sunken Bourne Lane. The site is owned by Twyford School and is in use as a boarding house having formerly been a purpose-built residential home (including assisted living for older persons). The site includes built development and car parking in the north and a historic Edwardian Garden in the south. The site gently rises to the north and is enclosed by established vegetation including some protected trees. The upper floors can be seen in glimpsed views from the wider landscape.	The site is allocated in the Twyford NDP (Policy HN5) for the change of use or redevelopment of the site. The NDP policy limits redevelopment to the footprint of the existing buildings and immediate surroundings so to minimise the impact on the historic garden. The policy does not provide a specific end use or development quantum, but instead sets out a criteria-based policy to help guide anticipated changes following purchase by Twyford School. The site was entered onto the South Downs Brownfield Register in December 2020. The entry highlights an opportunity for the delivery of, at least, 5 dwellings within a 0.14ha area.	Yes	The landowner confirmed in June 2024 that the site is not currently available.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
WI108	Land at Long Priors (Extension)	West Meon	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity as it is located within a bowl-shaped valley and is readily visible from all sides via PRow and other established footpaths. Development would create an incongruous extension to the north-western settlement boundary and edge of West Meon.	The site is adjacent to recent development and comprises an open field within a bowl-shaped valley. The site has no distinctive boundaries and so is open to views from all sides, including from PRow and other established footpaths. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI109	Land north of West Meon Road	West Meon	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It comprises an open, arable, and relatively flat, “gap” between the existing defined settlement boundaries of West Meon. However, development within this gap would coalesce two distinct areas of settlement: the historic village centred around the A32, and the cluster of dwellings centred around Westbury Manor. This would conflict with the historic settlement pattern of West Meon such that the separate areas of historic settlement would no longer be legible in the landscape.	The site is part of a larger field and forms a “gap” between the existing defined settlement boundaries. The access is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 due to the proximity of the River Meon. Development within this gap would coalesce two distinct areas of settlement: the historic village centred around the A32, and the cluster of dwellings centred around Westbury Manor. This would conflict with the historic settlement pattern of West Meon such that the separate areas of historic settlement would no longer be legible in the landscape. Given the above and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to a Flood Risk Assessment.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI110	Land north of Doctors Lane	West Meon	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is flat, is characteristic of the wider landscape, and is enclosed by existing trees, hedgerows, allotments and built development. Given its relative enclosure, it is mostly hidden from public view and development would create a neutral extension to the settlement.	The site is adjacent to the West Meon Conservation Area and the Grade II listed Cedars Cottage. The access is via a narrow single-track which is used by walkers, rural in character, and within the conservation area and setting of a listed building. The engineering works required to achieve vehicular access would have a likely adverse impact on the conservation area and the setting of the listed building. Moreover, the site is not currently suitable given its proposed access.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The existing access is via a single-track which is gated, within the conservation area and setting of a listed building, and currently only used by walkers to gain access to the allotments and PRow network. Although development is technically achievable, it is likely to impact on the rural character of this track and have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI111	Land north west of Easton Lane	Winchester	Rejected	The site is not considered to be achievable. If achievable, the site is not considered to be suitable given its condition, sensitive location, and potential adverse impacts on ecology and the PRoW network.	The site has moderate landscape sensitivity but is considered to have a high ecological sensitivity given its location in the floodplain of, and proximity to, the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. The site is adjacent to priority habitat associated with the River Itchen and Winnall Moor Nature Reserve. The west boundary straddles Flood Zones 2 and 3, and flood risk is likely to increase with predicted climate change. Given its small-scale, it is unlikely that effective, meaningful, and characteristic mitigation and landscape buffers could be appropriately achieved.	The site is in a mineral consultation area, is in proximity to historic landfill, is adjacent to existing employment uses, and is accessed via the Itchen Valley PRoW. There is potential for contamination given past uses of the site. Moreover, given the condition and sensitive location of the site, potential impacts on the PRoW network, and the findings of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	The site is accessed from the Itchen Way PRoW (off Easton Lane) which provides access to existing residential properties and an angling club. The PRoW is a single access track with limited scope for widening to accommodate new development. It is unclear whether access could be achieved from the adjacent trading park.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WI118	Land east and south of Cobbett Close	Swanmore	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It is less sensitive compared to the larger site (WI031) given existing tree, shrub, and scrub cover. The loss of trees, shrubs, and scrub to facilitate development would impact on the appearance and character of the area. The vegetation along the east boundary is unlikely to screen views from Droxford Road and the wider countryside.	The site is on the boundary of the National Park, is in a mineral consultation area for clay, and is in a catchment which drains to the Solent. The site includes trees, shrubs, and woody scrub of varies ages and qualities, including a protected tree in the north-east corner adjacent to Dodds Lane. The Swanmore VDS explains that the village cannot be seen in its entirety from external viewpoints. Development would erode the existing tree, shrub and scrub cover and would be visible from Droxford Road and the wider countryside. Development would also constitute “backland” development taking access from a (now built out) rural exception site.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
WO001	Land between Honeysuckle Lane, West Hill and Heather Lane	Worthing	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is elevated, is part of a large arable agricultural field, and is part of a wider downland landscape. There are no north boundary features. The south boundary provides a strong settlement edge with mature trees. The east and west boundaries are delineated by the PRow network providing views into the site.	Development would extend beyond a strong settlement edge into open downland which would be detrimental to landscape character.	No	The site was promoted during the 2022 Call for Sites and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WO002	Land east of Cote Street	Worthing	Rejected	The site is not available.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity overall. The south area is visible from the A27. The site rises to the north. The north area has a higher landscape sensitivity and provides views across Worthing.	The site is in a mineral safeguarding area for chalk. Given the findings of the landscape assessment, only the south area may be suitable for further investigation.	Yes (In part)	The site was promoted by a third party in July 2024, but the landowner confirmed that the site was not available for development in May 2025.	No	Further information is required to understand potential access points.	Uncertain
WO003	Land between Charmandean and Lyons Ways	Worthing	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity. It has a rural and open character and is a stark contrast to the strong urban edge and built-up area to the south.	Development would extend the urban fringe and would dilute and encroach into a rural and open area on the edge of the National Park.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	No

Site Ref	Site Name	Settlement	Recm.	Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability assessment	Achievable
WO005	Land south of Hill Barn Golf Club House	Worthing	Rejected	At present, insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the site is suitable and achievable. Further information is required to understand access, loss of overflow car parking, loss of putting green facilities, and the relationship with, and operation of, the remaining golf course.	The site has a very low landscape sensitivity. The landscape character is influenced by the existing golf course. The site comprises a putting green and overflow car parking. It is contained by the club house and access road to the north, and existing residential development to the south.	The site may have some potential for built development subject to design and further investigation around access, loss of overflow parking, loss of putting green facilities, and the relationship with the remaining golf course. However, at present, insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the site is truly suitable and that the operation of the existing golf course would not be impacted.	No	The site was promoted during the 2025 Regulation 18 public consultation and is available for development.	Yes	At present, insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the site is suitable and achievable. Further information is required to understand access, loss of overflow car parking, loss of putting green facilities, and the relationship with, and operation of, the remaining golf course.	No