

Henfield Neighbourhood Development Plan

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

The sustainability appraisal is seriously flawed as a number of significantly incorrect assessments have been made relating to site KI & K2 land north of Furners lane Henfield identified in the SHELAA as ref: SA005

As a result of these incorrect assessments the overall conclusions drawn as to the most suitable locations for housing sites are also therefore incorrect.

The first incorrect assessment is relating to Site K1 Land north of Furners lane.

SITE ASSESSMENT K1

Henfield parish council has chosen to split the site into two sites identified in the neighbourhood plan as site K1 & K2 without the authority of the landowner.

This site is all part of one site recognized in the “SHELAA ref: SA005”

The assessment of this site should therefore be consistent with the assessment carried out of site K2

SITE ASSESSMENT K2

Your assessment of **Objective 6 Infrastructure provision** you have scored – Greater negative impact on sustainability objective.

This assessment is incorrect as this site will provide green infrastructure and community facilities and should therefore be scored at least ?+ possible positive or slight positive impact on the sustainability objective, consistent with your assessment of site X Parsonage farm

Your assessment of **objective 7 Additional community infrastructure** you have scored / No impact or neutral impact on the sustainability objective.

This assessment is incorrect as this site will provide Additional community infrastructure and should therefore be scored at least ?+ possible positive or slight positive impact on the sustainability objective, consistent with your assessment of site C Wantley hill and site X Parsonage farm.

Your assessment of **objective 8 Character & heritage** you have scored ?- possible negative or slight negative impact on the sustainability objective yet your assessment of the neighbouring Site C WSCC land east of Wantley Hill you have scored / No impact or neutral impact on the sustainability objective.

This assessment should be scored / No impact or neutral impact consistent with your assessment of the neighbouring site C

Your assessment of Site **objective 10 Environmental quality** you have scored – Greater negative impact on the sustainability objective yet your assessment of Site C you scored ?- possible negative or slight negative impact on the sustainability objective and your assessment of site Xa you scored ?+ possible positive or slight positive impact on the sustainability objective.

This assessment should be scored at least ?- or ?+ consistent with your assessments of site C and site Xa

Your assessment of **Objective 12 Protect biodiversity & Green infrastructure** you have scored as – Greater negative impact on the sustainability objective.

Yet our assessment of site Xa Parsonage farm you have assessed as ?+ possible positive or slight positive impact on the sustainability objective, which is totally inconsistent with the findings of the landscape capacity study, that clearly identifies area 69 of which Site Xa Parsonage farm falls into as having no low capacity for development. The assessment also ignores the fact a new access will be required which will have a negative effect on green infrastructure

This assessment should be scored at least ?+ possible positive or slight positive impact on the sustainability objective consistent with your assessments of site Xa

Site options - Housing

SUMMARY CONCLUSION

Your summary conclusion is incorrect and inconsistent:

Your assessment of Objectives 6,7,8, 10 & 12 respectively, relating to Site K2 is incorrect and inconsistent against the same assessments made for Site C, Site X & Site Xa

As a result this has informed your incorrect assessment that site option 4 would result in a number of negative impacts on the objectives and as a result is not considered appropriate to be included within the plan moving forward

Had you made the correct and consistent assessment of site K2 regarding objectives 6,7,8, 10 & 12 as outlined below “Option 4 housing locations would have scored highest of all 6 options

Site K 2

Objective 6 assessed as – Should have been assessed as ?+ At least same as site X & Site Xa

Objective 7 assessed as / no impact should have been assessed as ?+ at least the same as site C & Site Xa

Objective 8 assessed as ?- should have been assessed as / no impact at least same as site C

Objective 10 assessed as - Should have been assessed as ?+ At least same as site C & site Xa

Objective 12 assessed as – Should have been assessed as ?+ At least same as Site Xa

NOTES:

As a result of so many inconsistencies and incorrect assessments as outlined earlier it is impossible to arrive at a fair and accurate assessment of the most suitable location/s for housing