

NP SA objectives appropriate for site assessments	Assessment criteria	WHCS01 - Hangdown Mead
To encourage growth that addresses local housing needs, in particular the identified need for homes to address the needs of younger and older people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sites should be considered favourably if they are capable (by virtue of size) to accommodate needs of all identified groups). - Is the site large enough to provide for affordable housing needs (i.e. the site is capable of delivering 4 or more dwellings)? - Sites should be considered favourably if they are within walking distance of existing services and the route is safe to walk. 	<p>0.67ha of developable land (1ha total size). Based on a reasonable density in a rural village, this might deliver 13 dwellings. So could provide 4 affordable units (either under adopted or emerging Local Plan policy). So has some potential to provide for a range of local housing needs.</p> <p>Site is within short walking distance of all services, but more than 1km from school. Walk would be reasonably flat so no problems for aged or infirmed. Access to Costcutter would not require crossing of any busy roads. But access to pub and school would require crossing of busy Top Road twice (where pavement ends).</p>
To ensure development does not take place in areas of flood risk, or where it may cause flooding elsewhere, thereby minimising the detrimental impact to public well-being, the economy and the environment from flood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sites within flood zone 3 should be eliminated. - Sites in flood zone 1 should be prioritised over sites in flood zone 2 - From local knowledge has there ever been flooding on the site. 	Flood zone 1
To make the parish an attractive place for businesses providing essential retail and service offerings for the local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is any site, by virtue of location and size, capable of providing new retail units? - Will the site result in the loss of existing retail or service units? 	<p>Site not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings. Unless alternative premises are found, then there would be a loss of employment from the site, including some businesses that provide valuable local services, e.g. car repairs. The promoter has suggested the use of an existing barn to the south of the site along a track for existing businesses. However, there is doubt over whether this would provide appropriately for the needs of all the businesses.</p>
To sustain and enhance the diverse selection of clubs/societies/sports/ worship for all age groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the site create the opportunity to provide new amenity or open spaces, e.g. allotments, a community room, sports centre, etc? 	Site not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings.
To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is site brownfield or greenfield? 	Brownfield
To maintain and enhance the countryside and open spaces of West Hoathly parish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the site in open countryside/will it encroach unacceptably on open countryside? - Is the site within the AONB? - Will the site have a detrimental impact on the landscape? - Will the site impact on areas of designations of value to the landscape, e.g. ancient woodland, TPOs? - Will the site impact on any existing footpaths or other rights of way? 	<p>The site is in the AONB.</p> <p>The site will have potentially significant impact on views across the landscape, both to and from the site; however, its existing use already has an impact.</p> <p>The site does not impact on any designations of value to the landscape. There are no PROWs that would be impacted by development.</p>
To maintain and enhance the biodiversity of West Hoathly parish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will the site impact on areas of environmental sensitivity, e.g. SSSIs, biodiversity action plan areas, local/county wildlife sites, TPOs? 	No
To conserve and enhance the architectural and landscape heritage of conservation areas and individual historic buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the site impact on a Conservation Area and/or listed building(s)? 	No
To have an efficient, quick and coordinated public transport service that meets the needs of residents and visitors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proximity of the site to a public transport interchange (bus stop) – walking distance [in excess of 1,000m makes it less likely to be used] 	380m to bus stop so very easy walking distance.
To substantially reduce the impact on residents' lives of the volume, speed and weight of traffic within the parish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does a site, by virtue of its location, cause an unacceptable impact on congestion on the existing highway network? - Can a site create the opportunity to improve traffic flow at junctions? - Can a site create the opportunity to reduce traffic speeds? 	<p>Scale of development would not impact on main road network (Top Road). Access from site westbound in the morning peak (prevailing direction of traffic) would be easy.</p> <p>There is no prospect of securing a roundabout on the junction of any access point, so access would not be improved and there would not be the opportunity to reduce speeds on Top Road.</p>
Facilitate employment opportunities in the parish (local businesses, working from home, self-employment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will the site result in the loss of existing commercial activities and jobs from the parish? - Does the site offer the opportunity to create new jobs within the parish? 	If an alternative site for the displaced businesses cannot be secured as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, then it will be difficult to guarantee that there would be no loss of commercial activities and jobs.
To retain a variety of hospitality businesses for local and tourist use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will the site result in the loss of existing tourism activities and jobs from the parish? - Does the site offer the opportunity to create new tourism activities and/or jobs within the parish? 	<p>There will be no loss of tourist jobs or activities as a result of development.</p> <p>The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs or tourist activities.</p>
To retain the distinctiveness of the parish's settlements and the gaps between them	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would development of the site materially result in the erosion of the gap between settlements? 	No. The site is separate from the existing settlement boundary of Chaverton.
Deliverability		<p>The principal deliverability issue relates to the future of the existing businesses, some of which provide local services of value to the community. In addition, there is uncertainty over the ownership of the access road.</p>
Overall assessment		<p>Limited potential unless (i) it can be demonstrated that the existing businesses can be satisfactorily be relocated and this can be secured through a policy in the Neighbourhood Plan; and (ii) issues regarding ownership of access can be resolved.</p>

Assessment

Strongly positive
Slightly positive
Neutral
Slightly negative
Strongly negative

Glossary

BAP sites:

Biodiversity Action Plan sites are those that were identified as being the most threatened and requiring conservation action under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan

The loss of these sites should be avoided/minimised. Current Local Plan Policy C6 seeks to 'resist' the loss of woodlands. The Emerging Local Plan Policy DP36 is less categorical - *'Unavoidable damage to biodiversity must be offset through ecological enhancements and mitigation measures (or compensation measures in exceptional circumstances)'*. But the BAP sites are not specifically designated as sites for protection. So a judgement must be made as to their contribution to biodiversity.

PROW:
Public Right of Way

WHCS02 - Bluebell Woods	WHCS03 - West Hoathly Station Goods Yard	WHCS04 - Webbs Mead
1.56ha of developable land (3.12ha total size). Based on a reasonable density in a rural village, this might deliver up to 30 dwellings. So could provide up to 9 affordable units (either under adopted or emerging Local Plan policy). So has potential to provide for a range of local housing needs. Site is within walking distance of all services, but more than 1km from school. Walk would be up steep hill (Station Road) which could be difficult for aged or infirmed. Access to Costcutter, pub and school would require crossing of busy Top Road.	0.5ha of developable land (0.7ha total size). Based on a reasonable density in a rural village, this might deliver 10 dwellings. So could provide 3 affordable units (either under adopted or emerging Local Plan policy). So limited potential to provide for a range of local housing needs. Site is within walking distance of all services, but more than 1km from school. Walk would be up steep hill (Station Road) which could be difficult for aged or infirmed. Access to Costcutter, pub and school would require crossing of busy Top Road.	2.5ha of developable land (3.2ha total size). Based on a reasonable density in line with this part of the village, this might deliver up to 75 dwellings. So could provide up to 23 affordable units (either under adopted or emerging Local Plan policy). So has excellent potential to provide for the full range of local housing needs. Site is well within walking distance of the school and a bus stop, but is outside of reasonable walking distance for the Costcutter (1.5km) and is some distance from the nearest pub. Walk back from Costcutter would be up steep hill which could be difficult for aged or infirmed. Access to Costcutter would require crossing of busy Top Road twice (where pavement ends). Access to pub and school would not require crossing of busy Top Road.
Flood zone 1	Flood zone 1	Flood zone 1
Due to its size, the site could provide for businesses but this would be at the expenses of dwellings (including affordable dwellings). The site will not result in the loss of any existing units.	Site not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings. The site will not result in the loss of any existing units.	Site is large enough to provide a small shop on-site, which would provide a service currently lacking in this part of West Hoathly. The site will not result in the loss of any existing units.
Due to its size, the site could provide for community uses but this would be at the expense of dwelling provision (including affordable dwellings) unless the community use was incorporated as part of the green open space that would be provided as part of the development. This could include a small community garden or children's play facilities.	Site not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings.	Site is large enough to provide for a wide range of community needs.
Greenfield. Although there were former brickwork activities on part of the site, this ceased over 100 years ago. However, the site is quite scrubby in nature and whilst it has some mature trees on it, it does not represent an	Brownfield	Greenfield
The site is in the AONB. The site is not in open countryside but is not particularly well related to the existing settlement. The site is unlikely to have significant landscape impacts. Northern quarter of site is ancient woodland which would require a buffer from development although promoter states that this area would be left undeveloped anyway. There is a PROW running along the south-eastern edge of the site, but this would be unlikely to be affected by development.	The site is in the AONB. The southern part of the site is not in open countryside and is well surrounded by the railway. The northern part of the site is open and distinct in character and development at this location could have wider landscape impact. Northern part of site is ancient woodland which would require buffer from development. The site does not impact on any PROW. It is near a public bridleway to West Hoathly and footpaths to Gravetye Woods and Blackland Farm, so provides good access into the countryside.	The site is in the AONB. The site would encroach significantly onto open countryside, particularly the western half of the site. Excluding this western half would serve to reduce the impact but this would serve to reduce the number of dwellings and the associated benefits. In fact, if this left just Bakers Pit (with the radio mast/pond) then to date there has been no interest from Housing Associations to put dwellings there. The site will have significant impact on views across the landscape, particularly long range view of the High Weald. The site does not impact on any designations of value to the landscape. There are no PROWs that would be impacted by development.
All of site is BAP priority woodland.	Majority of site is BAP priority woodland	No
No	No	Site is adjacent to Duckys Holt, Grade II listed building and could impact on its amenity. However, this could likely be addressed satisfactorily.
440m to bus stop so very easy walking distance. However, access would be up steep hill (Station Road) which could be difficult for aged or infirmed.	560m to bus stop, so easy walking distance. However, access would be up steep hill (Station Road) which could be difficult for aged or infirmed.	380m to bus stop so very easy walking distance.
Scale of development would not impact on main road network (Top Road). Access from Station Road westbound in the morning peak (prevailing direction of traffic) would be difficult. There is limited prospect of securing a roundabout on the junction of Top Road and Station Road with this level of development (but this should be confirmed with WSCC Highways), so access would not be improved and there would not be the opportunity to reduce speeds on Top Road.	Scale of development would not impact on main road network (Top Road). Access from Station Road westbound in the morning peak (prevailing direction of traffic) would be difficult. There is no prospect of securing a roundabout on the junction of Top Road and Station Road with this level of development, so access would not be improved and there would not be the opportunity to reduce speeds on Top Road.	Scale of development at upper end could impact on main road network (Top Road). Access through Broadfield onto Selsfield Road could cause congestion Highest levels of growth could potentially create the opportunity for a roadabout to be provided at the junction of Broadfield and Selsfield Road, but this would need to be confirmed by WSCC Highways Department. If so, this could serve to reduce traffic speeds.
There will be no loss of jobs as a result of development. The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs.	There will be no loss of jobs as a result of development. The potential to bring the rail halt back into active use could possibly create jobs although there are no definitive plans to do this.	There will be no loss of jobs as a result of development. The site does offer the opportunity to create new jobs if a new retail facility was provided.
There will be no loss of tourist jobs or activities as a result of development. The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs or tourist activities.	There will be no loss of jobs as a result of development. The potential to bring the rail halt back into active use could possibly create tourism jobs and bring more tourists into the area although there are no definitive plans to do this.	There will be no loss of tourist jobs or activities as a result of development. The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs or tourist activities.
No. But the site does extend the settlement boundary of Sharpthorne quite considerably.	No. But the site does extend the settlement boundary of Sharpthorne quite considerably.	No
The major issue for deliverability is the presence of the electricity pylon, which would either need to be moved or placed underground. Either way, this is very expensive and could impact on the deliverability of the development. There is also the possibility of contamination under the site which would require remediation which is likely to add to the costs.	The shape of the site would make development difficult and could potentially be quite constraining for access. It also would serve to extend the village northwards. The current planning permission for residential development on the southern part of the site has not been implemented which potentially casts doubt over the deliverability of that scheme (although the landowner's submission does state the intention to proceed). The landowner's submission to the NP also suggests that development coming forward would be dependent upon the relocation of operational activities to other sites on the railway. This suggests that there is uncertainty over the deliverability of residential development across the whole site.	The most fundamental deliverability issue is access. This would require the purchase of part (the conservatory/side extension) or possibly all of a property adjacent to the current narrow access point and there is no demonstration by the promoter that the property owner is willing for this to happen. Power cables running through the site, coupled with the presence of the telecoms mast, would impact on the deliverability of a quality scheme.
Reasonable potential, subject to concerns over viability being satisfactorily addressed without the need to reduce levels of affordable housing on the site (in order to reduce costs). BAP priority woodland status is an issue that would be difficult to mitigate - this would need further assessment to understand the value of this woodland to biodiversity.	Limited potential. If more detailed landscape assessment could show no impacts and deliverability of scheme could be confirmed by owners, then it may have some potential. But ability to address wider needs is limited. BAP priority woodland status is an issue that would be difficult to mitigate - this would need further assessment to understand the value of this woodland to biodiversity.	Limited potential. The issues relating to access and the impact on views are fundamental. Whilst the access issue could be solved (but it would need to be demonstrated now that the property required to create the access could be bought), the landscape issue is unlikely to be capable of mitigation.

WHCS05 - Land north of Top Road	WHCS06 - Land adjacent to Cookhams	WHCS07 - Work House Platt and WHCS10 - Land adjacent Langridge Farmhouse
1.2ha of developable land (1.2ha total size). Based on a reasonable density in a rural village, this might deliver 24 dwellings. So could provide 7 affordable units (either under adopted or emerging Local Plan policy). So has good potential to provide for a range of local housing needs. Site is within short walking distance of all services, but more than 1km from school. Walk would be reasonably flat so no problems for aged or infirmed. Access to Costcutter, pub and school would require crossing of busy Top Road. In the case of the pub and school, it would have to be crossed three times.	0.8ha of developable land (1.4ha total size). Based on a reasonable density in a rural village, this might deliver 16 dwellings. So could provide 5 affordable units (either under adopted or emerging Local Plan policy). So has some potential to provide for a range of local housing needs. If the whole 1.4ha of the site was used then this would be able to address a wider range of needs. Site is within short walking distance of all services, but more than 1km from school. Walk would be reasonably flat so no problems for aged or infirmed. Access to Costcutter would not require crossing of any busy roads. But access to pub and school would require crossing of busy Top Road twice (where pavement ends).	0.75ha of developable land (5.6ha total size). Based on a reasonable density in a location separate from a rural village, this might deliver 10 dwellings. So could provide 3 affordable units (either under adopted or emerging Local Plan policy). So has little potential to provide for the full range of local housing needs. Sites are within walking distance of the school and the nearest pub, but is outside of reasonable walking distance for the nearest bus stop (1.2km) and the Costcutter (1.5km). Walk back from Costcutter would be up steep hill (Top Road) which could be difficult for aged or infirmed. Access to Costcutter, pub and school would not require crossing of busy Top Road.
Flood zone 1	Flood zone 1	Flood zone 1
Site not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings. The site will not result in the loss of any existing units.	Site not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings. The site will not result in the loss of any existing units.	Sites not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings. The site will not result in the loss of any existing units.
Due to its size, the site could provide for community uses but this would be at the expenses of dwellings (including affordable dwellings) unless the community use was incorporated as part of the green open space that would be provided as part of the development. This could include a small community garden or children's play facilities.	Site not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings.	Sites not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings.
Greenfield	Greenfield. The site is slightly scrubby and does not provide community access, so does not represent a particularly attractive greenfield site.	Greenfield
The site is in the AONB. The site has limited impact on the open countryside, having ancient woodland to the north and east of the site. The site is adjacent to ancient woodland so there would need to be a buffer provided in order to ensure it would not impact upon it. There are no designations of value to the landscape. There are no PROWs that would be impacted by development.	The site is in the AONB. The northern part of the site is not in open countryside and would not intrude significantly on the landscape, provided that there is appropriate landscaping work done on the southern boundary. Any increase in the area of the site that is developed would have significant landscape impacts. There are no designations of value to the landscape. There are no PROWs that would be impacted by development.	The sites are in the AONB. The sites do not particularly encroach on open countryside as they are reasonably well screened. The sites would have a significant impact on the landscape, particularly WHCS10. WHCS07 is adjacent to ancient woodland so there would need to be a buffer provided in order to ensure it would not impact upon it. This would serve to significantly reduce the developable area. There are no PROWs that would be impacted by development.
No	Most of the site is BAP priority woodland.	No
No	No	Sites lie adjacent to the conservation area, and would have a negative impact upon it due to the existing rural character of the area.
240m to bus stop so very easy walking distance.	110m to bus stop so very easy walking distance.	1,170m to bus stop so outside of reasonable walking distance.
Scale of development would not impact on main road network (Top Road). Access along Top Road westbound in the morning peak (prevailing direction of traffic) would be difficult. There is no prospect of securing a roundabout on the junction of Top Road and Station Road with this level of development, so access would not be improved and there would not be the opportunity to reduce speeds on Top Road.	Scale of development would not impact on main road network (Top Road). Access from site westbound in the morning peak (prevailing direction of traffic) would be easy. There is no prospect of securing a roundabout on the junction of any access point, so access would not be improved and there would not be the opportunity to reduce speeds on Top Road. Possible issue relating to location of access and safety with vehicles travelling westbound on Top Road due to bend and brow of hill.	Scale of development would provide no opportunity to address wider traffic needs but development would not detrimentally impact on traffic flows either.
There will be no loss of jobs as a result of development. The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs.	There will be no loss of jobs as a result of development. The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs.	There will be no loss of jobs as a result of development. The sites do not offer the opportunity to create new jobs.
There will be no loss of tourist jobs or activities as a result of development. The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs or tourist activities.	There will be no loss of tourist jobs or activities as a result of development. The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs or tourist activities.	There will be no loss of tourist jobs or activities as a result of development. The sites do not offer the opportunity to create new jobs or tourist activities.
No. But the site does extend the settlement boundary of Sharpthorne quite considerably.	No	No. The sites are separate from the existing settlement boundary of West Hootby.
There are no particular issues for deliverability.	There are no particular issues for deliverability.	Access could potentially be a problem as it would most likely have to be via the track off Hook Lane which is very narrow. The cost of upgrading this, coupled with the cost of providing an appropriate buffer to the ancient woodland, could render any development unviable.
Very good potential.	Good potential, subject to confirmation of satisfactory access by WSCC Highways Department. BAP priority woodland status is an issue that would be difficult to mitigate - this would need further assessment to understand the value of this woodland to biodiversity.	Very low potential.

WHCS11 - Land adjacent 9 Bayhams Field	WHCS12 - West Hoathly Garage	WHCS13 - Land off Station Road
0.25ha of developable land (0.25ha total size). Based on a reasonable density in a rural village, this might deliver 5 dwellings. So could provide 2 affordable units - however, under existing Local Plan policy this would be as a commuted sum so may not be provided within the area. Therefore very limited potential to provide for any local housing needs. Site is within walking distance of all services and the school. Walk would be up steep slope from Bayhams Field which could be difficult for aged or infirmed. Access to Costcutter, pub and school would require crossing of busy Top Road.	1.2ha of developable land (2ha total size). Based on a reasonable density in a rural village, this might deliver 24 dwellings. So could provide 7 affordable units (either under adopted or emerging Local Plan policy). So has good potential to provide for a range of local housing needs. Site is within short walking distance of all services, apart from the Costcutter, which is 1.2km away. Walk would be reasonably flat so no problems for aged or infirmed. Access to all services would require crossing of busy Top Road and this is at an extremely dangerous point to cross. To access the Costcutter, this would require crossing Top Road three times.	0.51ha of developable land. Based on a reasonable density in a rural village, this might deliver 10 dwellings. So could provide 3 affordable units (either under adopted or emerging Local Plan policy). So limited potential to provide for a range of local housing needs. Site is within walking distance of all services, but more than 1km from school. Walk would be up steep hill (Station Road) which could be difficult for aged or infirmed. Access to Costcutter, pub and school would require crossing of busy Top Road.
Flood zone 1	Flood zone 1	Flood zone 1
Sites not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings. The site will not result in the loss of any existing units.	Site not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings. The site will result in the loss of an existing service.	Site not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings. The site will not result in the loss of any existing units.
Sites not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings.	Due to its size, the site could provide for community uses but this would be at the expenses of dwellings (including affordable dwellings) unless the community use was incorporated as part of the green open space that would be provided as part of the development. This could include a small community garden or children's play facilities.	Site not large enough to provide anything apart from dwellings.
Greenfield	Brownfield and largely within the existing settlement boundary.	Greenfield
The site is in the AONB. The site does not encroach on open countryside. The site could have a significant impact on the landscape, with views into the site from some distance away being possible. There are no designations of value to the landscape. There are no PROWs that would be impacted by development.	The site is in the AONB. The site does not encroach on open countryside as it is reasonably well screened. The site would not have a significant impact on the landscape. There are no designations of value to the landscape. There are no PROWs that would be impacted by development.	The site is in the AONB. The northern part of the site is thick woodland which serves to prevent any landscape impact. There are no designations of value to the landscape. The site does not impact on any PROW.
All of site is BAP priority woodland.	No	Part of the site is BAP priority woodland.
No	No	No
50m to bus stop so very easy walking distance although for westbound travel, crossing of Top Road could be difficult.	40m to bus stop so very easy walking distance but walk would be on roadside constrained by wall of The Chapel and houses. For westbound travel, crossing of Top Road could be very difficult because it is a dangerous point to cross	Less than 500m to bus stop, so easy walking distance. However, access would be up steep hill (Station Road) which could be difficult for aged or infirmed
Scale of development would provide no opportunity to address wider traffic needs but development would not detrimentally impact on traffic flows either.	Scale of development would provide no opportunity to address wider traffic needs but development would not detrimentally impact on traffic flows either.	Scale of development would not impact on main road network (Top Road). Access from Station Road westbound in the morning peak (prevailing direction of traffic) would be difficult. There is no prospect of securing a roundabout on the junction of Top Road and Station Road with this level of development, so access would not be improved and there would not be the opportunity to reduce speeds on Top Road.
There will be no loss of jobs as a result of development. The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs.	There would be a loss of jobs at the car garage and the closure of the garage would represent the loss of an important service to the community.	There will be no loss of jobs as a result of development. The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs.
There will be no loss of tourist jobs or activities as a result of development. The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs or tourist activities.	There will be no loss of tourist jobs or activities as a result of development. The sites do not offer the opportunity to create new jobs or tourist activities.	There will be no loss of tourist jobs or activities as a result of development. The site does not offer the opportunity to create new jobs or tourist activities.
Very slight erosion of the gap	No	No
There is a significant difference in ground levels across this site, from Top Road down to Bayhams Field. This would require significant engineering works to accommodate development and would have a major impact on deliverability.	The site has previously had the benefit of planning permission (now lapsed). There are no deliverability issues.	The site has no deliverability issues, although the key issue is the amenity of neighbouring properties which are on two sides. This would likely mean having to place the properties as far away from the existing properties as possible, which would result in the existing woodland being lost to development.
Very low potential. In addition to the deliverability issues, the site would overlook properties in Bayhams Field, negatively impacting on residential amenity. BAP priority woodland status is an issue that would be difficult to mitigate - this would need further assessment to understand the value of this woodland to biodiversity.	Neutral. Being within the settlement boundary, this site could come forward for redevelopment. However, the loss of a local service should not be encouraged by allocating the site in such a way that would encourage the loss of that service.	Neutral. The site is deliverable yet provides little in the way of wider benefits.

