

NP DROP-IN DAY - GENERAL BUILDING COMMENTS

Plot density should be kept reasonable – this is a rural area – house should not be crammed together

Find some small unobtrusive 2-3 house plots around village and use them to make up 50 house allocation.

Whereas some of the developments put forward are reasonable in themselves – I am concerned that the future agenda will be to continue infill between the developments and the villages joining the areas into ‘Super Villages’

Ensure that the development is a mixed one to include homes for single or elderly people and well placed affordable homes within small infill developments

Favour smaller housing developments more affordable housing for young people. Houses in keeping with village sites away from centre of village to reduce traffic

I wish to express my dismay that property developers were allowed to ‘sell’ their proposals at your Exhibition. It does not permit residents to have OBJECTIVE UNINFLUENCED views on the NP

Small scale developments for starter homes or downsizing.

No new big schemes till they sort out A27.

Only small developments desired – no new roads.
Where have all the hedgehogs & frogs gone?

Design considerations should be paramount – we want good quality houses that don’t all look the same

Overall I favour small in-fill developments plus North Fontwell developments which are already on outskirts.

Would like to see road infrastructure and housing considered in tandem.

Nice to have discreet developments and some sheltered housing for the elderly

Small developments throughout village – not one development

Walberton doesn’t need a large housing development like the Hanbury proposal. Smaller sites will be much better for the village community

We don’t want 50 houses in one place!

All good ideas of smaller plots. Goodbye Hanbury!

50 too many in one place

NP DROP-IN DAY - GENERAL BUILDING COMMENTS

Small in-fills of 2-3-4 houses are absolutely fine. Massive 50 house development will change character of village

Please remember to build houses affordable for local people on local salaries – don't build houses for Londoners downsizing or reaping the benefits of their house prices in London & Surrey.

Plots that have least effect on other people should be priority.

West Walberton Lane – love the idea of long term affordable small properties. There is a real problem finding small, easily affordable & manageable properties in the village.

Some maisonettes would be good for younger families and first time buyers.

I would favour such a development if it contributes to the 50 houses required by Walberton. Better to have a spread than single large concentration.

Smaller sites as opposed to one big development as more fitting in the village setting

I moved to this village as it is still a village, if Hanbury get to build it will be a small town. Use the infill

The village does not need more large executive houses but a mix of 3 & 4 bed family houses, plus smaller houses for older people who wish to downsize and remain in the village
Bungalows and some affordable must be considered

Is National Trust into property speculation now? There goes my membership

I see no proposal for flats. Many older residents are looking to downsize not to a house but maybe a 1 or 2 bed flat with access to village shops. Also flats are more affordable for first time buyers.

We need affordable housing which people can actually afford to buy

I think it's a brilliant idea to have one or 2 houses built on different private land on small plots. I'm against 50 houses to be built by Hanbury – would it really be 50?? I'm sure the number would be much more!

I like the infill/small developments options with maybe 'top ups' on brownfield sites

I would be in favour of development on Tye Lane. If land was provided for a school car park it would make the village a safer place

Small satellite developments are preferable to large 50+ developments

Small pockets of new housing must have less impact on taking the village feel away than building all 50 together.

NP DROP-IN DAY - GENERAL BUILDING COMMENTS

Developments contain many large properties, but how about affordable houses for both young and old

Smaller sites spread out over several areas. NO to 50 house in one place

We don't need 50 houses, we are a village, and don't want to become a new town

Make them affordable please for first time buyers

Reasonably happy with most proposals subject to traffic calming in West Walberton Lane. 50 houses would be absolute max, preferably less.

Council houses for rent are desirable. Not everybody wants to buy a house.

Keep new developments to small infill projects within existing village boundaries. Keep the green areas between villages.

NO to 50 houses in one field. Better to spread houses/developments around the surrounding area. Bungalows/ small family affordable houses are required & small developments can deliver these.

Bungalows are also needed.

Why build houses up against A27. Not a great place for anyone to live – air quality, etc.

I would like to see smaller developments out of the centre of the village, to ease traffic congestion – perhaps near A27

Most of the schemes are too BIG and not appropriate to rest of the village. Too many people, not enough resources, shops, schools and doctors etc.

The 50 should be spread out no more than 10 in one place

Spread the houses around Walberton. Hanbury development too concentrated. We need to take advantage of the new backfill site and spread the impact of traffic on our roads. NB. New Incinerator at Ford will attract massive movement of work trucks down Yapton Lane!

I would rather see a number of small developments than 50 houses in one field. But most important is that they are:

- Affordable - include special housing
- Built to high energy efficient standards
- not crowded together

Several smaller sites better option than all 50 in one place

Small quality developments are preferable

NP DROP-IN DAY - GENERAL BUILDING COMMENTS

Yes to smaller sites – NO to 50 in one place. More energy efficient & affordable. Work with local people on their local sites.

Maintain existing boundaries between Barnham, Eastergate & Walberton/Binsted/Fontwell

Why aren't there any sites offered in Binsted? Certainly more space there than in Fontwell

We all rely on our cars. Improvement to roads (surfaces of West Walberton Lane), pavements and cycle links which work/link up.

Don't fall into the hands of a developer who wants to build a big estate of expensive houses.

The village needs smaller houses for single people, retired people and professional couples. These people want gardens & garages but not large houses. We do not need more large family houses.

Please keep, Potwell Copse & Silverwings informed. As a whole unit we have approx. 17 acres with direct A27 access. Development here would provide village housing with no inconvenience to existing village fabric.

1. Yes flooding is still a problem around the Walberton Green junction & Barrats Row area
2. Proposed housing in sites 11, 12 & 15 although shown as 'low' would join Barnham (?) to Walberton so I am strongly against it!
3. Proposed Cycle route connecting Barnham to Walberton & on to Slindon would be great
4. Because of increasing cars/speed MORE footpaths along roads required

Prefer to have small pockets of houses as less intrusive

Beware Water & lack of infrastructure

1. Develop the land north of the A27 within the old Gravel Pits
2. Better for the village to have small scale developments than one huge new development

No to large developments, Yes to Brown field sites - Yes to affordable housing

There are sufficient options for smaller, separate developments throughout the village to satisfy the demand for 50 extra homes.

Only little pockets of houses, please in & around our beautiful village

We absolutely object to large developments. Should Hanbury Homes succeed, we would have to question the objectivity of Arun DC

All large sites anywhere in the Parish seem prone to flooding – so avoid these

I see villager pitted against villager – West Walberton Lane prefer Tupper's Field, Central Wallberton prefers very small developments – Where do we go next? Who has the loudest voice?

NP DROP-IN DAY - GENERAL BUILDING COMMENTS

There are a good number of small/brownfield sites that are viable for developments. No need for large developments

The sites considered or likely add up to 47 dwellings. This excludes 1 & 19 and options on site 3. I guess for a successful plan to be proposed at least 50 are required.

Like the community feel. If we put in lots of houses there is a danger that we could lose the unique sense of community.

Settlement Gap. Why does BW gap not extend further north and west, to promote a Walberton/Eastergate gap. This assumes Fontwell is part of Walberton P.C. etc

Small developments would be preferred, not large ugly properties. We don't want 'affordable' homes in Walberton. They should extend the towns not the tiny hamlet villages! Walberton is a GEM at the moment, please don't destroy it. Develop the area at Slindon, where they have the '4by4' altervan race circuit north of the A27

The centre of the village cannot cope with the traffic now, so smaller plots outside of the centre, not one large site.

Integrated houses better than one big development. Thank you for your hard work

Against large building sites as detrimental to village life. Spread the developments over smaller sites.

Smaller developments have to be far better than large ones

Site development all in one area is preferred with improved drainage, sewerage and affordable housing (alan.joseph@virgin.net)

There is enough land in small pockets of brown field sites to easily accommodate 50 homes

We have to move on. Walberton needs more starter homes and provision for the elderly – Not 4 bedroom executive houses

Totally against large building developments, smaller affordable housing please on smaller sites.

Building should only be on brownfield sites not green field. Should be possible as you only need to find sites for 50 houses.

I support the Holders proposals for small houses on land near West Walberton Lane. Any new development should have main access to A27 via one of the existing roads (Tye Lane, W.Walb Lane) so as not to exacerbate the current traffic problems in The Street

Eastergate Lane. Land set aside for school – why not considered?

NP DROP-IN DAY - GENERAL BUILDING COMMENTS

Access to A27 – Fontwell roundabout – local traffic meeting through traffic – speed & safety issue
Less expensive housing on new development. Rented (affordable) homes urgently needed.

NO! to one site for all houses. NO! to Hanbury. We will fight it with everything!!

Would support small developments of 10-20 houses – do not support large developments on the edge of the village

Why the need to build? We chose to live in a rural community not an urban sprawl. DO NOT agree with houses.

Sheltered housing needed for elderly who can no longer live in their homes but do not want to leave Village & friends.

Don't tell us that a barren patch can't be used due to an arbitrary boundary drawn 2 years ago. Use the old gravel pits.

Use the 50+ houses and the cycle route as a way to control what can be built after the 15 year period by spreading/blocking

Please do not destroy large swath of country side & wild life habitats East of Fontwell Avenue Fontwell

All 50 new houses should be for first time buyers . The village needs young people

Smaller developments will affect the area much less than one big one

Totally disagree with any building of houses in this area – no no no

As a parent, I like to think that my children would be able to live local (if they chose to do so). Spare a thought for future generations who will not be able to afford to live here unless affordable housing is made available.

Prefer not to have one massive development but infilling option

Small scale developments have been very successful over the past years. Large estates without facilities will overload schools, doctors etc. which are already full

If 50 houses have to be built across Fontwell, Walberton & Binsted could the load not be divided into 16, 16 & 18 houses in each village? They may integrate more this way?

Smaller building sites spread around the village. Totally opposed to large sites. Affordable housing as I personally cannot live in the village I grew up in.

If you add 50 houses to the village this will ..?... an increase in traffic on The Street. This road is already an accident waiting to happen in Walberton

NP DROP-IN DAY - GENERAL BUILDING COMMENTS

Why not have a form of small units/sheltered housing at the small sites (garage/Bookers Yard) for our single elderly

Why not build some houses north of A27 in the old ex sandpits area. It's in the "National Park" but the land is STERILE! New builds in national parks do happen

? This ? is an in-fill plot so once developed can't expand into a big development

Developers should NOT be present selling their sites. The Parish Council should assess site against planning criteria and put forward only sites that meet the criteria

In general terms you have more than enough sites for 50 houses. So keep the green spaces. Develop brown field sites only – e.g. Turnpike Motors or various infill sites e.g. NT land & Barnfield House, Fontwell

I think it would be far better to have smaller sites than 1 or 2 larger ones.

There must be a good mix of housing and no second homes.

We like it as it is – please leave alone. Nice as it is now.

No large urban sprawl. West Sussex has had enough! Small & brownfield development only to use our quota!

No development of more than ten ANYWHERE and ½ of those to be for "social housing"? (so-called)

We live on Arundel Road & the volume & speed of traffic up W.Walberton Lane already makes it unsafe for my children to walk/cycle down. Road is too narrow and full of potholes. The size of proposed development of site 2 is completely out of proportion to existing village & its amenities

Why hasn't the Parish Council established what residents want in terms of type of housing by carrying out community surveys.

Still no plots at Binsted ? !

Leave West Walberton Lane alone! If new houses are built it could change the 'feel' of the road and decrease the value of beautiful properties which add pride to the villages.

No large developments and new sites which would encourage further adjacent development. Need to consider fair distribution for impact on roads & Sewage.

There has always been some 'development' in Walberton. In Victorian times a speculative builder helped make Walberton what it is today – his name was Booker! If the 'older' population of W'ton say NO to all development, the village will die.

NP DROP-IN DAY - GENERAL BUILDING COMMENTS

We are proud of our lovely villages roads/streets. Please no more traffic which of course will be inevitable if more houses are built!

May I suggest for housing – a complex suitable for older people wishing to downsize – i.e. 2 bed flat with small square to sit in or balcony

50 houses across three villages : not 50 houses in Walberton ? !

What about social housing for people who cannot afford £500,000 houses?

I do think it is a shame that the PC did not take the opportunity to interview or speak to Mandy & Helen of Walberton Pre-School before the (cpalw)? Building was supported by them. You missed the opportunity to get a balance opinion.

Conservation Area Walberton. I am dismayed by the appearance of the pub which does not fit in with the conservation area. The conservation area needs measures to protect the appearance of The Street.

How will you ensure properties in Avisford Park Road would not flood if you built 50 new homes in the field opposite? What about access? Tye & Yapton Lane are not suitable for excess traffic

I am very annoyed that 2 development companies have been invited to ‘sell’ their companies to the village. How are we supposed to make an objective decision when faced with biased money making presentations?

Affordable housing on small sites to keep the small village feel/community

Development companies could fill in slips promoting their sites thus biasing results. Should have registered people and issued them with designed comment forms

I object to Hanbury continuing to wreck the village

What about some sheltered housing in the village for the existing elderly to move into. They should not be forgotten!

Smaller building plots spread around the whole of the village should be used and not big developments in one area. Smaller affordable housing instead of bigger houses as I grew up in the village and would love to come back.

Please consider the ex-industrial gravel pit N of the A27. It could also revitalize Slindon – kept in aspic too long – One large development within Walberton has serious traffic related problems.

From here it looks like you are dumping the 500 + 50 in Fontwell !!! What a disaster

It seems that Walberton PC/NP might well decide to sacrifice Fontwell – its ‘poor relation’ to development. Not Happy!

NP DROP-IN DAY - GENERAL BUILDING COMMENTS

Facilities Good on the whole but not enough public transport & most modest houses have been allowed to become far too large – for money making – i.e. nothing for 1 person households which are the greatest growing sector both elderly and unwed.

Heavy Goods the amount of HGVs through Walberton is unbelievable. This must be looked at and changed, the roads & buildings surely can't withstand it

On reflection we need new houses as there is a shortage. Hanbury's ideas seem sensible but concerns re further over development. But look at the pub & Community Centre – How great now Walberton

Small groups that do not take away the 'village feel'. Many of us have paid a lot financially and in life style to live a village type life – we do not want to be part of an urban sprawl.

Hanbury take people away from local shops and have no character compared to small site developments.

Looking at all the smaller sites, that would probably cover enough housing without building on Tappers Field

What about Poplars, Yaption Lane – Derelict glasshouse nursery

Small developments preferable and using small local shops. This will help communities grow

I prefer the 'infill' options over the proposals for 50 in one place. But the village needs to remain viable & not fall into being a commuter/retirement village. The local businesses need it & the community needs it.

NP DROP-IN DAY - GENERAL BUILDING COMMENTS

TOTAL 299 notes transcribed.