



### Summary of Representations made on the Regulation 16 version of the Henfield Neighbourhood Development Plan (HNDP)

1. This document provides a summary of the representations submitted in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 to the Henfield Neighbourhood Development Plan (HNDP). This document is produced in compliance with the Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum) Regulations 2012.
2. Horsham District Council (HDC) published the HNDP for consultation for 6 weeks from 8 November to 20 December 2019 in accordance with Part 5 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Representations were submitted during the publicity period by 46 respondents. The representations were received from statutory consultees, developers, their agents, and other organisations.
3. Set out below is a summary of the issues raised in the representations. All representations can be seen in full on our website by following this link: <https://www.horsham.gov.uk/planning/neighbourhood-planning/henfield>

Rep	Name/ Organisation	Date received	Method of submission	Summary of representation
1	Resident (Ref 1)	Redacted	Representation form	Pleased to see inclusion of Hollands Lane Industrial site, however, have some concerns over the District Council's plans for the area. The representation goes on to explain their surprise at the objections made by HDC's Property team and Seaward Properties.
2	UK Power Networks	Redacted	Email	Did not foresee any impact on assets. The representation also noted the inclusion of electric vehicle charging in future communal parking proposals. If this was taken forward, UK Power Networks offered their services for new connections or connection upgrades.
3	Resident (Ref 3)	11/11/2019	Representation form	In support of the plan, that it was well prepared, presented and clearly supported by evidence.
4	Resident (Landowner/Ref 4)	Redacted		Land was submitted for consideration for development within the HNDP for residential (The Paddock, Dears farm), in particular for self/custom build and individually designed. Resident believed they were engaged within the steering group, and public consultation events. They felt during these events there was generally a preferred approach to small scale

				developments and a variety of different sizes and tenures. They believe the large scale of Parsonage Farm goes against these wishes and does not represent the wishes of Henfield.
5	Surrey County Council	Redacted	Email	No comments to make in response to this consultation.
6	Southern Water	Redacted	Email	No comments to make in response to this consultation at this stage after reviewing the document.
7	Natural England	09/12/2019	Email	No specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.
8	Resident (Ref 8)	Redacted	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 2.2: Land east of Wantley Hill Estate (objection). Concerns that development will separate the Meadow Walk Estate from the rest of Henfield. The proposed area is used for recreation and dog walking, and worries over building on greenfield sites. Concerns over the narrow access, that has been worse in recent times by the Meadow Walk development. The site does not mention the power lines that run along the boundary of the site.
9	Henry Adams obo Seaward Properties	December 2019	Representation form/email	Made particular representations to Policy 2: Housing Site Allocations, Policy 2.1: Land at Parsonage Farm, Policy 3.1: Employment Development site allocations, Policy 3.2: Development of New and Existing employment uses and other Evidence Base documents. The client's land (Land south of Hollands Lane, which comprises of site D2 and north part of site U). The representation lists site specifics/benefits of the aforementioned site, and its locality in Henfield. Policy 2 has all allocations to the north and east of the village. SEA does not take into account mitigation, so rules out sites without justification. Site U should be considered as delivering the objectives as it allows for redesign to new employment opportunities. Policy 2.1, concerns over how long the planning application could take, plus the build process. Could affect HDC 5-year supply. Suggest that other sites could be delivered within one phase, resulting in a dispersal strategy. General support for Policy 3.1, as it supports opportunities for local businesses. Policy 3.2, main concerns over criteria in the policy to do with the Built up area boundary (BUAB). Further comments were made to the evidence base; the transport report, SEA/SA report, SA addendum and site assessment amended report (all oppose). Final comments are made in regards to the timetable of the HDC Local Plan review, and that housing numbers may be uplifted.

10	Barton Willmore obo Taylor Wimpey	December 2019		Made particular representations in regards to site DD: Land to the north east of Henfield. Encouraged that comments made at Reg 14 have been incorporated, but have concerns that the HNDP has inconsistencies with what is in the evidence base. Such as that to do with housing numbers and the HDPF and HNDP. The Site assessments do not appropriately consider site DD and the conclusions made negatively skew the outcome for the site. The representation comments further on the Objectives (6, 10, 11 and 12) in the SA that they believe to be incorrectly scored. They also believe some of the scores to not take into account WSCC Highways in regards to Road Standards. The representation also has two maps to show the site boundary and masterplan.
11	Resident (Ref 11)	13/12/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 2.2: Land east of Wantley Hill Estate (objection). Concerns that development will separate the Meadow Walk Estate from the rest of Henfield. The proposed area is used for recreation and dog walking, and worries over building on greenfield sites. Concerns over the narrow access, that has been worse in recent times by the Meadow Walk development. The site does not mention the power lines that run along the boundary of the site.
12	Resident (Ref 12)	11/12/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43 (support). Support the development as it will create opportunities for local people, to stay and work in the local area. Allow businesses to grow and will benefit other local businesses too.
13	Resident (Ref 13)	Redacted	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43 (support). The resident works for a specialist steel construction company and supports this development. It will enable the industry to expand and for future business. It also offers potential employment opportunities in the local area.
14	Resident (Ref 14)	12/12/2019	Representation form	Did not leave any particular comments, but indicated on the representation form that they supported Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43.
15	Resident (Ref 15)	16/12/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43 (support). There is a lack of medium-sized commercial premises in Sussex, and the need to support local business is of utmost importance. Strongly recommend supporting this new development, and that the proposal is sympathetic with the surroundings. It also brings in employment potential to the area which is needed.
16	Resident (Ref 16)	17/12/2019	Representation form	Need more facilities; schools, medical centres, car parks and bus services. Concerns that development is destroying wildlife and the countryside.

17	Boyer Planning obo Wates Developments Ltd	18/12/2019	Email	<p>Made particular representations in regards to site the Land West of Shoreham Road, small Dole and paragraph 4.6 (object). Made previous representations to Regulation 14, that commented on the need for the HNDR to be more closely aligned with the HDC Local Plan review, which increases the housing requirement for the District in general, and Small Dole in particular. Paragraph 4.6 comments on the HNDR intention to review every 5 years, and that it is somewhat vague. The representation notes the consultation statement, and the position on how housing numbers agreed. Further comments are made in regards to the relationship between the emerging Local Plan and the need for housing under the new standard methodology. Further clarity is required on this point as other NDPs within Horsham District have commitment to review in 2021.</p> <p>The representation also links to the W. Grinstead NDP and a copy of Reg 14 representation.</p>
18	DowsettMayhew Planning Partnership obo landowner of site W- The Paddocks	19/12/2019	Email	<p>Made particular representations in regards to site W, The Paddocks. Made previous representations to Regulation 14, that commented that the HNDR did not take into consideration the South Downs Local Plan (SDLP), national policy, contribute to achievement of sustainable development and breach of EU obligations.</p> <p>The representation goes on to comment on Aim 1, that the phasing of development is not justified through national policy guidance. Policy 1: A Spatial Plan for the Parish, where the plans for BUAB is supported and contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Policy 2: Housing Site Allocations, the policy does not take into account changes to national guidance. They believe that their site contributes to sustainable development as it is adjacent to the BUAB, and delivery of an additional 284 dwellings.</p> <p>The representation lists site specifics/benefits of the aforementioned site, and its locality in Henfield.</p>
19	Resident (Ref 19)	17/12/2019	Representation form	<p>Made particular representations to Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43 (support). This will create jobs within the community therefore reducing travel distances and time, which will have positive effect on environment. Good use of brownfield site, redevelopment will positively affect the local economy.</p>
20	Resident (Ref 20)	17/12/2019	Representation form	<p>Did not leave any particular comments, but indicated on the representation form that they supported Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43.</p>
21	Resident (Ref 21)	12/12/2019	Representation form	<p>Made particular representations to Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43 (support). This will increase interest in local investment, provide employment and make use of brownfield site. Provides option for old businesses to also use space. It would</p>

				assist in reducing age of districts commercial sites, and provide area with fibre optic connections.
22	Horsham District Council	12/11/2019	Email	<p>Congratulate neighbourhood groups efforts and commitment to engaging the community in the neighbourhood planning process. The Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) is the adopted development plan for the district. It notes that all emerging NDPs will assist in taking a share of 1,500 dwellings through the plan process. HDC welcome the HNDP proposing to make new housing allocations to count towards that requirement.</p> <p>Policy 3 of the HDPF recognises Henfield as a 'larger' village, therefore a sustainable settlement. HDC also recognise the change in the NPPF and the various stages that different plans within the district have progressed to. The Council recognises that this HNDP has been positively prepared and in conformity with the adopted HDPF.</p> <p>HDC support NDPs allocating areas of Local Green Space, however asks that no. 15 'Green land around Meadow Walk' is revoked as it conflicts with access to proposed allocation Policy 2.2 'Land East of Wantley Hill Estate.'</p>
23	West Sussex County Council (Services)	Redacted	Email	<p>Made particular representations to Policy 2.1(i): Land at Parsonage Farm, Policy 2.2(h): Land east of Wantley Hill Estate and Policy 2.3(h): Land west of Backsettown, off Furners Lane. WSCC suggested some amendments/deletions to the policy wording to the land allocations. That the requirement for mitigation to be implemented in full is not compliant with CIL Regulations 122. The size and scale of the site affects the mitigation requirements, and it may not be appropriate for a developer to pay in full for this. As contributions towards improvement works may be required instead.</p>
24	DMH Stallard obo Wellbeck Strategic Land (II) LLP	20/12/2019	Email	<p>Made particular representations in regards to Parsonage Farm, and wholly support the HNDP and meets the basic conditions. Policy 1 is supported in its positive approach, amendments to the BUAB and inclusion of Parsonage Farm on map 1A. Policy 2, supports the housing figure and sites identified. Further comments on the site selection process and Sustainability Appraisal undertaken by the Parish Council was significant and robust. The development at Parsonage Farm allows for open space and recreational infrastructure, country park, allotments with a good housing mix.</p>
25	Resident (Ref 25)	Redacted	Email	<p>Support the HNDP. Represents sustainable development in the village using existing brownfield sites where possible, minimising impact on countryside and providing employment opportunities. Particular support for Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g), as it reuses existing employment land that is already surrounded by businesses situated in the local area.</p>

26	Resident (Ref 26)		Email	Disappointed that a majority of housing allocations are large scale, which is contrary to what a majority of the residents wanted. Residents wanted small-scale, which would be in keeping with the village character. Consultation has been ignored.
27	Campaign to protect Rural Henfield (CPRH)	18/12/2019	Representation form	The representation supports with modifications. The draft plan fails to take into account the Sandy Lane Planning inquiry. It concluded that development of site F is not sustainable, harm to landscape character (visual), environmental matters, setting of listed buildings and 42 homes is not sustainable development. These conclusions have not been taken into account in the Site Assessments, or reflected in the SA. The representation goes on to comment on the Sustainability Appraisal and expand upon the conclusions raised at the appeal. Further comments were made on the Local Green Space proposals. In particular, Green Space 23 'Verge east of Dropping Holms/Sandy Lane' as it relates to the above appeal. It was revoked as inclusion of this LGS designation would impede on the housing development being able to come forward. The representation would like to see this LGS re-considered.
28	Gladman	Redacted	Email	The representation recognises the role of the HDNP and neighbourhood planning as a tool for local people, but needs to have regard to National Policies and strategy for wider authority area. Gladman made further comments on Policy 1: A Spatial Plan for the Parish, Policy 2: Housing Site Allocations and Policy 11: Local Green Spaces. Policy 1, object to the use of settlement limits as a way to preclude otherwise sustainable development. The use of this arbitrarily restricts development, and is not a positive approach. A re-wording of the Policy was also put forward. Policy 2 sets a housing provision of 270 homes, concerns that this is not the true reflection of housing need for Henfield. Highly likely that housing needs for Henfield will increase in the near future, and policy requires more flexibility to these changes. Policy 11 identifies 16 Local Green Spaces. Gladman disagrees with a number of findings in the assessment. Agrees there is no standard definition to what makes land 'extensive' in the LGS tests, some areas do not meet requirements.
29	Resident (Ref 29)	19/12/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43 (support). Henfield is in short supply of industrial/employment sites, as lost Adams Yard and other industrials sites to residential. Site is well located/sustainable location and nearby to other businesses uses, centre of Henfield, local transport links (bus). Site is also brownfield and well screened by trees/hedges. Also positive for local businesses and start-ups, help local economy grow.

30	Resident (Ref 30)	17/12/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43 (support). Opportunity to bring in more jobs to the local area, this will support uplift of new housing. Could provide further local investment with new businesses moving into Henfield. Should remove Old Cottage and dilapidated buildings on site to increase energy efficiency.
31	Montagu Evans obo Sandgate Developments Ltd	20/12/2019	Email	<p>Represent former Sandgate Nurseries site in West End Lane (site Q) and have been engaging in the Neighbourhood Planning process. The representation lists site history/specifics/benefits of the aforementioned site, and its locality in Henfield.</p> <p>There are concerns over flaws in the evidence base, particularly in site assessments. It goes on the comment that there is no evidential reason to allocate Site A over the above site. Approach taken is flawed, as Option 1 gives rise to no red scores unlike the HNBP which goes with Option 5 which scores 2 reds. The representation goes on to discuss Affordable Housing, and that the HNBP does not deliver the need.</p> <p>Evidence supports that there is a growing older population in Henfield. Whilst Site A (Policy) makes reference to single storey dwellings/apartments, there are concerns that market housing will take precedent unless the Policy dictates.</p> <p>The representation also includes Appendix 1 which shows maps and photos of the site and a Local Housing Need Study.</p>
32	Resident (Ref 32)	16/12/19	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43 (support). Worked as an employer for 13 years and the local businesses operating in the local area are key to the community. Provision of more career opportunities for local people and those further afield. Will reflect positively on local business and industry.
33	South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA)	20/12/2019	Email	Congratulate Henfield Parish Council on hard work on the submission HNBP. The HNBP does not allocate any sites within the SDNP. Amend the date of designation by the SDNP to the <u>10</u> December 2013. Support Policy 1: Spatial Plan for the Parish, particularly P1.4 in relation to the SDNP. Support Policies 3.1.3, 3.1.4, and 3.1.5 for their inclusion of references to Dark Night Skies SDNP Policy. Further small amendments in regards to referencing the South Downs Local Plan (SDLP).
34	Rodway Planning obo Fairfax Acquisitions Ltd	December 2019	Email	Made particular representations to Policy 1: A Spatial Plan for the Parish and Policy 2: Housing Site Allocations (object) and site Land north of Sandy Lane (also referred to as Land south of Chanctonbury View (Site F). This site should be included as an additional allocation for residential, and have been involved in the HNBP plan preparation and process. There is a need to build more houses within the District, and this will help boost supply. The site would

				<p>not create any issue with coalescence between Small Dole and Henfield village. The representation also includes the site's assessment scoring. The site had a recent appeal that commented that landscape character and impact on heritage were the reasons for dismissal. The site is available and sustainably located. It is unconstrained by any landscape or planning designation and can provide vehicle access.</p> <p>The representation comments on the AECOM Housing Needs Assessment (HNA), and that the housing need for Henfield should be higher than 270 units. Agree with the environmental objectives in the HDNP, however suggest that certain terms in the criteria set the bar too high. Policy 1 should be amended to accept principle of development, and Policy 2 do not appear to be in accordance with the Landscape Character Assessment (2003).</p>
35	DH Stallard obo Sweeptech Environmental Services & Edburton Contractors	Redacted	Email	<p>Made particular representations to Policy 3.1. Employment Development sites – Site F: Land North of The Old Brickworks. General support of the allocation, but proposed some modifications. The representation also supported neighbouring proposed allocations E: Southgrounds, Shoreham Road and G: The Old Kennels.</p> <p>Site is a suitable location, and is capable of accommodation commercial units. Representation represents clients that are already on the site, and they would like to expand. Clients would like to work with neighbouring site owners to facilitate joint access, instead of the four points that are proposed. These changes would increase the extent of the allocation. The representation also refers to Paragraph 80-82 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and the HDPF Policy 5: Horsham Town and Policy 7: Economic Growth.</p>
36	Daniel Watney LLP	20/12/2019	Representation form	<p>Made particular representations to Policy 2.3: Land west of Backsettown, off Furners Lane (support with modifications). Welcome the allocation of Policy 2.3, however request that some specifics of the allocation are reviewed/amended. Much needed residential allocation for Henfield, alongside amenity provision of open space and ensure setting of Grade II listed Backsettown House is preserved. Will welcome flexibility within the allocation to ensure deliverability, by amending to the policy wording to seek a range of bungalows (single storey) and 2 storey dwellings across the site.</p> <p>The Policy is worded in a way that some features such as having regard to key views, ecology and biodiversity will be sought through planning application stage. Amend policy wording for the remaining elements to allow flexibility.</p> <p>The representation also includes a Technical Note on the site, maps, photos and a Road Safety Audit report.</p>



37	Historic England	Redacted	Email	No areas of concern, are pleased to see that the HNBP sought to accommodate comments and suggestions made by Historic England at Regulation 14. In these circumstances, HE did not review the Strategic Environmental Assessment.
38	Resident (Rep 38)	11/11/2019	Representation form	In support of the plan, that it was well prepared, presented and clearly supported by evidence.
39	Resident (Rep 39)	29/11/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Chapter 5, Policy 2.1: Land at Parsonage Farm (objection). The Parish Council have gone against what the village said they wanted; developing brownfield sites. There is a large gas line through the site that cannot be built around and flooding issues/increased flooding. Increased excessive traffic, and worries of children that walk to school at greater risk. Schools are full, and development is accumulating over one side of the parish, that increased traffic. Not enough parking.
40	Resident (Rep 40)	02/12/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 2: Housing Site Allocations c: Land west of Backsettown, off Furners Lane and Policy 2.4: Land south of the Bowls Club, off Furners Mead (support with modifications). Would like to preserve the land at Backsettown and Bowls club due to its rural nature, and the site would mean traffic would increase. Would prefer development to be located north of the village in Deer Park, but does appreciate the need for dwellings within the village.
41	Resident (Ref 41)	05/12/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 2.1: Land at Parsonage Farm (objection). Gas pipe runs through site and will cause excess of cars. Development is accumulating over one side of the parish. The last phase of Parsonage Farm was reduced by 30 dwellings due to traffic problems and access. The flooding is also worse over this side of the village. Since houses have been built flooding has increased. Should ensure no access is allowed via Deer Park. The views of the village have not been considered.
42	Resident (Ref 42)	11/12/2019	Representation form	Representation is in regards to the Housing Allocations (object), and would like to see the removal of the allocations Policy 2.1: Parsonage Farm and Policy 2.2: Land east of Wantley Hill Estate. Would like to see inclusion of site K at Furners Lane, which was identified as site K1 and K2. It is also identified in the Landscape Capacity Study as 70. These sites at Furners Lane, would provide a mix of housing and affordable housing. The representation also includes two critical analyses of the HNBP Site assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.
43	Resident (Ref 43)	16/12/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43 (support). Premises should be built to modern design and up to date EPC rating, and able to stay in the locality and continue to contribute to commerce of Horsham District.

44	Resident (Ref 44)	19/12/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 3.1.5: The Old Kennels Site (Site g) and paragraphs 5.42, 5.43 (support). Pleased with overall HNDP, but particularly pleased to see re-use of local brownfield sites that have been dormant for some time. This will allow greater opportunities to provide coherent residential development in the village. Allows local businesses to develop and increase with the expansion of the village.
45	Resident (Ref 45)	19/12/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 2.3: Land west of Backsettown, off Furners Lane (object). Concerns over congestion on Furners Lane area, with off road parking and cars blocking the road. Furners Mead is the proposed access route for builder's lorries, which is unreasonable. This will affect more homes than if Furners Lane was used. Using Furners Lane as access would make more sense, it's a shorter distance, more accessible.
46	Resident 46 (Ref 46)	20/12/2019	Representation form	Made particular representations to Policy 2.1: Land at Parsonage Farm (object). This is agricultural land with natural beauty with views across the Downs. Rich in wildlife, biodiversity and easy to walk into town for older people. Concerns over the full GP surgery, local pharmacy and school. Development will cause light pollution due to increase in cars. Also not enough car parking spaces.