

## Comments re NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

As a parent I like to think that my children would be able to live locally (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.

Site 16: Option 1 Tye Lane would become very congested. Issues around accessing A27 from Tye Lane - a severe accident hazard

Site 16 - Against Option 1. Option 2 or 3 could be possible but needs to be controlled

Subsequent thoughts about Hanbury development – smaller developments would integrate better into the village so stick with 25 and 25

NO to no 16

## AGAINST SITE 16

Why not build some houses north of A27 in the old ex sandpits area. Its in the “National Park’ but the land is STERILE! New builds in national parks DO happen

No to site 16. Far too big, too much traffic. Smaller plots are needed

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.

Totally disagree with ANY building of houses in this area NO NO NO

Greatest challenges for village

- How to prevent developers from overriding all attempts to control their activities
- How to keep traffic out of central village area
- Medical facilities will not cope

None of the residents in Fontwell Close want house built in the field opposite Fontwell Race Course. We will fight this all of the way.

Favour smaller housing developments, more affordable housing for young people. Cycle paths very good idea. Houses in keeping with village. Sites away from centre of village to reduce traffic

Site 19. Turnpike Motors – Ideal for sheltered housing

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.

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

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

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

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 object to Hanbury continuing to wreck the village

Site 13. Seems a good option as it will be controlled and not over developed. Considerate of local community – housing will be in keeping with locality, if developed by current owners.

## Comments re NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

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

Would support 50 houses spread over areas 12 & 11 on possible housing sites map. Development of Fon2 and NW of Wandleys Lane would be excessive considering that land to the E of Fontwell is to be developed – it would turn tis area into a complete new additional village/small town. Am deeply concerned re traffic levels that huge development will cause as well as stress on local services.

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

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

Area 15 is the best area to build on. Small village – keep it that way. All villages blending in.

I like it as it is – Please leave alone. Nice as it is now

Definitely **NO** to the Hanbury project.

If a small development of houses (4-6) was put behind the Brewery Complex it would not be ideal but it would be much more acceptable than 10-20 which would possible fit.

No large scale development in Fontwell

Prefer not to have one massive development but in-filling options

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

Nos 5, 6 & 8 would be good development sites

Conservation Area, Walberton, I am dismayed by the appearance of the pub which des 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 houses in the field opposite? How about access? Tye Lane & Yapton are not suitable for access traffic. Hanbury, Tupperts Field **NO!** Private developers should not have been invited to ‘sell’ at this meeting. Keep green fields.

Site 13. Great for chalet bungalows with small gardens – not enough in village. Very supportive

13 is a good site for several ‘shaly’ (chalet?) bungalows, would make a nice area for the retired

Community Playcentre will be a big improvement on childcare facilities

One large site would be out of character with Walberton. Site 16 in particular is large, on rising ground, visible and close to the Conservation Area, should be resisted strongly. Several smaller sites close to Fontwell with good A27 access

Not site 15 or 16! Smaller sites preferable

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

FLOODING Impact on The Green, Walberton

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

Community Bring the three villages together - But not with bricks

1. Small scale developments for starter homes or downsizing
2. No new big schemes till they sort out A27

## Comments re NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Ongoing flood risk. Volume of traffic. Speed through village street

Environment agency flood map is rubbish! As far as I know we have no tidal rivers in this area.

NO to Dandara development

There must be a good mix of houses and NO second homes

NO to site 16

House building is better in small sections rather than a great big estate. Proposals at site 13 sound good – in keeping with the village and the type of people who live here! Don't let Hanbury build a big estate!

We just need A Resigns and we will be put back Right ??

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

Disagree on 450 houses at Fontwell, traffic will be a problem, too many houses will be a strain on Hospitals, doctor's surgeries, schools and traffic. Regarding Walberton Houses, I would like to see small areas used instead of one large unit.

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

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

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 current traffic problems in The Street.

Less expensive housing on new developments. Rented (affordable) homes urgently needed.

Development At present 6 new at Holly Tree, 6 new at Turnpike Motors. Possibly 6-10 various houses in West Walberton Lane. Remainder opposite Fontwell race course.

Site 8. Access would be better if the class 'D' road on the Northern boundary rather than on to W.Walberton Lane!

I am much more pro an infilling approach rather than plonking an estate on farmland such as Hanbury's options. Of Hanbury options I think option 1 is the least disruptive as access for the building will be from the relatively quiet Tye lane. The danger with an estate even on part of the field (16) is that there is the likelihood of expansion and it could swallow Walberton, so that it loses its character and community feel. This is all open to question until A27 route is resolved.

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

Playground equipment for older children needed in Fontwell

A27 I prefer option A from Crossbush to the beginning of the dual carriageway

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 PC etc.

I came in today as I had been part of the village with my parents for 56 years. After my father passed away the farm went back to the Council and was sold in 2012. I would like to be kept informed of the plans for any local building. My email parkesmandc@gmail.com

On behalf of family

Stop building ugly little boxes – use some imagination

## Comments re NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Smaller developments have to be far better than large ones

Sites 9 & 10 NO Floods, access, drainage, NOT SUITABLE AT ALL !!

Site development all in one area is preferred with improved drainage, sewerage & affordable housing.  
[alan.joseph@virgin.net](mailto:alan.joseph@virgin.net)

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

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

The Street can't cope with more traffic, housing should be on smaller plots away from the center of the village.

Hanbury seemed to have sewn up Walberton.

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

I think if we continue to allow a quarter of a million people settle in this country every year we must say goodbye to England's green & pleasant countryside.

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

I agree totally with the solar farm. The by-pass is a bribe to make developers rich & overload the area.

Land Owners asked Green definite no. Orange no reply. Yellow see number of replies and plans on boards. ?

Yes to Turnpike Motors development

WHY is there no indication of plans for roads, access to A27 for new developments (from Tye Lane) – Surgeries? Shops?  
- No mention of the Parade Shops?

Improved bus service for Fontwell

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

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.

Walking round, it became clear that 50 houses is the bare minimum to be built. – How can the numbers be limited ?  
Dunhill Trust must not be allowed to build on this land, it must be kept as a designated open space

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

There is enough land in small pocket of Brown Field sites to easily accommodate 50 homes

We feel under siege from mass development (50 houses in Tuppens /field) – the proposed A27 Arundel by-pass Option B.  
What next ? Walberton – as we know it – could be destroyed in the very near future. Tuppens Field is a valuable green space. The proposal to build on it is an opportunistic big business venture – the character of Walberton would be lost forever. The village could not sustain a development on such a scale.

RE: Siting of 50 houses with access to Tye Lane: This lanes is overused at the moment as a cut through for traffic coming from or going to the A27 from a southerly direction – due in part to increased development of local sites to the south. The lane also serves an industrial site and although a weight restriction applies this is more often than not ignored by an increasing number of HGVs using the lane. It would be hazardous to users (the lane is often used by horse riders, dog walkers etc.) to have all the traffic from 50 houses turn onto the lane. Why do we need 50 houses all at once? ?

## Comments re NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Please keep Potwell House, 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 & Barnham Road area
2. Proposed housing are '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

22 years ago I could park my car briefly outside my house on Yapton Lane, Not anymore, too many big lorries

Hanbury. I support houses East because the traffic from the houses would not come up West Walberton Lane which is crowded with horses & bikes & traffic.

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

Not site 5&6 in Fontwell but smaller infill sites look the better option.

Development north of school looks a good way to serve the school and also alleviate issues in The Street.

No to site opposite race course

I object to Hanbury continuing to wreck the village

Site 13. Great site.

Community Issues: We need a Post Office – Save it !

We do not need the 3 villages to be closer together. We are fine as we are.

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

No to Choller Farm development because it will close gap between villages

Site 13 – mixed sizes but smaller rather than large – Cottage style & chalet bungalows

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.

Flooding issues important to us. Don't like that centre of village isn't conservation area – too disjointed.

Yellow sections 11 & 15 are huge – surely more than 50 houses would end up going up. Infrastructure/roads won't cope. 13 sounds sensible spot.

Strongly opposed to route B of A27 proposed route

Need speed calming measures thro village – dangerous

There is a prime infilling site behind the allotments (now derelict) in Homefield garages. I would think 4 dwellings could be build – even more if the ill-maintained garages were re-built to give further space.

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

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

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

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

## Comments re NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Site 8. Houses here would be very welcome and make sense

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

We would like to build 3 to 4 houses on land at Cherrytree Nursery which is next to a large care home

Surely the first question that villages should agree on is:

1. Infills or
2. New large development

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

Option 1/2/3 is too condensed. Any development should be more spread around the village.

Plot 13: Really good opportunity for the development of smaller low priced properties for first time buyers or older villagers to down size

Site 5 & 6 Broadly in favour. Seems sensible

Site 7 In favour of Option 1

Site 13 In favour

Site 19 In favour

Site 16 HUGE problem – scope for large future development plus Hanbury are toxic NO !!!

OVERALL I favour small in-fill developments plus North Fontwell development which are already on outskirts

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

Sites 1 & 2 Horrendous. I thought we had to provide 50 houses not 450

Tuppers Field (16) NOT acceptable. Wherever they build eventually they will want to cover the whole. Looking at all the smaller sites that would probably cover enough housing without building on Tuppers Field

I thought National Trust was for preservation of farm land not money making.

Possible sites we would support: 13. 6. 5. 7 (option 4) 19. 22 NOT in favour at all of Hanbury schemes (2 Walberton residents)

How will you create the services to accommodate an increase in population? This would put more pressure on the school, the health services and other amenities.

Hanbury Option 2 & 3 Traffic on Yapton Lane oneway in through Golf Club. Destroy open area!

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 villages joining the area in ‘Super Villages’

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

Holly Grove houses are a) Too high, b) Too big. Why does no one check plans? Should be low/small units.

Better use of local surgery outlet for local residents who cannot drive.

If Tuppers field is accepted there must be guarantees that the rest of the field will be farmed and not eventually built upon.

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

## Comments re NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

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

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

Please consider horse riders !

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

Would like to see road infrastructure and housing considered in tandem

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 alterane race circuit north of the A27

Would support small developments of 10-29 houses – do not support large developments on the edge of the village.

Site 5 Possible potential though it would cause quite a bit of traffic at the little mini roundabout. But looks like good infill.

Site 16 Don't trust Hanbury Developments after issues with land behind Pub. What's to stop them filling in all the land eventually? Too big a development for the heart of the village.

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. Use the cycle route to make a boundary

A plan was shown marked up with potential WSCC development land along Barnham Lane – as WSCC did not attend no information was available – it would be good to receive some.

Ensure proper consideration given to sewage issues in all developments

Concentration on small in-fill sites will protect against greedy developers expanding sites in later years.