

CHIDDINGFOLD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - OCTOBER CONSULTATION ANALYSIS

		Complete and validated questionnaires returned : 212							
Question 1	Do you agree with the revised assessment in respect of the following:	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Validation		ü
Board 4 - Site 6	Land north of The Villagers:	50	101	25	9	27	212	212	212
	% :	24%	48%	12%	4%	13%	100	100	100
Board 4 - Site 7	Land north of Queens Mead:	52	116	18	10	16	212	212	212
	% :	25%	55%	8%	5%	8%	100	100	100
<hr/>									
Question 2	Which revised options do you prefer to meet the additional housing?	First choice	Second choice	Third choice					
Board 5 - Option 1	Site 3A - Field to the rear of Meadow Nursery:	63	102	47	212	212	212		
Board 5 - Option 2	Site 5 - Land to the north of Woodside Road:	40	66	106	212	212	212		
Board 5 - Option 3	Site 22 - Land east of Bethwins Farm:	109	44	59	212	212	212		
<hr/>									
NOT COUNTED ABOVE		Incomplete questionnaires returned : 17							
Question 1	Do you agree with the revised assessment in respect of the following:	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree			
Board 4 - Site 6	Land north of The Villagers:	2	8	1	1	2	14	14	17
	% :	12%	47%	6%	6%	12%	82	82	100
Board 4 - Site 7	Land north of Queens Mead:	2	10	1	0	1	14	14	17
	% :	12%	59%	6%	0%	6%	82	82	100
<hr/>									
Question 2	Which revised options do you prefer to meet the additional housing?	First choice	Second choice	Third choice					
Board 5 - Option 1	Site 3A - Field to the rear of Meadow Nursery:	5	2	0	7	7	17		
Board 5 - Option 2	Site 5 - Land to the north of Woodside Road:	1	1	2	4	4	17		
Board 5 - Option 3	Site 22 - Land east of Bethwins Farm:	10	0	1	11	11	17		

## Site 6 Comments

The access to this land is obviously not ideal and will prove challenging. Lovely countryside will be ruined here.

Houses would be more unobtrusive

Already made access road already exists. Expect a heavy increase in traffic in Woodside Road

Access off A283 seems reasonable.

Seems reasonable given access off the main road (A283) and through site 7.

Access on A283 needs to be made safe. Mini roundabout either at the entrance or at sharp bend to slow south bound traffic round bend.

Provided that access to Petworth road is addressed e.g.. Roundabout (plus measure to slow vehicles approaching the blind corner

Should be kept for recreational and community use, not residential - previous proposal

Should be kept as previous proposal.

Not sure how you would get access

More sites should be considered to spread the load. It seems that one area is being hit hard whilst other areas in the village are left alone

There seems to be a concentration of the new houses into one area and I think that putting up a large housing estate will greatly affect the village and village life.

Topography and position in relation to the rest of residential development in the village has no context.

Disjointed from centre of village for community facilities and for residents resulting in more cars and car parking.

Reduce numbers

New village green. Yes. Attract more businesses and shops

Should only be scouts/football. Why can't villagers hall be used for nursery?

Much better to consolidate more housing here with access from main road into Chiddingfold.

Like mix of housing & community.

This land should remain green space. It is a well established open area used for walking and stands as a buffer for the 'creeping' effect.

Love scout hut.

Access land would have to be on A283.

Access is a key issue with the busy road- calming measures on the 283 plus probably a roundabout.

Access will need significant additional infrastructure

Strong community input on the design & feel of the building is key.

New to the area

Site 5 and 7 would have a detrimental affect on the existing residents in these areas. Not to mention the existing wildlife e.g.. Active badgers setts.

It is too big a development - will impact that side of the village to a negative extent.

Access?

Would it not be better to have a pedestrian access to the nursery school here too?

Where would the access for this site be? Site 7 as Woodside Road doesn't need any more traffic.

It does make sense to develop 6 & 7 side-by-side particularly to provide recreational/community services to the new buildings.

the original proposal seems for more appropriate, central location, particularly for nursery and scout hut.

Makes sense to keep cars off village roads.

All traffic would access on/off the A283 - is this a safe option

The concept of a new 'estate' preferable to many developments.

Best site, definitely for it to happen quickly.

Would be happier if both proposed Scout hut and nursery had access to field or woodland for learning and recreation.

Access will be the key.

I do not feel this is a suitable site for housing.

Makes sense for the change linked to site 7. Access will be an issue as will it being owned by the 'villagers'.

More central to the village.

Bit concerned about access.

Both these sites (5&7) are the ideal places to provide the extra housing and are the best way of adding to the village scene.

This will cause an increase on traffic to site 7.

This should not be developed at all in my view.

Compensate for loss of football field by e.g.. Upgrading/better use of the of the pm Ridgeley road.

I see how units need to be built but I still think its too many if site 5 has to be built on why not put nursery there not houses

The site would effectively join with site 7 (and potentially now site 5) to create one large and concentrated site of development. The effects of this bolt-on-extension would give rise to a rapid and poorly integrated expansion that threatens the character and community feel of the village. I am not clear on the need for an additional community building, but if is required this site does not seem a central/accessible location.

This is completely different to original proposal - I strongly disagree.

Access facilities should be left to provide access to future development if required of Option 2 (Site 5).

This land is well used by all dog owners/walkers from Woodside road the the north of the village also by the majority of villagers walking to the Winterton Pub. This is the nearest accessible area of 'countryside' to a lot of houses in the village and developing this land would really change the feel of living in a rural village location for many residents.

All traffic would access on/off the A283 - is this a safe option.

Access again. The wood gets flooded at times and for a road to be put through will destroy the woods & wildlife & nightingales will vanish. People seem to have forgotten the countryside!

This identifies with the need to concentrate all development to be served by an additional sewer constructed up valley opposite Skinners Lane.

No easy access.

A new forty-house development (concentrated at a single site) sounds shocking enough. Trying to get away with more in the area would be pushing it beyond the limit.

Loosing more footpaths and countryside

This is a discrete site, away from the main village which can be connected by new access roads and can be connected to new drainage and sewage facilities. It would avoid disturbing the existing overloaded village.

For reasons strongly stated in our submissions put forward in reply to the last public consultation meeting and my e-mail to the Parish Clerk on 27.10.17 seeking clarification as to the phrasing/skew of the current questions, I disagree with the direction the consultation has further taken, in skewing questions with

reference to Sites 6 and 7 on the predication there is nothing stopping these site from being built on. The questions are biased as is the position taken on the days of the latest consultation that 'Sites 6 and 7 are happening, get over it' which could not have been more forcefully made. The steering committee are obviously set on its agenda. We would ask all of the previous submissions, together with the 'petition' responses which were, contrary to assertions, made with reference to the previous consultation boards, are taken into account as part of the villagers' position. It has been ignored that with these results, Site 7 for example became the least popular site (in your own words), moving from second least favourite!

**THE PROBLEM IS TOO MUCH IMMIGRATION NOT TOO FEW HOUSES ITS ALSO A GOOD EXCUSE TO FARM MORE COUNCIL TAX CONTRIBUTIONS**

Would depend on access e.g through site 7

No way! You now want to use the whole field - and build houses? No. No no no no no. So many of us walk our dogs there - and use that field to walk to the pub (Winterton Arms). If you try to build houses there I will make sure there is massive local opposition. I was just about OK with your first proposal - the football field and scout hut - but not this - not the whole field - no.

No way! You now want to use the whole field - and build houses? No. No no no no no. So many of us walk our dogs there - and use that field to walk to the pub (Winterton Arms). If you try to build houses there I will make sure there is massive local opposition. I was just about OK with your first proposal - the football field and scout hut - but not this - not the whole field - no.

I agree for the residential units, but think the Scout Hut should be rebuilt where it stands.

What has happened to the football facilities proposed here? The junior club is in desperate need of a building (the scouts already have a but at least !)

Dependant on whether previously proposed football facilities will be provided elsewhere.

No clarity regarding where youth facilities would be placed if not here

The site is too remote from the village centre. It is isolated and is only viable if access can come through Site 7 (the assumption is that the two sites are therefore in separate ownership). There is consequently doubt over whether the site can be considered.

## Site 7 Comments

Easy Access to the site and final housing via the A293 and would impact on the centre of the village (other than increased volume of vehicles on our roads)

Provided houses are away from the area bordering the A283.

If building goes ahead, next to the villagers then this would be just an extended site so perhaps could share access roads.

Access off A283 seems reasonable.

Access to site 6 through here - off A283 preferred.

Housing needs to be balanced with more development to south of village as there is a predominance of housing on north side of village.

Provided that access to Petworth road is addressed egg. Roundabout (plus measure to slow vehicles approaching the blind corner

Leave as 50 units.

Very good access road required from main road including un? Site lines.

More sites should be considered to spread the load It seems that one area is being hit hard whilst other areas in the village are left alone

I think more sites for houses should be considered and we should spread the load.

The impact of high density housing from the main road will have an adverse affect on the village and its position in the landscape.

Use of this land will alter the way the village is perceived from the main road. It will be detrimental to the rural quality seen from the A283.

Could be traffic problem. Reduce number mixed housing.

If access form A283 agreed.

Access - increased traffic at school times. Safe routes across Woodside.

But nursery provision not required of villagers hall could be used.

Same as above.

The sift to other site to take the extra and reduce numbers on this site is not a preferable change.

But can nursery be accessed by foot from village.

Could people walk to nursery through Wildwood Close? Big piece of land, minimal impact.

Again ensuring enough consideration is given to access.

Infrastructure very difficult e.g. for buses and delivery etc.

Strong community input on the design & feel of the building is key.

New to the area

Site 5 and 7 would have a detrimental affect on the existing residents in these areas. Not to mention the existing wildlife e.g.. Active badgers setts.

Again, to big and will affect the whole village. The village will struggle to absorb so man new residents.

Subject to 'improved' access (not a cul-de-sac)

This looks to be quite a big site. Can't really understand why you have reduced form 50 - 40. I think the less sites that have to take development, the better. Also has its own access.

As this is the biggest site should it not have more houses on it.

I didn't put 'strongly agree' only because it seems strange to reduce the number of proposed houses on the largest site in the plan. Maximising the potential of this largest site will reduce the impact on the village by reducing the number of sites that would be developed.

Not good for nursery - perhaps reduce number of houses to 45 (from original proposal).

Concern if two go ahead it is a very big block.

Makes sense to keep cars off village roads.

All traffic would access on/off the A283 - is this a safe option

I think essential particularly with access to the main road. Site 3A excellent, however, traffic congestion along Ridgeley road would need to be addressed 3A many cars are parked there all day - this greatly restricts the view of traffic, especially as many people visit Chi surgery

Would be happier if both proposed Scout hut and nursery had access to field or woodland for learning and recreation.

Unsure because of access onto Petworth road. Traffic needs to be slowed down!

Suggested pedestrian access via the cemetery behind St Teresa's church is a cause for concern.

Not sure how building a nursery equated to loosing 10 houses.

Nursery being sited amongst the houses makes good sense for access on foot, and spreading out house allocation over both sites.

Access with be the key.

Agree this is good site for housing. Not sure nursery will be best located here. Would be better close to school and far away from the main road.

Further out from village but a possibility.

Bit concerned about access.

Both these sites (5&7) are the ideal places to provide the extra housing and are the best way of adding to the village scene.

Reduced number of houses is a step in the right direction. I am still concerned about the access to A283 and increasing risk of accidents that may occur due to increase of traffic in that area.

Nursery needs to be as close to school as possible certainly not further from village central & school.

Again too many units in one place.

I agree with the reduction in housing on the site, but it would still, when combined with site 6, give rise to one large/concentrated site of development, as opposed to utilising a greater number of small sites, more evenly distributed across the village. A large new housing development like this is not in keeping with the character of the village. A large development like this also makes a phased increase in housing/population unlikely - a sudden increase in village population would put considerable strain on village resources/infrastructure.

Land not used before by locals

These two sites, 6 & 7, make ideal sites for low cost housing.

Although if site 6 is rejected then site 7 could revert to previous plans for building 50 houses.

All traffic would access on/off the A283 - is this a safe option.

Makes sense to keep cars off village roads.

Access to this stie from the Petworth Road will be dangerous from the bend of the road - it is a very busy road now in mornings and evenings. Chiddingfold does not deserve an estate built the countryside will be destroyed if quality built. The young will not afford them. Design & quality must be preserved but not on mass.

This identifies with the need to concentrate all development to be served by an additional sewer constructed up valley opposite Skinners Lane.

Better access.

The nursery should be next to the school. Logistics and the environment should be above all in the decision making process.

Wildwood Close will be totally overlooked and this will destroy the countryside. The field is full of wild animals and nature which will be destroyed. Chiddingfold is turning into a town!

Again this would be a development with new access roads and drainage and utilities which could avoid major problems to the existing settlement

For the reasons stated previously in the 'Chiddingfold Neighbourhood Plan - Potential Lines of objection to Sites 6 and 7' document which we would ask you make public, I strongly disagree to both the question and the answer it is looking for. People are not being given the full facts as to the infrastructure which would be required if Site 7 (which the Parish Council are erroneously linking with Site 6 (and potentially now 5)) - where a new access to Petworth Road from Site 7 would be required the road would need widening; substantial new lighting; likely roundabout and the change in character of the village as a consequence; opening up lines of site at the junction; traffic congestion which in my view will be extremely dangerous, especially in a southerly direction with the blind bend, adverse camber; the fact that the village school is not part of the Parish Council's remit and again, the position taken at the consultation was 'SCC will have to pull its finger out'. The Parish Council are not thinking of the stress already placed on the school and the issues in situ. What of the pressures already! The village itself is being taken out of the green belt, there are sites available and if the 'line of site' argument from the green is taken out of the equation from the parish owned site, then all of the coffers from a village development (if the Parish council pursue in my view an incorrect urban expansion programme as opposed to commensurate, phased village development) then the village council would be in funds for decades to come, and the current infrastructure could be improved/new commensurate village community infrastructure phased in over time.

THE PROBLEM IS TOO MUCH IMMIGRATION NOT TOO FEW HOUSES ITS ALSO A GOOD EXCUSE TO FARM MORE COUNCIL TAX CONTRIBUTIONS

Would prefer to see this site maximised in terms of units rather than more of the smaller developments in more central and densely populated areas which would have associated access and road traffic issues. Strongly in favour of a new dedicated nursery building.

Not used by locals up till now. Don't really have a view.

Not used by locals up till now. Don't really have a view.

Site OK but concerned about safety of the access on to Lincolns Hill. With that number of houses the increase in traffic will not be insignificant.

The site residential numbers have been reduced from the previous consultation, putting pressure on releasing additional land from the Green Belt.

## General Comments

I fully appreciate extra housing is required and this needs to be more affordable housing. Any proposed sites needs to be easily accessed. My big concern is the increased volume of traffic on our roads. Our beautiful, peaceful village is being ruined by the sheer volume of traffic. Increase demand on our fabulous doctors surgery and village school needs to be addressed. What would be very sad is with the increased quantity of housing built over time, Chiddingfold will slowly but surely encroach into other neighbourhoods and the 'quintessential village' environment will be lost for ever. I have seen this happen in other areas.

I am still concerned about the necessary improvements to infrastructure - school, services - especially water and drainage and doctors - already stretched.

Extra housing may be required but the local infrastructure and services (Doctors, schools etc.) must be adjusted to compensate for the increased population.

I think the idea of a village green at item 5 is a good one if sites 6 and 7 are put forward, Therefore my 3rd choice.

The idea of village green (site 5) seems very sensible to retain as green community space if site 6/7 are developed

In view of additional demands the present proposals seem to be reasonable. 1) Care needed to maintain present ambience and characteristics of this delightful English village. 2) Infrastructure needs careful thought to meet increased demand. 3) Wetter areas - drainage? Flooding?

Against Bethwins exit would be outside village perimeter onto main A283. Surely it is better to use sites located more in centre of village, before causing a sprawl outside.

Not happy with site 15A + 15 through I understand this has been accepted previously. It will spoil the look of that part of the village round the school and cricket green

3B I am the owner of this site and would like a 2 bedroom bungalow for my own use.

Once again large developments have been proposed opt the north and Woodside Road site 6,7 +5 all at a huge detriment to the village. Centre of village moving away from the heart of village i.e.. The green and pub more land for development should be considered being released to the south of the village not only to recentre it but to move it away from the densely populated north. Access to these sites from Petworth Road is extremely dangerous. Previous consultation I was conciliatory that houses needed to be built in the village. However, already the goal posts have changed. I strongly object to any houses on site 5 and fully support the application for a village space which we were assured was supported. Very disappointed that this i.e. a proposal for even more houses at the site surrounding the loss of potential sporting spaces for the Site 27 is outside the village envelope and in an area of ONB. As such it is not suitable for development and access is an issue. Even with a rural exception it seems inappropriate to consider their site in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan

I believe site 27 to be unsuitable for development, even of 2 affordable houses because, 1) no main drains 2) access over bridge path onto blind corner. 3) no footpaths between village and site. 4)AONB. 5) Gbelt. 6) Area GLV. 7) no lighting. 8) already rejected by planners and designated amenity land. 9) Well outside settlement boundary.

If at all possible could WBC indicate sooner rather than later sites which they consider will not be There are more sites available, I thought we had all agreed to build more houses over a twenty year period in small no more than 10 house developments. Now you are proposing most of the building to be in one area, which changes the village. All the countryside and wildlife that surround the north of the village will be pushed outwards. Houses in the middle will feel more like being in a town.

There still appears to be no 'joined up' thinking about the best use of available land to absorb the requirements for extra housing required. The combination of site 2, 3, 3B and additional 11 acres offered on the 'call for site' would allow for development of mixed housing with ready access to Ridgley Road and surgery, drainage, and situation opposite recreational space already provided within the village.

Furthermore, the proposed development of business/industrial facilities Pickhurst/wood road with result in white van lorry traffic to excess along an already dangerous lane, which will require substantial further investment in order to make safe. This should be located on site 6 where there is already main road access

The problem of the ability of the school to accommodate the increased number of children has still not been addressed in any way. The nursery is a minor problem the scout hut is a minor problem the school is a big problem. Release the school site for housing development and build a state of the art new primary school with an attached nursery and scout and sports facilities at the weekend/holidays/evenings. A big site could hold light industrial/office facilities. The plan so far is piecemeal and does not solve the bigger idea, ? and frustrations villagers have mentioned in the consultation process.

130 homes - impact on services, schools, surgery, transport links, especially sustainable walking and cycling routes - a 'greenloop' or something similar is needed to support healthy life styles. Design guidelines and energy efficiency - methods to ensure highest standards.

Very concerned with the increased traffic on Ridgley Road, with the proposed houses at site 3.

I am pleased to see spread of smaller developments as opposed to larger swathes of building.

I am glad the parish council has argued the extra houses. I feel the impact to existing residents of building on land near their houses is not being considered fully enough. There are sites which have far less impact on residents which are not being considered. Site 5 should be retained as a green space and the parish council should continue to support the village green application.

I though site 5 had PC support to save it? Site 7 makes great sense for the community as it has minimal impact on existing residents if it is developed away from Queensmead and Wildwood (i.e. by road)

Site 6, 7 and 5 make sense. It would be quite hidden but near the heart of the village. Easy access to school, nursery and village shop. It would be less disruptive to have all the new dev development in one place.

No thank you

1) The focus must be on affordable housing, and the use of existing brown field sites (not even mentioned) Compulsory purchase applications must secure point 1 above. 3) The housing MUST support the emerging community and not prioritise the existing. 4) The local infrastructure is probably among the worst possible and car parking is simply inadequate to support the local, never mind the visiting community. 5) Bus services will need at least 100% increase and access to them.

Still concerned regarding the infrastructure impact of 130 extra houses, especially the impact on the village school in terms of capacity.

Please don't allow a 'main stream' or 'profit' driven development. Homes to last 500 years with architectural value.

The land to the east of Bethwins Farm would be preferable as there would be much less disruption during construction and the population density of the main part of the village would not be increased,

I would prefer ? Existing buildings within the village are utilised to the maximum, without the need for addition developments. E.g.. The 'closed' Villagers, Village Hall, Football pavilion, St Mary's school. The housing development at Bethwins farm would impact few residents.

Very concerned that even though there seemed to be a lot of objection to the site 4 (Ballsdown) proposal it now seems to have developed to an additional piece of land. Of all the site this one in my opinion is the least desirable yet it has been further developed and made larger. The Access, volume of increase in traffic movement and safety (being a public footpath) are just a few reasons for the site not being a good idea. All of the other sites seem, although not perfect, a better proposal and the new suggestions are good I have previously documented my concerns about site 4 in Ballsdown due to access and safety. I am further concerned and surprised today to see that site 4 is now referred to as 4A and a new site 4B is being proposed. My previous objections stand and are increased as a result of this additional plot proposal.

I feel strongly that the nature of the village will be affected by such large developments. I believe that it is unfair for one side of the village to pick up all of the new properties. It would be much fairer for smaller areas of potential site to be developed gradually, to allow the village to organically adapt to the new residents and properties. The residents of Woodside Road, Wildwood Close, Queens Mead etc. will suffer whilst residents of other areas in the village will be unaffected. It does' seem fair.

On the face of it sites 2/3/3A/3B/19 are my preferred sites obviously subject to some scheme appeal as for all sites! Has a housing density assessment been made for any/all of the proposed sites? Lets be bold and unlock a decent site so as to get ahead of the game for future needs.



Totally against site 27. 4A and 4B not appropriate.

Not 4A and 4B - not appropriate.. Totally against site 27 - affordable housing

Further to question 2, if access can be provided to site 5 through sites 6 & 7, then this would make sense, but only if access is not via Woodside road, In previous consultations, the village has resoundingly said no more traffic in Woodside & Ridgeley, but 2 of your options will put traffic on these roads. The Beethwins site must surely be a non-starter as will affect the skyline from all entry points to the parish. Rather a pity the other 40 homes haven't been identified this time.

Would it not make sense to put as many houses as possible on a few sites as possible? There will be new demand for houses in the next 10-15 years so it seems a bit silly to spread these 130 out to much I disagree that Bethwins's is not visible. The undeveloped land as it stands at the moment is clearly visible from the top of the green, so development would significantly impact the sight line. My only other comment is about the lack of retirement/care homes in CFhiddingfold, with the whole older generation of your family needed to move out of the village for assisted living in a nursing home, removing them from where they spent their whole lives

Site 4a and 4b strongly object : 1) Access direct onto Ridgeley Road would add to dangerous road - too much parking. 2) Access via Ballsdown involves using of private road. 3) Buildings on site 4a and 4b would badly affect existing Ridgeley road properties & Balldown properties.

I understand 'the Mulberry' pub may shortly become available for redevelopment perhaps residential.

What guarantee is there that access to sites 6 & 7 will be on Petworth Road as Woodside road very busy now and often congested by parked cars,. Ridgeley road - similar problem so site 3a could add additional problems to traffic flow.

Getting up and down on Ridgeley road is already a challenge so to keen for more traffic there.

Whilst admitting a personal interest, I would like to build one small house on site 20 technical planning advice is currently being obtained

Struggle to see how an area of land used and enjoyed by the community is being considered over land that is currently unused.

Site 5 is currently used by a wide rang of the community and it would be such a shame to loose this well loved piece of land.

Option 3 site 22. Access by foot to this site not good, very narrow pavement only on one side next to the very busy main village Petworth road,

Thank you for all your hard work.

Assuming this is inevitable, managing the infrastructure as best possible is really important. Parking is already a challenge for many with the inevitable impact on traffic flow. Woodside road could 'block' quite easily for instance.

I strongly object to site 5 being proposed to house new housing. It is being considered by the council as a potential new village green because it is and always has been used as such. The residents of Woodside road are trying to protect site 5 so it remains green, unspoilt and freely accessible to all.

I understand the need for extra houses (30) as proposed in the 3 additional options. Option 3 is the least desirable :- the Petworth road already is far too dangerous with cars not keeping to the speed limit coming down the hill into the village. This road is badly maintained in the winter with surface water draining from nearby fields turning into black ice. Several accidents have occurred because of this with nearby residents having their wall demolished. I'm assuming access will be from site 22 directly onto A283. In my mind the most sensible option is for site 3A as building in already proposed for the adjacent site.

As we are right on the boundary at Chiddingfold nor Witley Station we find it difficult to comment, but are concerned at the extra traffic which would use Combe Lane for the station with limited parking. Already, Combe Lane is used to park during the week, which makes it extremely difficult for residents to exit Westway Close.

The village nursery has been looking for a new home for quite a while. Why was the Villagers unsuitable?

Would it not have been cheaper to modify that building rather than build a new one. The road to Bethwins is very dangerous with no pavements etc. Would then new homes have easy access to the village?

Whisper quiet road surface on A283. Speeding ! Average speed limit. Tighten corner off A283 to Green/Pithurst road to force people to brake before they turn left

Whisper quiet road surface please and reduced road limits

I'm not keen on any of the options in question 2. I think that if an extra 30 houses are to be built far more effort should be made to find in filling sites. It seems that Waverley are only interested in big sites to save themselves effort. It would be much better in my view if we could put up with a bit more density if necessary rather than allowing Chiddingfold to sprawl outwards in every direction. I remain puzzled about the entrenched objection to using land enclosed by Ballsdown/Ridgeley/Coxcomb. Building on that would actually help join up the village without spreading it outwards though the changes introduces more houses, this results in a far more evenly distributed development plan from a residential prospective. It's shame to lose the beautiful countryside surround ing us but it appears unavoidable.

I think that site 22 and 3A would be better for housing compared to site 6. For site 7 a clause should be put to ensure the number of housing put on the site can not be increased as this site is very large.

It would be good to spread the required houses/homes allocations around the village

Strongly feel nursery should be in centre of village near green and school.

Site 5: Application to become village meadow/green. As a resident we hope that this does happen of course the thought of 25 houses in that field is awful. If our appeals fail and it is considered for development why not propose it for the scout hut/recreational facilities but not housing. So site 5 could still retain its tranquillity and charm, but also provide facilities of the whole village. Of course we want it to remain a village green if; possible. Lets hope Surrey Council say yes

I strongly oppose site 5, there is not access to the site and it would further exacerbate the problems I believe will be created by having on large site of new housing rather than several, smaller/medium sites. I strongly object to the housing strategy put forward in the draft Chiddingfold Neighbourhood plan for the following reasons: Residents feedback form the first consultation indicated an overwhelming majority support for smaller housing sites (86%) and that minimising impact on the countryside is a major concern. Also in connection with the 'future evolution of the village' residents expressed a strong preference for developments that are well designed and landscaped with adequate off street parking and that traditional properties are preferred. The strategy that is now put forward for residents' comments, shows the majority of the proposed housing development in one location (sites 5,6 an&) which gives rise to one large, concentrated site of development. Not only does this seem to go against the wishes of the majority of residents but it also seems entirely unbalanced and unfair that existing residents on the northern side of the village are being asked to take the brunt of the majority of the new development for Chiddingfold. There are many reasons why one large development will have a far greater detrimental impact for the whole of our village than would a more dispersed approach with smaller pockets of development being proposed. I list some of the main disadvantages below:

Site 6&7 are in a visually prominent location and an expanse of development here would appear particularly intrusive on the main approach to our village. It will not be possible to envelop such a large site into the existing fabric of Chiddingfold and so will appear as a bolt on extension to the main village, with the loss of some lovely open countryside views and natural walking areas. Not only will this create a marked divide visually and physically between old and new but it would arguably also create a social divide which would give rise to a less sustainable and integrated community in the future.

The ability to stagger development of this large site over an extended period of time is not feasible, the instant impact of such a large increase in population will create overwhelming pressure on the existing facilities and amenities of the whole village, giving less time for schools, doctors etc. to adapt and expand to accommodate this sudden surge in population. Far better to let development and population evolve and increase incrementally so as to be more easily absorbed into the existing physical and social fabric of our community. Smaller sites spread around the village would allow for a more natural organic growth over a long time span with far less impact on the overall character of our village.

It will create a concentration of activity, noise and traffic in one location with all the negative consequences such as congestion on the main road especially during rush hour and school pick up times. The combination of housing and amenity facilities for sites 6 & 7, will attract large volumes of traffic and parking requirements. The proposed footpath access to the recreation facilities/football pitch will inevitably lead to over-spill parking along Woodside road - a road already used extensively for parking, particularly by the many users of the nearby cricket grounds.

I note that other selected sites are classed as brownfield but with very little housing numbers proposed. In line with government advice these sites should take priority for development and could be developed at much higher densities than is suggested. Great Oaks Farm appears to have been left out of the selected sites this would appear to be an appropriate part brownfield site in a more concealed and central location with better opportunities to blend with the existing village, all helping to disperse development and allow for a more controlled rate and form of growth.

I hope you will consider these comments and reconsider the housing strategy that you have put forward to date. Unfortunately I will not be able to support the NP at referendum as it stands.

Site 6 is completely different to original proposal. Site 5 is supposed to be a village green. There will be massive local opposition if you try to sue site 5. We have been walking our dogs at site 6 for years - that path is hundreds of years old now you want to use the whole field? No way, not happy at all with this new. Consideration should be given to sites with service facilities to reduce costs even if within the conservation areas.

Appreciate all the hard work being put in by the NP Steering Group / PC. Hope that it will still be possible to resist pressures to expand unduly the village, particularly to the detriment of the Green Belt. Concerned re. traffic impact of proposed developments close to Ridgley Road.

No additional comments at this stage but appreciate efforts made by the group proposing the plan.

If there were to be any further building off Ridgley Road, along which the traffic and the speed of the traffic is already very bad, then I would want to see concrete plans for traffic calming to be put in place before additional building starts (frankly this is needed anyway).

Still worried about capacity of school and station car park.

The topography of Site 7 is questionable and there is a waterway. Chiddingfold will be altered forever it is known as a very attractive village but large clumps of houses will alter this permanently.

There was no mention of community buildings medical school post office being involved. With numbers growing these would have to be accommodated.

The main sewer constructed in Ridgley Road in 1940/50s is very overloaded (Ashcombe Estate built in 1970s). Sensible to develop new sewer serving N & E Woodside Road. Possibly new access road (opposite Skinners Lane) off A283.

Site 3A. Believe this land belongs to Great Oaks Farm. If this estate is sold off as that of Prestwick Farm, great pressure from developers to use this estate. (See Prime Location.com - sale of various bits of Prestwick Farm land, one even has a diagram of 'house size' plots! 3 smaller plots (£150k each) unsold at auction 14/11/2017).

Site 5. Would give another junction with A283 for little gain in housing accommodation. The majority of houses have had some increase in accommodation since original built. We need more smaller units for starter families and 'down-sizers'. The Oaks, Coxcombe Lane is ideal with small gardens and central. Site 5 has been submitted to gain 'village green' status which I think implies how strong local opposition will be against housing on this site. Access to site 5 would be particularly difficult unless site 6 was also developed both of which I am against as they are well used. If the village green/church/shops are taken as the centre of the village then the spread of housing is already heavily skewed towards the north of the village. In order to even out the village spread and prevent too much impact on certain roads etc. I would not consider sites 5 & 6 to be viable options and would look to spread the village housing more evenly around. Is there any chance of sheltered housing/accommodation for older people? Many older people have to move out of the village.

Concerns the traffic in the village, especially Ridley Road and potential increase in weight of traffic. Site 7 make sense from a traffic flow point of view given it has direct access to the Petworth road, thus taking pressure off internal village roads

Very concerned about traffic on Ridgeley road and safety for children it is currently a gauntlet and very dangerous as it is. Also find it bizarre that 2 number of proposed sites outside of the village boundary (towards Hambledon Dunsfold, (Prestwick) that have not been brought forward for consideration despite most people agreeing they may be a viable solution.

Sites 6 & 7 - still concerned about access from the Petworth Road.



Prefer idea of infilling rather than building large blocks.

There seem to be good number of potential small sites within or close to the existing village curtilage that would allow for absorption of the vast bulk of the additional housing numbers. It seems self-evident to me that infilling of this nature is far more preferable to further ingress into the open countryside.

The houses on Woodside Road backing on to Site 5 are among the most attractive in the village, precisely because they back onto the countryside, which is what many people look for when they move into a countryside village. Building in Site 5 would mean ruining twenty of the nicest houses in Chiddingfold - and there aren't many left. We want landowners to put sheep and cows in their fields, not houses.

I'd be concerned about the additional volume of traffic going through the village if built near Bethwines. This is obviously already a problem that SCC haven't addressed.

It's all very disappointing. I have lived here for 33 years and it's sad to see it turn into a concrete jungle.

Option 1 should be dismissed immediately. This would increase the total no of dwellings on the 2 Meadow Nursery sites to 45 which is ridiculous. For a start this would require access to Ridgley Road which elsewhere in the NP as having major traffic issues; the need to accommodate a possible increase of 50 vehicles would be ludicrous. The last Meadow proposal already suggests 20 dwellings which is in itself not sensible. Apart from the access and traffic issues, these Meadow sites have not been subject to any technical evaluation but it is clear that there are major land issues involved; this area is on a downslope to Ridgley Road and such scale of housing would cause real drainage and sewage issues, particularly if they would be connected to existing, already inadequate systems and the many trees are removed. It is particularly alarming that someone has even suggested building a bridge to connect the two sites. The existence of a stream between the 2 sites already illustrates the potential flood and drainage risks of these proposals and the suggestion to consider a bridge which would presumably need to carry both cars and heavy vehicles would be lunacy. I consider that the existing Meadow proposal should be rejected on the grounds of access, drainage flood and traffic. This new suggestion to build on the land in the rear with a BRIDGE is the height of folly. Already, the decision to have a referendum for residents to vote on the sites has subverted WBC's proposals to concentrate development on 2 main sites and made the CPC responsible for the consequences. The NP was born from a claimed need to protect us from unwanted development both in terms of scale and location. The first of these has been lost by the acquiescence of CPC in the new target of 130; we can at least hope to reduce the disadvantages to the village of scattering development through the various sites and concentrate it in the 2 Woodside Road and Bethwins sites. This would at least avoid massive disruption over many years and some of the access, drainage and utilities notes above and also the risk of blight to existing houses. Given that WBC has delegated much of the initiative to CPC and its NP, the responsibility lies with CPC to protect the villages by, if possible, still reducing the no of dwellings, but at least developing a solution which will concentrate developments in the large and accessible sites to the North of Woodside Road and East of I think the Parish have moved away from the village request at the outset for smaller, phased development. It has not considered the potential for there being a one way road from Petworth road, down past the school playground and football pitch (making people aware that there is a car park at the football pitch already which is not signposted or advertised), and back past the pond, which would allow one way parking in effect from the current scout hut to the church and thus free up the proposed car park site for development (reference to the reasons why that site currently is not being considered being flooded with reference to the proximity to a list building and the church). Any new development could include undercroft parking. Given the Parish Council have said there will not be a traffic warden or double yellow lines around the village green, all will continue to park near the shops, so it is an opportunity missed in my view. I have made various submissions which I would like made public and have concerns as to the direction the plan is/has travelled to date in light of the original statistical analysis. We need the mandate to be from the village - with current turn out and direction, that is not, in my view, the case. If dispensation were given for sites not needing to be within 100 metres of the current village boundary, there would be some potential sites made available which might suit the majority - without knowing whether representations have been made to this top down led restriction (have they?) it would perhaps suit our village better.

**THE PROBLEM IS TOO MUCH IMMIGRATION NOT TOO FEW HOUSES ITS ALSO A GOOD EXCUSE TO FARM MORE COUNCIL TAX CONTRIBUTIONS**

The board showing all originally proposed sites was confusing. It would have been clearer if those site that were favoured following previous consultations could have been highlighted with potential housing numbers - perhaps in a different colour. I believe the Meadow nursery site should be reduced in housing numbers rather than increased as this would help relieve traffic problems on Ridgley Road. In particular the suggestion for traffic calming via indicated parking areas on either side of the road (creating a snake effect) does not seem very sensible as there is only a footpath on one side of Ridgley Road and many drives come almost directly on to the road with very little side visibility. I believe speed bumps would be far more effective. Don't understand why site 4a and 4b remain on the plan when various factors impacting the suitability of the site have already been raised including, inadequate access, flooding, contaminated land, restrictive covenants, impact on surrounding residents. Please explain.

Not site 5. Trying for the third time to complete this.

An excellent Plan. Site 22 would be an excellent site for the affordable housing but it must be for local people and the ones who work locally. Not for anybody that nobody else wants in their locality.

Not site 5 - no way site 5 - and not happy with changes to site 6 either.

Petworth rd is a very busy road, if houses were to be placed on the land east of Bethwins Farm this would cause more traffic causing more accident. It would also spoil the countryside and wildlife. All sites would mean a bigger school, doctor surgery needed to be able to accommodate more people. Our village is losing the its character and there is less and less people whom family have lived it for years living here as they are being force out because the house which are being build are not affordable for the next generation to stay ... I don't believe it would be possible to provide safe access to and from site 22. The road is already dangerous due to speeding vehicles and ice on the road during the winter. There have been countless accidents on this stretch of road. In addition to this, the land in Turners Mead is prone to subsidence with numerous properties requiring foundation strengthening. Nearby construction would likely lead to substantial structural damage to what are already unstable existing properties. I think it would make sense to keep the village close to the existing and the new amenities. Therefore building alongside the North side of the larger existing property boundry seems the best option.

I am unclear what the proposals are to improve the football club facilities. The current junior facilities are frankly embarrassing when we have visiting teams. We can't even offer a loo (particularly for young girls on the teams, at least the boys can pee in the bushes).

Parking at the station - or a safe footpath to get to it is essential. No provision has been made for the influx of commuters needing to get to work from the station with no means of getting there. At the moment there are often no parking spaces by 9am. Many would walk if the road had a footpath and wasn't so treacherous! There is no mention of any plans to manage the extra pressure that will be placed on St Mary's school and the GP surgery

**STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH FURTHER DEVELOPMENT** Believe the Council should mount a legal challenge to external requirement to build additional housing to meet needs external to Chiddingfold residents.

**STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH RELEASING GREENBELT LAND FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT.** Believe there should be a full review of Village capacity to take new homes not in terms of just sites but rather traffic, schools, shops etc.

*[This was submitted by an agent on behalf of a landowner].* Our Client is generally supportive of bringing Site 14 (Coxcombe Lane) forward for development and notes the proposal for parking within the previous draft NP. However, she wonders if this is now the right time to review the suitability of the site for housing? There appear to be problems in delivery on three of the five sites proposed (3A, 5 & 6) where the access situation is not resolved, being in separate ownerships. As such there can be no certainty that these sites are deliverable within the relevant Plan period. Site 22 is considered quite remote from the village centre and, whilst Site 7 is proposed to take the largest numbers, these have been reduced to accommodate a community building. The reduction in numbers creates additional pressure on releasin land from the Green Belt and within AONB. In contrast Site 14 is available, developable and deliverable, being within one ownership. It is also within the heart of the village (rejecting the site for housing previously the relationship of the site to the historic village core was noted, albeit with concerns over impact on character and heritage assets). It is capable of accommodating approximately 15 dwellings, which would make a strong contribution to taking the additional housing numbers proposed by the Planning Inspector. There are planning arguments in favour of a housin development on Site 14, which is better related to the central village facilities. In addition heritage assets such as listed buildings and conservation area designation need not be a bar to development. Well located sensitively designed residentail development could be worth considering on this site rather than expanding the edges of the settlement further into the countryside. Notwithstanding the above, as said, our Client is interested in exploring the proposal for the car park on site, along with some enabling re-development to help bring this forward.

Are we missing something here? Why should our rural village have to provide extra housing just because an urban sprawl like Woking say they cannot meet their requirement? The problem is Woking's and they must look to their options. It is undemocratic that others are forced to make up Woking's shortfall. Furthermore, if Woking can say that they cannot meet requirements, Chiddingfold can say the same thing. We should look at what we can contribute without encroaching on established Areas of Natural Beauty, green belt, natural recreation areas or to the detriment of countryside wildlife. If this only produces a fraction of the oped amount then Chiddingfold should stand firm. If Woking can have a shortfall then so can Chiddingfold. I would expect Chiddingfold, through its Parish Council, to protect its boundaries from over-habitation not simply acquiesce to outside demands that are not in the village's best interests. Stand firm. Save our AONB. The road surfaces within the village are abysmal. Resurfacing and maintenance programmes by whichever authority is responsible should be vigorously pursued. I would venture to state, from experience, that the roads in this part of Surrey are the worse in the Country. The village is a credit to its occupants. Development outside the present settlement area is not required. Further large housing sites would downgrade this. We do not need to challenge Cranleigh as the largest village in the country.

Rec'd 16/1/17  
232

**Chiddingfold Neighbourhood Plan**  
**Consultation Questionnaire**

This questionnaire seeks to gather your views on the emerging Chiddingfold Neighbourhood Plan, based on the boards presented to the public on 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> January 2017.

You can also complete the questionnaire online at: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/WWW/CHNP/4123>

1. Do you broadly agree with the overall Vision that we have proposed for the Neighbourhood Plan? (Please tick)

Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
				✓

Do you have any comments/changes you would like to suggest?

**NOTE FROM CLERK:** These two surveys are identical in all but the names. They were submitted in November in response to a very different consultation and, as such, the responses are not able to be scored against the Oct 16 questions. The comments and the photographs have been included in accordance with the SC decision on 21 Nov 2017.

2. Do you agree with the objectives (set out below) that we have proposed on the display boards? If not, could you tell us why?

Objective	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Comments
Heritage, character and design						
Countryside and rural economy						
Infrastructure (facilities and amenities) and wellbeing						
Recreational and culture						
Retail, local services and tourism						

Just to record that I'm against the proposal for sites 5,6,7.

As a relatively new-comer to Surrey I read the Surrey Life Magazine to help me discover the County. The August edition contains a lot of information that stresses the beauty and importance of 'The Surrey Hills - AONB' and the wildlife within. There is also a supplement this month, 'A Celebration of Surrey Life', this also cherishes The Surrey Hills and its natural inhabitants. Chiddingfold gets a mention in the section dedicated to '35 of our most beautiful villages', with a specific reference to our (quote) "spectacular countryside". Apparently, we the residents (quote) "over the years have known how to party too!". I got was obviously in the past because with the current Neighbourhood Plan we are more intent on destroying the beauty around us and that isn't a call for a celebration. Site 7 is a Surrey Hill, occupiable with a small one, but it still needs to be recognised as part of the village's spectacular countryside and be protected.

The Surrey Life also refers proudly to the County as having the most wooded areas in England. To access sites 5 & 6 a bluebell wood would have to be destroyed, exposing a natural waterway. This stream would have to be ducted changing it from natural to man-made. It is even more distressing when you realise that this western destruction of woodland and wildlife habitat is to provide facilities that are already catered for in more accessible parts of the village.

The need for houses is recognised but the still is locating plots that fit into the village in small numbers. To designate an AONB as a site for an estate of 50 housing units is not in keeping with a rural area and should be reconsidered. As I travel around this part of Surrey it is consistently reminded by road signs that I'm in the Surrey Hills. Let's not turn them into an urban sprawl.



Do you really want to cover this with 40 houses?


Chasing these away



And the:



Cut these tree down



Once 90 houses are built together with roads and other facilities, all the forgoing habitat will be lost for ever – there is no going back once an estate has been built!