

Consultation on Future Development – Comments Received

The Comments Box by the Housing boards contained 47 comments slips (some of which covered multiple sites). The results are summarised below under the relevant site number (where given).

Please note, some residents used the reference number shown on the Parish Council's potential development sites map, whilst others used SHLAA map plot references.

Each comment slip has been numbered for ease of reference. The number in brackets at the end of each comment refers to the relevant comment slip.

Site 1

- Rural area – not considered as first option. (4)
- Preferred site (alongside others - see comment against site 6) (26)
- Preferred site (alongside others – see comment against site 6) (27)
- Support low grade infill (28)

Site 2

- This is a unique green field site. It has never before been considered for development and adds greatly to the rural landscape. Surely this is worth preserving? (1)
- There would be real drainage issues here – water already pours off these fields. Definitely against this site.(2)
- Prime agricultural land. Do not consider acceptable – not in keeping with rural aspect of village.(4)
- Reject proper greenfield development lack of short term need. Impact. Better sites available.(28)
- These [along with site 10] are greenfield (or garden sites no 10). Development should be resisted. (37)

Site 3

- 3 would destroy the village/rural views and increase traffic along the Downsview Drive 'rat run'. (3)
- Poor agricultural land. Acceptable providing big buffer zone with footpath – prone to flooding!!(4)
- One of the only greenfield open spaces still used so should not be built on. (12)
- Possibly support. Expansion of existing development much more sustainable than no 2.(28)

Site 4

- Rural area – not considered as first option. (4)
- Preferred site (alongside others - see comment against site 6) (26)
- Preferred site (alongside others – see comment against site 6) (27)
- Support. Low grade infill – minimum impact. (28)

Site 5

- Small infill sites would be better to maintain the village feel and provide sufficient housing.(3)
- Small developments much more acceptable than huge building areas.(5)
- Rural area – not considered as first option. (4)
- Site 5 far too big. The need is for affordable housing with small clusters rather than large areas being built on. (6)
- This is the first I have known about this development on the B2112. I wish to be kept informed of the development. How do I do that? How can we object? I appreciate it is nimby – but I have to do something. I don't believe the infrastructure is in place to support such a large development.
- Too large a development site and would ruin the ambience and rural nature of the area.(8)
- Possibly support as long term development allocation. due to low quality land sensible expansion of village. Better traffic provide B2116.(28)

Site 6

- Good option for brown site development (4).
- Need to be building on brown field sites. Leave the green areas green.(9)
- Building on a brown site more appropriate.(10)
- This is a 'brownfield site' – is a blot on the landscape, and has been for many years. It is well worth developing this site. It is near to much better transport links and a 'B' road.(11)
- Springfield – clearly this should be a favourable site given its location, being a brownfield site thus fitting in with the local development strategy.(12)
- This seems the obvious site to develop that will cause least offence to existing residents. It would also be convenient for bus routes and existing services etc.(13)
- Preferred site. Would like to keep Wivelsfield 'Green' – hence prefer small sites. Brownfield sites should have priority. Must minimise traffic through village.(26)
- Smaller sites would be better to safeguard 'village' and prevent its character being completely changed. No 6 is a brownfield site so should be a priority so no loss of agricultural land. It would also not increase traffic into village too much. 9 and 11 would also be suitable (27).
- Support brownfield development. Probably {can't read word} 30 plot need.(28)

Site 7

- Possible? (4)
- This is too large a site but ideally placed for access, perhaps ¼ of this could be used.(14)
- The Ridge Way site already has the infrastructure, being near to H Heath. I would be in support of a few more houses here. It would be good to develop some smaller sites by infilling here and there.(15)
- Any development on this site will add hugely to the existing (and comparatively modern) Greenhill Way site and will – in effect – expand Haywards Heath into the green countryside surrounding the town which at present keeps Wivelsfield as a village. Wivelsfield will in

effect become part of Haywards Heath in an increasingly urban area and atmosphere. Our neighbourhood countryside is disappearing.(16)

- Support. Better infrastructure tie into new hospital development.(28)

Site 8

- Preferred site (alongside others - see comment against site 6) (26)
- Preferred site (alongside others – see comment against site 6) (27)
- Support. Low grade infill provided only linear.(28)

Site 9

- No thank you! Reasons against...
 - 1. Lane is already too busy and dangerous.
 - 2. No public transport runs through Slugwash Lane
 - 3. Ruin look of the lane
 - 4. Get rid of green belt between Haywards Heath and village.(17)
- (next to Rookhurst Cottages) I strongly oppose development on this site. It would be undesirable ribbon development that would erode the green belt separating Wivelsfield Green from Haywards Heath. It would also increase the traffic on what is already a dangerously busy lane. It would spoil the rural environment.(18)
- Preferred site (alongside others - see comment against site 6) (26)
- Preferred site (alongside others – see comment against site 6) (27)
- Support low grade infill as 8 (28)

Site 10

- Both acceptable small development (4)
- Over development of this site.(19)
- Why offer these sites as well as site 2. Building in the garden would create a crowded environment. (20)
- Site at back and side. Issue of access to site at back. Over development of Coldharbour Farm.(21)
- Entrance between Coldharbour Farm and Coldharbour Croft. Access – private property? Where would alternative entrance be?(22)
- Access onto roadway or private driveway would be an issue.(23)
- Support low grade infill (28)
- These [along with site 2] are greenfield (or garden sites no 10). Development should be resisted. (37)

Site 11

- Theobalds Road is an unadopted single track road – where would vehicular access be to this site? Theobalds Road entrance is almost on the brow of a hill on Valebridge Road and is already a very busy road with traffic to and from Haywards Heath. Any increase in volume of traffic could lead to accidents and exist from Theobalds would be almost impossible.(24)

- Theobalds Road is a single lane farm track with no capability to cope with increased numbers of cars. End of Theobalds Road has poor visibility with brow of hill and speed that cars come down Rocky Lane – into Valebridge Road. With H. Heath relief road being opened in July 2014 the traffic along Rocky Lane will only increase. (25)
- Preferred site (alongside others - see comment against site 6) (26)
- Preferred site (alongside others – see comment against site 6) (27)
- Support conversion of existing development (28).

03WV

- ? would make sense, if housing to be built, in SHLAA sites 15WV 03WV. (46)

05WV

- We were promised that the ‘special measures’ for ‘Shepherds Close’ would not commit it to further development.t (32)
- Outside the village planning boundary.(36)

07WV

- Could you please explain whether or not this site is up for development? It is not clear on the map. (39)

08WV

- Please advise on any developments to this site. (35)

09WV

- I believe this area of wilderness and woodland is one of the richest in the village – beautiful hidden treasures and streams. Please help us keep it.(29)
- These plots are suitable (along with 15WV and 14wv) (31)

14Wv

- These plots are suitable (along with 09WV and 15WV) (31)
- Could you please explain whether or not this site is up for development? It is not clear on the map. (39)

15WV

- Most space available. Housing along part nearest Green Road so view from school not obstructed. Development along Slugwash/Hundred Acre Lane not suitable because of roads. Centre of village developed enough. (30)
- These plots are suitable (along with 9WV and 14WV) (31)
- A carefully designed layout for a proportion of the field may be favourable to me – however I love the view from the memorial and the school. And I love using the hill on ‘snow days’. Are we able to design a layout to enhance the village enjoyment of this private land – while allowing a ‘modest’ development.(34)
- ? would make sense, if housing to be built, in SHLAA sites 15WV 03WV. (46)

19WV

- Please advise on any developments to this site. (35)

20WD

- Is a 'brownfield' site. Why is it not suitable? (33)

General comments received

- No more houses on west of parish. There has been enough building there already.(38)
- As much as I am against ANY building in the village, I understand the need for new housing and Wivelsfield's part in that. However, I feel any new development should be carefully planned with specific attention to avoid destruction of wildlife and natural habitat – woodland especially; if possible the type of building should avoid any big change to the village ie facilities for housing recovering drug addicts/criminals, & to avoid low cost housing. The housing style should mimic the rest of the village. I would also like to especially oppose any development off Hundred Acre Lane – There has already been a recent significant development here. Finally, I think the village should take as much opportunity out of the situation as possible by building in the same place if this means the community will receive a larger grant for improving its infrastructure/schools medical etc. (40)
- Concerns about what/how development will affect schooling locally, therefore development should benefit this. Any development should be in-keeping with other homes in the area ie no mass flats/cheap housing.(41)
- Better bus services needed to Lewes and Burgess Hill. Improved footpath/cyclepaths to Haywards Heath. (42)
- Village housing for people from surrounding villages. (43)
- Small plots preferred. (44)
- Would converting the 2 brick built barns at Green Park Farm to Residential Use ie 2 dwellings count as part of the required allocation of 30 for the Parish (45)
- Housing – would be good to develop Wivelsfield with more of a 'centre'. (46)
- I enjoy cycling but find Green Road and B2112 very intimidating on a bike. Cycling to Burgess Hill would be a lot safer if the footpath through from Eastern Road, behind village hall to Ditchling Common to St Georges was all-weather. Then you can cross B2112 and link up to cycle path at bottom of Janes Lane into Burgess Hill. (47)

Additional comments received at Village Day (12 July 2014)

Sites for Consideration:

Sites 1 to 4 – Slugwash Lane is too narrow for further development. Site 9: A very bad place for new houses – small road, rural part of the lane. Little room for many houses. Submitted site on Green Road next to Fanners – (i) A green field site and (ii) I live near with a drive on same side of the road and it is extremely dangerous/tricky to pull out of my drive – will only be worse with more driveways.