

**Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan
Consultation on Potential Housing Sites
January 2015**

Two consultation events were held at Downlands School on the 30th and 31st January 2015.

Attendees were given a short presentation about the purpose and the need for a neighbourhood plan and were given the opportunity to ask questions.

Each attendee was given a questionnaire (Appendix 1) listing the sites which had been identified as potential areas for future housing development. That list had been compiled from a number of sources, including:

- those suggested in previous consultation exercises;
- those included in the Mid Sussex and/or South Downs National Park Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment;
- those where previous planning applications have been made.

Following the presentation, attendees were invited to take a place at round-table sessions to discuss the pros and cons of each of the sites to assist them in completing the questionnaire.

Further information (appendix 2) was also provided in the form of maps of the sites, of the parish boundary, of the relevant part of the South Downs National Park and of known flooding events. In addition, an additional assessment of the sites, undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group, was provided for each table.

Many of the attendees completed the questionnaire during the evening, others took them away to return to the Parish Office at a later date.

The questionnaires, maps and site assessments were also made available on the Parish website, and could be returned by e-mail, by post or by hand.

Quantitative Analysis of Responses

The analysis has been based on the 429 responses received up to 17th February 2015.

In order to understand how responses varied between different parts of the parish, they were coded to eight different areas, 3 to the West of the railway and 5 to the East. Whilst it is possible to undertake the analysis separately for each of the areas, the sample sizes at this level are relatively small, and the analysis was confined to differentiating between West and East of the railway.

Of the 429 respondents, approx 150 live to the West of the railway, and 250 to the East of the railway (the remainder did not give addresses, or lived outside the parish). A number of respondents did not provide answers for all of the sites and some used the questionnaire to object to only one site (generally close to their home address).

Overall (across all sites) there were more responses AGAINST housing development on sites than there were FOR. And more support for small, brownfield sites than for large greenfield sites. The overall percentages were as follows:

No response	9%
FOR	34%
AGAINST	42%
NEUTRAL	15%

Analysis of the FOR Responses

The three sites with the strongest **support** were:

Site number	Site Location	Percentage FOR
3	Station Goods Yard	72%
11	Old telephone exchange	72%
10	National tyre centre	66%

The four sites with the least **support** were:

Site number	Site Location	Percentage FOR
18	Infants school	14%
8	Field opposite Thatched Inn	14%
2	Ham fields	19%
1	Fields opposite Stanford Ave	19%

The remaining sites had between 22% and 50% support

Not surprisingly, respondents were more in favour of sites that were more distant from their home, those on the West of the railway tend to be more in favour of sites on the East and vice versa. However, this does not affect the choice of the three sites with most support.

It does have some effect on the bottom four sites, as site 9 (Friars Oak Fields) has only 10% support from those West of the railway, but 35% support from those East of the railway. There was a strong turnout from the Shepherds Walk estate with 64 respondents, all recording AGAINST Friars Oak Fields. Similar results were found for site 8 from those living close to the Thatched Inn, and for sites 1 and 2 from those living to the West of the railway.

Analysis of the AGAINST responses

The analysis shows stronger reactions AGAINST sites - and roughly in the inverse order to the FOR analysis.

%FOR				%AGAINST			
Site	All	West of Railway	East of Railway	Site	All	West of Railway	East of Railway
3	72.0	74.8	71.2	18	74.6	66.0	79.7
11	71.9	76.9	69.3	8	74.5	58.3	85.2
10	66.5	72.4	63.6	2	67.3	84.9	55.5
14	50.0	53.1	48.7	1	66.7	78.4	58.3
17	49.4	46.3	52.7	5	63.3	45.0	75.2
13	47.3	55.0	42.1	9	61.6	85.1	47.6
4	42.3	54.6	33.8	16	59.5	74.0	50.2
20	40.9	46.5	38.7	15	52.5	67.3	44.7
12	35.8	50.3	26.7	6	51.1	34.4	62.3
15	34.6	22.2	39.4	19	43.6	37.7	45.9
7	34.4	45.6	27.6	4	42.8	30.9	52.8
19	32.1	32.2	33.3	12	42.2	25.5	53.0
6	30.9	43.0	23.7	7	41.4	24.5	52.6
16	26.6	14.9	34.8	20	36.7	31.3	39.2
9	24.7	10.4	34.9	13	36.5	27.5	43.4
5	22.4	35.8	14.6	14	26.2	20.4	28.3
1	19.4	12.4	25.0	17	26.0	31.3	21.0
2	18.5	7.2	26.9	10	21.7	15.8	25.5
8	14.2	22.9	9.1	3	15.8	11.6	18.9
18	13.5	16.3	12.1	11	7.7	4.8	10.1

Analysis of the Comments on Particular Sites

This analysis is based on the 436 questionnaires returned by the end of February 2015.

There were a total of 9270 individual comments on the potential sites, of which 2773 were FOR development and 6497 were AGAINST development. In this analysis, responses which had been written in the NEUTRAL box were coded as FOR or AGAINST, depending on the implication of the comment.

The individual comments were coded, using 35 separate codes that were identified during the analysis. The codes, and the numbers of respondents quoting them as reasons FOR or AGAINST development are shown in the following table.

The most often used reasons (FOR or AGAINST) were traffic, strategic gap, National Park and good site. The first three of these were usually, but not always, quoted as reasons AGAINST development on a site. The last one was something of a catch-all for support FOR a site, often supported by a statement about the type of housing (sustainable, low density, high density) or proximity to the village centre. Brownfield site, and within the existing village boundary were other main reasons given for supporting a site.

Impact on traffic was another reason given for supporting some sites, although there are some sites where traffic is given by some respondents as a reason FOR and by other respondents as a reason AGAINST. This reveals a difference in perception of the impact of development at those sites.

Code	Comment	For	Against
1	National Park	26	684
2	Strategic Gap	51	801
3	Boundary of built up area	135	181
4	Flood plain	25	705
5	Impact on views/countryside	119	780
6	Impact on traffic	172	939
7	Impact on Health Services	4	34
8	Impact on schools	9	261
9	impact on jobs/employment	13	146
10	Difficult road access	161	363
11	Distance from shops	104	70
12	Distance from station	50	24
13	Distance from schools	35	46
14	Distance from health centre	18	23
15	My land - not consulted	0	2
16	Tree Preservation Orders	0	42
17	Conservation area	4	61
18	Affordable housing	41	6
19	Need high density housing	58	20
20	Need low density housing	98	8
21	Housing quality	28	7
22	Sustainable housing	125	11
23	keep as open land	6	409
24	flats for older people	58	0
25	brownfield site	389	7
26	impact on pollution	9	404
27	use as station car park	17	23
28	use as new health centre	16	14
29	good site, balances development	823	51
30	impact on local services/amenities	29	290
31	new village centre - not housing	87	34
32	small site	40	37
33	conversion not demolition	3	1
34	develop as sports ground	5	12
35	Promote ribbon development	15	1
	total	2773	6497

Comments on Individual Sites

For each site we have undertaken a full analysis of the reasons given either FOR or AGAINST the site. In summary, we present the number of responses given FOR and AGAINST the site and the top three reasons given FOR or AGAINST. The codes refer to those shown in the preceding table.

In commenting on the degree of support or opposition for a site, we have used the percentage of comments on that site that were FOR or AGAINST. Our comments have been graded as follows:

Over 80% is referred to as **much more**

Between 65% and 79% is referred to as **more**

Between 50% and 64% is referred to as **slightly more**

Site 1: Land opposite Stanford Avenue

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	98		541	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	31	6	173
2 nd	6	10	26	123
3 rd	11	6	2	92

There is much more opposition than support for this site (85% of comments were AGAINST). For the people who supported this site, the most popular reasons were that it was a good site, with a limited impact on traffic, and within easy reach of the shops. For the people who were against the site, the main reasons given were the impact on traffic, air pollution and the strategic gap.

Site 2: Land at the Ham

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	86		545	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	27	6	150
2 nd	10	14	2	112
3 rd	6	12	26	110

There is much more opposition than support for this site (86% of comments were AGAINST). For the people who supported this site, the most popular reasons were that it was a good site, with a limited impact on traffic, without difficult road access. For the people who were against the site, the main reasons given were the impact on traffic, the strategic gap and air pollution.

Site 3: Station Goodsyard

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	345		148	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	25	124	10	38
2 nd	29	71	9	29
3 rd	22	29	27	22

There is more support than opposition for this site (70% of comments were FOR).

For the people who supported this site, the most popular reasons were that it was a brownfield site, it is a good site, suitable for sustainable housing.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons given were the impact on jobs/employment, the difficult road access and a preference for use of the site as a station car park.

Site 4: Land to N West of Clayton Mills

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	176		278	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	74	2	76
2 nd	10	22	5	34
3 rd	3	16	10	33

There is slightly more opposition than support for this site (61% of comments were AGAINST).

For the people who supported this site, the main reasons were it is a good site that balances development, the ease of road access and the fact that it is within the boundary of the built-up area.

For the people who were against this site, the main reasons were that it would close the strategic gap, would impact on views and the difficulty of road access.

Site 5: Land at Southdown Farm

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	80		453	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	22	1	172
2 nd	6	16	5	101
3 rd	11	9	23	35

There is much more opposition than support for this site (85% of comments were AGAINST).

For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were it is a good site that balances development, the good impact it would have on traffic and the proximity to the village centre.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it is in the National Park, the impact on views and the need to keep green open space.

Site 6: Land to West of Lodge Lane

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	109		347	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	32	1	136
2 nd	20	10	5	75
3 rd	32	8	6	30

There is more opposition than support for this site (76% of comments were AGAINST). For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were it is a good site that balances development, it could be developed with low density housing and it is a small site. For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it is in the National Park, the impact on views and on traffic.

Site 7: Pattendens

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	111		319	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	45	1	101
2 nd	5	10	4	67
3 rd	20	8	5	36

There is more opposition than support for this site (74% of comments were AGAINST). For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were it is a good site that balances development, the fact that it does not impact on views and it could be developed with low density housing. For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it is in the National Park, the fact that it floods and the impact on views.

Site 8: Land to East of Ockley Lane

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	53		524	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	14	1	130
2 nd	6	10	5	121
3 rd =	1	5	23	73
3 rd =	3	5		

There is much more opposition than support for this site (91% of comments were AGAINST). For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were it is a good site that balances development, the fact that it would have a positive impact on traffic, that it is in the National Park and is within the boundary of the built-up area. For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it is in the National Park, the impact on views and the need to retain the open green fields.

Site 9: Land to North of Shepherd's Walk

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	119		644	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	39	4	147
2 nd	10	16	2	130
3 rd	6	13	5	86

There is much more opposition than support for this site (84% of comments were AGAINST). For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were it is a good site that balances development, the fact that it would have good road access and have a positive impact on traffic.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it is prone to flooding, that it would close the strategic gap and the impact on views.

Site 10: National Tyre Centre

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	318		112	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	31	69	31	30
2 nd	25	67	6	27
3 rd	29	58	30	18

There is more support than opposition for this site (74% of comments were FOR).

For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were that it should be redeveloped as a village centre rather than housing, it is a brownfield site, and it is a good site that balances development.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it should be developed as a village centre rather than housing, the impact on traffic and the loss of local services.

Overall, there was a strong feeling that the site should be redeveloped as a village centre to include retail and some flats, but the housing quality would be important.

Site 11: Telephone Exchange

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	252		50	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	25	63	6	9
2 nd	29	54	32	9
3 rd	24	22	28	7

There is much more support than opposition for this site (83% of comments were FOR).

For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were that it is a brownfield site, it is a good site that balances development and that development should be flats for older people.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were the impact on traffic and the fact it is a small site; there was also some opinion that it should be used for an extension to the health centre.

Site 12: Land East of Lodge Lane

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	115		343	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	41	1	100
2 nd	3	17	4	60
3 rd	6	11	5	49

There is more opposition than support for this site (75% of comments were AGAINST). For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were that it is a good site that balances development, is within the boundary of the built-up area and would have limited impact on traffic.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it is in the National Park, is prone to flooding and the impact on views.

Site 13: Land North of Mackie Ave/Clayton Mills

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	157		246	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	78	2	42
2 nd	3	20	10	37
3 rd	20	9	5	36

There is slightly more opposition than support for this site (61% of comments were AGAINST).

For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were that it is a good site that balances development, is within the boundary of the built-up area and could be developed with low density housing.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it would close the strategic gap, the difficulty of road access and the impact on views.

Site 14: Hassocks Post Delivery Office

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	165		114	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	25	44	30	47
2 nd	29	31	9	28
3 rd	24	11	6	12

There is slightly more support than opposition for this site (59% of comments were FOR).

For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were that it is a brownfield site, is a good site that balances development, and could be developed as flats for older people.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it would impact on local services and jobs and the impact on traffic.

Site 15: Hassocks Golf Club

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	89		471	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	38	2	120
2 nd	6	14	6	68
3 rd	10	11	4	41

There is much more opposition than support for this site (84% of comments were AGAINST). For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were that it is a good site that balances development, would have limited impact on traffic and would have good road access.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it would close the strategic gap, would have an impact on traffic and is prone to flooding.

Site 16: Land North of Friar's Oak

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	74		441	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	26	2	115
2 nd	10	12	4	100
3 rd	6	9	6	60

There is much more opposition than support for this site (86% of comments were AGAINST). For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were that it is a good site that balances development, would have good road access and would have limited impact on traffic.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it would close the strategic gap, is prone to flooding and would have an impact on traffic.

Site 17: Russell's Nursery

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	137		182	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	36	6	60
2 nd	25	26	26	33
3 rd	5	17	10	21

There is slightly more opposition than support for this site (57% of comments were AGAINST).

For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were that it is a good site that balances development, is a brownfield site and would have limited impact on views.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were the impact on traffic, the impact on pollution and the difficulty of road access.

Site 18: Infants School

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	50		279	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	16	8	189
2 nd	25	6	6	23
3 rd =	6	4	5	13
3 rd =	8	4		

There is much more opposition than support for this site (85% of comments were AGAINST). For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were that it is a good site that balances development, is a brownfield site and would have limited impact on traffic. There were views expressed that the infants school would be better moved to adjoin Windmills and Downlands schools in Dale Avenue, which would leave the present site open for development.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were the loss of the infants school in the centre of the village, the impact on traffic and the impact on a heritage property.

Site 19: Tate's Garden Centre

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	120		263	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	35	9	59
2 nd	25	32	30	48
3 rd	6	11	5	34

There is more opposition than support for this site (69% of comments were AGAINST).

For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were that it is a good site that balances development, is a brownfield site and would have limited impact on traffic.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were the loss of employment and of local services and the impact on views.

Site 20: Undeveloped Land South of Clayton Mills

	FOR		AGAINST	
Total	111		196	
	Code	No of responses	Code	No of responses
1 st	29	55	4	75
2 nd	3	14	23	43
3 rd	22	10	5	12

There is slightly more opposition than support for this site (64% of comments were AGAINST).

For the people who supported the site, the main reasons were that it is a good site that balances development, is within the boundary of the built-up area and could be developed as sustainable housing.

For the people who were against the site, the main reasons were that it is prone to flooding, should be kept as open green fields and the impact on views.

Conclusions

The quantitative and qualitative analysis tell a similar story in terms of the proportionate support or opposition for sites. Proportionately, there is a **strong adverse** reaction to the development of the following six sites:

- 18 Infants School (329 comments, 85% AGAINST)
- 8 Land East of Ockley Lane (577 comments, 91% AGAINST)
- 2 Land at the Ham (631 comments, 86% AGAINST)
- 1 Land opposite Stanford Avenue (639 comments, 85% AGAINST)
- 5 Land at Southdown Farm (533 comments, 85% AGAINST)
- 9 Land to North of Shepherd's Walk (763 comments, 84% AGAINST)

There are two sites that have a **strong adverse** reaction in the qualitative analysis, but appeared to have a more **mixed** reaction in the quantitative analysis. Those sites are:

- 16 Land North of Friar's Oak (515 comments, 86% AGAINST)
- 15 Hassocks Golf Club (560 comments, 84% AGAINST)

The primary reason for the difference between the quantitative and qualitative analysis for these two sites is that many people were neutral to the option of development on the sites, but nevertheless reported comments against the development.

There is a **clear adverse** reaction to the following four sites:

- 6 Land to West of Lodge Lane (456 comments, 76% AGAINST)
- 7 Pattendens (430 comments, 74% AGAINST)
- 12 Land to East of Lodge Lane (458 comments, 75% AGAINST)
- 19 Tate's Garden Centre (383 comments, 69% AGAINST)

There is a **slight adverse** reaction to the following four sites:

- 4 Land to North West of Clayton Mills (454 comments, 61% AGAINST)
- 13 Land North of Mackie Ave/Clayton Mills (403 comments, 61% AGAINST)
- 17 Russell's Nursery (319 comments, 57% AGAINST)
- 20 Undeveloped Land South of Clayton Mills (307 comments, 64% AGAINST)

There is **support** for the following four sites:

- 3 Station Goods Yard (493 comments, 70% FOR)
- 10 National Tyre Centre (430 comments, 74% FOR)
- 11 Telephone Exchange (302 comments, 83% FOR)
- 14 Hassocks Post Delivery Office (279 comments, 59% FOR)