



# Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire December 2014/Jan 2015

49 Completed questionnaires were received

1. Do you support the concept of a strategic gap?

Yes: 48

No: 1

## 2. Which features of the parish do you think worthy of preservation

Strategic Gap	Lack of overcrowding	Village Street
Pub	Shop	Cricket Ground
School	Village Hall	Trees in the built up areas
MUGA pitch	Children's play area	Conservation area
Mobile library	Memorial	Green spaces
Tennis Club	Scout Hut	Downs Link
Football Pitch	Bus services	

Historic and Interesting buildings

Village Centre with rural surrounds

Undeveloped Land South Side of Park Street

Central Fields bounded by Street Hayes Lane Downs Link and Spring Lane

Clapgate Lane and rural paths

Open Views Downs link to church

Grass areas at the junction of Hayes Lane and Streetfield Road

No extension to existing Settlement Boundary

### 3. Are you aware of any sites suitable for development?

**No: 27**

**No answer: 3**

**Others:**

OS ref 5670; 5062; 3163

Padora Builders Yard

Pub field

Behind the school

Land North of railway line

End of West Way

Land behind Cricket Pitch

A29 next to Park House

Lyons Farm

Spring Lane

Brown sites

In filling of Hayes Lane

Stane Street between village entrance and Five Oaks boundary

End of Park Road up to Spring Lane

Lower Lodge shooting grounds

4. If you work from home would you be interested in accessing a work unit?

No: 13

Not Applicable: 29

Maybe: 3

Yes: 2

Blank: 2

5. Are you aware of friends/relatives who would like to run a business from the parish

No: 48

Yes: 1

## 6. What constraints are they facing?

One comment:

Not interested in an industrial site, a converted large house which they could work within would be better less noisy and something with a rural feel.

7. Are you aware of any friends or relatives who would like to live in the parish?

No: 33

Yes: 15

Possibly: 1

## 8. What constraints are they facing?:

House prices

Lack of affordable housing

Potential 2<sup>nd</sup> runway at Gatwick is putting them off

Lack of affordable rented property

## 9. What Local amenities do you value?

Shop

Pub

Village Hall

Church

Rights of Way

Help Scheme

Scout Hut

School Bus Service

Slinfold Minibus

Post Office

Golf

Concert Band

Downs Link

Cricket Club

Parish Magazine

Tennis Club

Rural environment

# 10. What do you dislike or are missing?

## Missing

Evening buses  
Good Quality eating establishment  
Village Green needs to be bigger  
Parking along Hayes Lane facility  
School too small  
Shop too small  
Affordable Housing  
Junior Pitch for cricket  
More benches around the village  
Traffic calming along Lyons Road  
Repeat prescriptions delivered to Village Shop  
Community bus line scheme  
Cobblers needs re developing into better accommodation for elderly  
Safe exercise area for 10-16 years eg MUGA

## Dislike

Speeding  
Increase in Industrial Development  
Aircraft noise  
Cars parked in village centre  
Loss of trees

# 11.General Comments

Volume of traffic through village as surrounding roads get blocked traffic forced to use this route.

Need a roundabout at end of Lyons Road with Five Oaks Road.

See Slinfold Parish Design Statement which cannot be bettered.

Traffic calming along Lyons road needed.

No more houses

Village doesn't want to get any bigger.

Housing stock needed for elderly

Small developments only

Larger notice board for village shop

Strong support for Strategic Gap

Parking restrictions in village centre

Finance from Parish Council for village organisations

Get CIL for village improvements to school , sports facilities etc.

## 11. General Comments Continued

### The following continued comments were from one resident:

There should be a *presumption against* any development within or immediately adjoining / adjacent to the **Conservation Area**.

- i. Any such development would necessarily alter and spoil the Conservation Area.
- ii. Any development in proximity to the **Conservation Area** *must* take account of the 'Important views in and out of the Conservation Area' as shown on the Conservation Area map/plan.

Again, so as not to spoil the Conservation Area unduly.

- iii. There should be a *presumption against* any development within the **Central Fields** (see **Design Statement**).

b) The criteria specified above might be varied in the case of any development that were thought to bring some concomitant benefit to the village/parish that might not otherwise be readily achievable. For example:

- i. *Limited* development might be permitted adjacent to the **Conservation Area**, if it also brought additional car parking availability to the centre of the village.
- ii. *Limited* development might be permitted within the **Central Fields**, if it also brought public access to the **Central Fields** for general recreation and enjoyment. Further comments on this point are given in paragraph g) below.

## 11. General comments continued

c) Any housing development that would substantially increase traffic in **Hayes Lane**, should, as far as possible, contribute towards ameliorating

i. traffic obstructions along Hayes Lane, including parking and 'pinch points' (although it is accepted that, to some extent, these do help to slow traffic down);

ii. drainage problems in Hayes Lane;

iii. any resurfacing or similar repairs that may be necessary to accommodate increased traffic along Hayes Lane;

iv. danger to pedestrians where the pavement is unduly narrow or non-existent.

d) Consideration might also be given to creating an artificial pinch point (forcing alternate one-way traffic) in Hayes Lane at the junction with the Downs Link, in order to facilitate safer crossing by horse-riders and cyclists using the Downs Link. Although any housing development in the vicinity would increase any danger at that crossing, the continuing general increase in traffic may also make that desirable in time.

e) All housing developments *must* contribute (directly or indirectly) towards the requisite proportion of **affordable housing**. (It seems that HDC has a track record of siding with developers and releasing them from some of their obligations in this respect.)

## 11. General Comments continued

f) In my view, additional (housing) development should largely be encouraged **away from the current Built-up Area**, so as to help minimise additional traffic through the village, and help to maintain the current village 'atmosphere' as much as possible. With that in mind, I offer the following thoughts / suggestions as to where some housing development might be possible elsewhere within the parish (subject of course to land being/becoming available):

i. **Maydwell Avenue** – now that the solar farm proposals have been withdrawn. That location is within reasonable walking & cycling distant of the village centre, yet does not rely on vehicular access through the village centre. It is already semi-developed by the existing industrial estates.

ii. Any sites that might become available with **access off Lyons Road**, probably **primarily to the south** of Lyons Road. Development to the *north* of Lyons Road would tend to impinge on the Slinfold-BBH Strategic Gap. Development directly *along* Lyons Road (i.e. effectively abutting the road) should be discouraged as creating a 'ribbon development' leading into the village and also tending to impinge on the Strategic Gap. But development to the south of Lyons Road and accessed from tracks/lanes leading off Lyons Road would be less prominent with reasonable access to the village facilities.

## 11. General Comments continued

iii. Sites accessed from the triangle of roads surrounding the village (A29, A264 & A281).

iv. Is there any potential for development sites in the **Clemsfold area**, where there are currently a few light-industry sites?

g) Finally, I would like to suggest that *every effort* should be made to achieve some public access to and use of — and potentially some public ownership of — the **Central Fields**.

i. I note that sale of **Nibletts Yard** has now apparently been agreed (see <http://www.henryadams.co.uk/residential/sales/nibletts-yard-hayes-lane-slinfold-horshamwest-sussex-rh13-orr>). **Nibletts Yard** forms part of the **Nibletts Farm** site (SHLAA site **SA 064**, considered as 'Developable' (yellow)).

The **Nibletts Yard** site has the **potential to provide access to the Central Fields** either:

a. through part of the much larger **Land at West Way** site; or

b. through the land behind **Taylors**, the **Chapel**, **Chapel Cottage**, and **Little Hammers**,

all of which I understand to be owned by, and rented from, the current owner of

**Nibletts** (house) and (presumably) seller of **Nibletts Yard**.

If the prospective buyer of **Nibletts Yard** has plans to develop it for housing, I suggest that

consideration should be given to negotiating public access through that site to the Central Fields, as part of the necessary

Planning permission

## 11. General Comments Continued

- ii. If there were any connection between the prospective buyer of **Niblett's Yard** and the current owners or potential developers of the immediately adjoining (currently 'Non-developable' (red)) site **SA 061 : Land at West Way**, then such negotiations could include both sites.
  - iii. Significant development of the larger (**Land at West Way**) site —especially development across the *whole width* of the **Central Fields**) — would be unacceptable, I would suggest that permitting *some* development of that site would be 'a price worth paying' to achieve *public access to and use of (and ideally also ownership of) part of the Central Fields*.
  - iv. I'm aware that there have long been concerns that the **KGV Playing Field** is too 'tucked away', with past efforts to achieve access through Mitchell Gardens having failed through land ownership issues. The availability of an adjoining property or part thereof (e.g. No. 1 or 2 Lyons Road) would facilitate access — but is likely to happen only by chance or by 'encouragement' from a developer.
- Might someone with an interest in the **Central Fields** be interested in developing the current KGV site in exchange for both (i) being allowed to undertake *some* development within the **Central Fields** (which might otherwise be denied him completely) and (b) providing other land within the **Central Fields** to which the KGV covenant could be transferred.

## 11. General Comments Continued

This would have the overall benefit to the village of achieving some public use, enjoyment and ownership of the **Central Fields**.

v. Alternatively or additionally, perhaps thought could be given to negotiating some (possibly merely 'permissive') public use of the '**Pub field**' (accessed through their car park) with the landlords of the Red Lyon. Such use would probably increase their custom and profit.

Perhaps they could also be encouraged to hold more events (such as the Boxing Day Steam Rally) that make use of the field, potentially as a way of encouraging movement towards more public use of the field.



---

Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Questionnaire  
December 2014 / January 2015