## Appendix D

## Assessment outcomes for 'Rejected' sites

Please note the document is structured in <u>alphabetical order by settlement</u>.

Sites assessed for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation are set out in a separate table at the end of this document.

Cita Daf	۸ ما ما سم د د	Cattlemant	Duord	Duay! Dagger for	Landagana Assass	Cuitabilitu Agaggarant	Suitabla	Availability	Available	A shi su shilite :	Achievable
Site Ker	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Sultable	l	Available	Achievability	Acilievable
WI045	Land at	Abbots	Recc'	rejection Potential adverse	The site has a moderate	The site is in a mineral	No	Assessment The site was	Linknown	Assessment There is no reason to	Yes
	Abbots	Worthy	Rejected	impact on the	landscape sensitivity as it	consultation area and includes	INO	considered	Olikilowii	indicate why	163
		VVOICITY		·	· '					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	Worthy				includes a large dwellinghouse	deciduous woodland priority		available in the		development on the	
	House			character and	, ,	habitat and trees which are		2016 SHLAA		site is not achievable.	
				setting of the	distant views from Long Walk are	l:		but has not			
				I '	noted). The site is adjacent to the			been			
				_	River Itchen SAC & SSSI, and	outside a defined settlement		submitted for			
				1 ' '		boundary and is located		consideration			
				scale to the existing	heritage sensitivity. The Abbots	between the A33, B3047 and		to 2022 Call for			
				settlement.	Worthy Conservation Area (CA)	M3 which are all noise sources.		Sites or since.			
					Technical Assessment explains	Given the above and the					
					that the House and grounds	findings of the landscape					
					contribute to the overall setting	assessment, development					
					of the CA due to the quality of its	beyond the footprint of the					
					design, materials, and overall	existing dwellinghouse would be					
					form. The listed flint and brick	disproportionate in scale to –					
					wall along its north and east	and be out of keeping with – the					
					boundaries also provide a	existing village size, pattern and					
					"striking" feature in the	built form. Any development					
					I -	would need to be small-scale					
					the setting of adjacent listed	and restricted to the					
					buildings.	reconfiguration and/or					
						alteration of the existing					
						dwellinghouse. This could be					
						considered under existing					
						planning policies.					
ı						planning policies.					

	1			T				1	T	ı	1
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI048		Abbots	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site has a high landscape		No	The site was	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Worthy Park	Worthy		impact on the	sensitivity. The site is open to	area and the Abbots Worthy		considered		indicate why	
	Home Farm			appearance,	views from the B3047 and PRoW	Conservation Area (CA), and the		available in the		development on the	
	(South)			character and	network and is adjacent to	setting of numerous listed		2016 SHLAA		site is not achievable.	
				setting of the	priority habitat and the River	buildings along Mill Lane. The		but has not			
				landscape and	Itchen SAC and SSSI (and its	northern area is part of a TPO		been			
				heritage assets.	associated flood zones). The site	Area, whilst all other trees are		submitted for			
					comprises an existing	protected given their location in		consideration			
					dwellinghouse, a single storey	the CA. The site includes some		to 2022 Call for			
					brick building, and an agricultural	elements of PDL. Contamination		Sites or since.			
					barn. The former two constitute	may be likely from historic land					
					PDL, and the latter two are	use. Small-scale development					
					dilapidated and vacant. The	may have the potential to					
					buildings are surrounded by	positively contribute to the					
					uncultivated pasture land which	character and appearance of the					
					contributes to the rural setting of	CA compared to the existing					
					the conservation area and	dilapidated structures.					
					adjacent listed buildings.	However, development of 5 net					
						dwellings or more would be					
						incongruous to the density,					
						form, and pattern of the existing					
						settlement and CA.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
						,		1		•	
	Land at West Street	Alfriston	Recc' Rejected	would have a detrimental impact on the settlement edge and pattern.	The land provides a transition function between the open arable landscape to the north and the village to the south. Loss of this function would be	screened, but there is potential for impact on the residential amenity of the properties to the south and wider views of the site from the north. The visibility from the existing access is relatively poor and any development on the site would be subject to improvements to access to the site. Due to the archaeological potential of the site, mitigation through planning condition may be		Assessment Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown	Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site could not be achieved. A safe access would need to be achieved on to West Street.	Yes
	Riding Stables, Park Place	Arundel	Rejected	site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. The site is High Sensitivity due to its location	its location within the Conservation area, in a prominent location beyond the existing settlement which would open views into development and significantly alter the setting of the town in views from the south and west. It is highly visible from Park Place due the topography of the site.	The site is not suitable due to location within the conservation area and is in close proximity to a number of listed buildings, topography of site and surrounding roads. The site is within 250m of a Historic Landfill Site.		The site is being actively promoted and is available for development, however it is noted that the stables are in operation.	Yes	Site can be developed provided access onto A294 is considered acceptable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection		Cartability Placesonicine		Assessment		Assessment	
AR004	Sawmill,	Arundel		The site is not	The site is high sensitivity due to	Development of the site would	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Arundel Park			considered suitable		lead to loss of employment		being actively		indicate why	
				due to the impact	parkscape. Whilst previously	land. The site is within a Grade		promoted and		development of the	
				on heritage. There	developed land – it is sensitive to	II* registered park. It is in close		is available for		site is not achievable.	
				are also other	housing development due to	proximity to a Scheduled		development.			
				concerns relating to	potential negative impacts on	Ancient Monument and					
				landscape impact of	surrounding parkscape character.	adjacent to Conservation Area					
				the wider site (not		and close to a Special Site of					
				just PDL part).		Scientific Interest (located to the					
				Development of the		east). Monarch's Way runs					
				site would lead to		within 12m of the site (located					
				loss of employment		to the east). The site is not					
				land.		suitable on heritage grounds					
						and the impact on heritage					
						assets.					
EA124	Land at Place	Binsted	Rejected	Potential adverse	Medium/High Sensitivity.		No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Farm, The			impact on the	Medium High Landscape	well related to the settlement.		being actively		indicate why	
	Street			character and	Sensitivity due to open and	The site is bounded by a mature		promoted and		development on the	
				appearance of the	exposed nature of the site and	hedgerow and sits higher than		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape and does	high visibility from local public	the road. The site is visible from		available.			
				not relate well to	right of way. Poor connection	the footpath network. The site is					
				the existing	with settlement.	somewhat remote from the					
				settlement pattern.		village core. Development of the					
						site would continue the line of					
						development along the Street.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land at Hoe	Bishops	Rejected	The site is not	The site has a moderate	The site is in the setting of four	Yes	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Road/Suetts	Waltham		considered to be	landscape sensitivity due to its	listed buildings and visible from		site was		indicate why	
	Lane			available for	relatively small-scale and its	the PRoW network to the east		considered		development on the	
				development.	relationship with existing built	and west. It forms part of the		available in the		site is not achievable.	
					development to the north and	eastern gateway to the town		2016 SHLAA		Suetts Lane is	
					west. The site is linked in	and is on the boundary of the		but has not		unlikely to provide	
					character and function to the	National Park. It could		been		required visibility	
					pasture / equestrian fields to the	accommodate a linear		submitted for		splays, so existing	
					south, and is in proximity to	development of approx. 5		consideration		access off Hoe Road	
					priority habitat, environmental	dwellings, subject to preserving		to 2022 Call for		may be preferable	
					and heritage designations to the	the setting of the nearby		Sites or since.		requiring the removal	
					south and south-east – the latter	heritage assets. Any				of and onsite delivery	
					includes a scheduled monument.	development would need to be				of compensatory	
					The site is also in the setting of	carefully and sympathetically				scrub and hedgerow.	
					four listed buildings on the	designed, drawing inspiration				Further highway	
					northern side of Hoe Road.	from the existing design, form,				investigations	
						massing, materials, pattern and				required.	
						set back distances of adjacent					
						and surrounding built					
						development.					

l				1				T		I	
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land off	Bishops	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site has a high landscape	The site is a substantial and	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Rareridge	Waltham		impact on the	sensitivity due to its large, open,	visually prominent site on the		being actively		indicate why	
	Lane			character and	and elevated nature. The site is	edge of an existing town. The		promoted and		development on the	
				appearance of the	adjacent to priority habitats,	site is in close proximity to a		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.	ancient woodland, and local	conservation area, has some		available.		However, the existing	
					environmental designations. It is	archaeological potential, and is				access off Butts Farm	
					considered that built residential	crossed at various points and				Lane is single track	
					development would be visually	locations by the PRoW and				with limited scope for	
					intrusive and create an	permissive path networks. Given				widening. This will	
					incongruous northern extension	the above and the findings of				influence	
					to the well-defined, nucleated,	the landscape assessment, the				development type	
					and medieval market town of	site is not considered to be				and capacity.	
					Bishops Waltham.	suitable for built residential					
						development.					
<i>i</i>											

	1	ı	<del>-</del>	T .				Г	T	T	1
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI040	Hoe Road	Bishops	Rejected	Not available or	The site is assessed as having a	' '	No	The landowner	No	· ·	Yes
	Sports	Waltham		suitable for	medium landscape sensitivity.	character due to existing		confirmed in		is accessed via a one-	
	Ground			development.	The site is adjacent to residential	community buildings, sports		November		way system (Hoe Road	
					development on its north and	pitches, recreation space, and		2022 that the		and Hamble Springs	
					west boundaries, and is enclosed	play equipment. If development		site is not		respectively). No scope to widen the existing	
					by mature hedgerows, and	was located in the north of the		available for		single-track entrance	
					surrounded by the PRoW	site, then this could help to		development		but the existing exit has	
					network, on both its east and	reduce potential landscape		and should		limited potential for	
					south boundaries. The site slopes	impacts and harm to the		only be		widening. The use of	
					down to the south and is near to	adjacent SSSI/LNR and PRoW		considered for		the one-way system	
					The Moors SSSI/LNR (to the	users. However,		recreation use.		would limit potential	
					south) and The Moors Meadow	notwithstanding the above, the				development capacity	
					Wildlife Trust Reserve (adjacent	site has a high community value.				and a new access is	
					to the east).	Development would not be				likely to lead to the loss	
					<u> </u>	suitable, nor appropriate, unless				of amenity, community,	
						alternative replacement				and play facilities and	
						community and open space				isolate the village hall.	
						provisions (of equal or better				Development could be achievable but using the	
						quality) are identified, provided,				existing access would	
						and secured.				limit development	
										capacity and uses.	
											1

Sito Pof	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Kei	Address	Settlement		rejection	Lanuscape Assessment	Juitability Assessment	l	Assessment	/	Assessment	
WI077	Land at	Bishops		Potential adverse	The site has a high landscape	The site is in a mineral	No		Yes	There is no reason to	Voc
			Rejecteu				l -		res		163
	Stakes Farm,	Waltham		impact on the	sensitivity. It comprises a large-	consultation area and has		being actively		indicate why	
	east of			character and	scale arable field at the	potential for some		promoted and		development on the	
	Winchester			appearance of the	westernmost point of Bishops	archaeological finds. The		is considered		site is not achievable.	
	Road			landscape and an	Waltham. The site is bound by	Southampton-to-London		available.			
				incongruous	B2177 Winchester Road, Ashton	Aviation Fuel Pipeline is					
				western extension	Lane, and the PRoW network.	currently being delivered in the					
				to the settlement.	The scale and location of	western area of the site, once					
					development would create an	completed this will reduce the					
					incongruous western extension	developable area. Given the					
					to the medieval and nucleated	above and the findings of the					
					town of Bishops Waltham.	landscape assessment, the site					
						is not considered to be suitable.					

	I	I	I	I	T	T	la 1. 1.1	I		l	I
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI078	Land north of	Bishops	Rejected	Not considered to	The site has an overall high		No	There is	Unknown		No
	Battery Hill	Waltham		be achievable and,	landscape sensitivity due to its	area and is bound by an Area TPO		currently no		off Battery Hill in the	
				if overcome,	scale, elevated position, and	on its south and west boundaries,		evidence that		south-east via a	
				potential impact on	apparent topography. The	and by the Claylands LNR on its east		the site is		single-track used by	
				the appearance and	landscape sensitivity reduces to	boundary. The site is adjacent to former historic landfill (east) and so		available or		farm vehicles. It	
				character of the	moderate in the south. The site is	further investigation would be		being actively		would be difficult to	
				landscape.	dissected by a PRoW and can be	required. Given the above and the		promoted for		widen this track to	
					seen in distanced views from the	findings of the landscape		development.		facilitate an	
						assessment, the site is not				appropriate access	
					site is good quality semi-	considered suitable for large-scale				given the mature	
					improved grassland priority	development. There could be				trees and adjacent	
					habitat and is adjacent to	opportunity for small-scale				residential	
					deciduous woodland priority	development (circa 20-25 dwellings)				development. The	
					habitat to the east in the form of	in the south and south-west area				potential for a new	
					the Claylands LNR/LWS. Whilst	(0.8ha). However, this is also not considered to be suitable given the				access in the south-	
					on plan the extent of the site	loss of priority habitat, and the				west is limited by	
					appears logical, the marked	potential impact on the appearance				existing residential	
					rise/undulation in the centre of	and character of the landscape				development and a	
					the site visually separates the	given the need to create a brand-				tree preservation	
					site. Only the south/south-west	new settlement edge, as well as the				order (TPO).	
					area (0.8ha) could be considered	engineering works required to					
					further subject to priority habitat	facilitate an appropriate access.					
					compensation and onsite						
					biodiversity net gain.						
					, ,						
1				1							

	1	Ia	I	I	I	- · · · · · · ·	6. 11.1.1			I	
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	l	Availability		Achievability	Achievable
	_	_	Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI079		Bishops	Rejected	· ·	The site has a low landscape		1	There is	Unknown	The existing access is	No
	Pondside	Waltham		rural character of	sensitivity. Despite its elevated	consultation area and is bound	1	currently no		via a single-track	
	Lane			bridleway and	position above the existing town,	by a vineyard [north], a metal		evidence that		bridleway known as	
				bridleway users and	the site is relatively flat, is	recycling centre (former quarry)		the site is		Pondside Lane.	
				the adjacent SuDS,	visually contained on three sides,	[east], twentieth century		available or		Development would	
				open space, and	and is somewhat domestic in	residential development		being actively		likely impact on the	
				vineyard uses.	character due to the existing use	[south], and Pondside Lane		promoted for		rural character of the	
					as allotments surrounded by	[west]. It is within a transitional		development.		bridleway, and it is	
					mown grass. There is a distinct	area, moving from the built-up				unclear how any	
					separation and lack of visual	character of the settlement to				intensified use or	
					unity with the surrounding	open countryside. There may be				widening of the	
					landscape. Development could	amenity issues associated with				bridleway for vehicles	
					provide an opportunity to	the adjacent recycling centre				would impact on	
					expand allotment provision,	which is on lower ground				bridleway users and	
					improve boundary treatments,	compared to the site. Works				the consented	
					improve the settlement edge,	required for vehicular access via				Sustainable Drainage	
					and achieve an appropriate	Pondside Lane (a bridleway)				System/s (SuDS) and	
					countryside transition.	would likely significantly impact				open space to the	
						on the appearance and				west.	
						character of the bridleway, and					
						it is unclear how development					
						(incl. access) would impact on					
						the consented SuDS and open					
						space adjacent to the west, and					
						the existing vineyard adjacent to					
						the north.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	•		Assessment		Assessment	
EA084	Land west of	Blackmoor	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site is assessed as having a	The site is in a mineral	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Church			impact on the	medium/high landscape	consultation area for soft and		site was		indicate why	
	Cottages			appearance and	sensitivity. The site comprises the	silica sand and is within 5km of		considered		development on the	
				character of the	residential garden land of a long	the Wealden Heath Phase II		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				landscape, and the	row of dwellinghouses, some of	SPA. The southern area is in a		2016 SHLAA		This is subject to	
				character, setting	which are non-designated	contamination land buffer due		but has not		demonstrating that	
				and significance of	heritage assets. The site is in the	to historic oil storage adjacent		been		the existing power	
				heritage assets.	Blackmoor Conservation Area	to the southern boundary. The		submitted for		cables along the	
					which has the character and	site is in a very sensitive area in		consideration		western edge would	
					appearance of a Victorian	terms of heritage and		to 2022 Call for		not affect or prevent	
					country estate village. The site is	landscape. Development on the		Sites or since.		potential	
					in proximity to a number of listed	site would be contrary to the				development.	
					buildings including, but not	existing appearance, built form,					
					limited to, the Grade II* listed	character, and pattern of the					
					Church of St Matthew. The site is	conservation area. Given the					
					also partly visible from the PRoW	above and the findings of the					
					to the west.	landscape assessment, the site					
						is not considered to be suitable.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Former Apple Packing Station, Blackmoor Estate	Blackmoor		The site is in active employment use.	developed land (PDL) comprising a former apple packing facility, offices, and storage, with some existing residential uses. The site is surrounded by deciduous woodland priority habitat, and the south of the site is within the Blackmoor Conservation Area which has the character and appearance of a Victorian	SPA. The site is in a very sensitive area in terms of heritage and landscape. Largescale re-development on the site could be contrary to the existing appearance, built form, character, and pattern of the conservation area. Even if the above could be addressed through a careful and		Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Annington Farm / St Mary's House	Bramber	1 '	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and the public enjoyment of the adjacent open space and cycle paths.	Highly sensitive landscape forming part of the floodplain alongside the River Adur.	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and the public enjoyment of the adjacent open space and cycle paths.		There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

			_								
Site Re	f Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
LE018	Land to south of Folders Lane,			Poorly related to nearest settlement with adverse impact on landscape that includes rural character and historic field systems	and trees (medieval and post- medieval with some later field systems). Ppockets of woodland (priority and ancient). Topography gently sloping with ridge adj. to Wellhouse Farm down to small	Tranquil site which feels part of the open countryside. Previously excluded on the basis that it is outside a settlement and is detached and unrelated to that settlement. Recent developments and permissions at Burgess Hill have come closer to the site but it would still be detached from the urban area.	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	Unknown	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jone Hei	71441 000			rejection		Journal of Albertaine		Assessment		Assessment	
EA006	Land at	Buriton		The site does not	High Sensitivity	The site is opposite the	No	Availability	Unknown	The land is raised	Yes
	Buriton	Barreon	ricjected	relate well to the	The site does not relate well to	conservation area and adjacent	110	unknown. The	Onknown	above North Lane,	
	House			existing settlement		to the Grade II listed buildings		2016 SHLAA		therefore a graded	
	riouse			pattern and	features or settlement pattern	located along North Lane. There		considered the		access would need to	
				•	<u> </u>	•		site to be		be achieved. There	
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	is a public right of way running					
				site would have a	, , ,	along the		available,		are no other reasons	
				potential adverse	runs	southern edge of the site. The		however the		to indicate why	
				impact on the	along the south side of the site.	site is elevated in relation to		site has not		development of the	
				character and		adjacent residential properties		been		site would not be	
				appearance of the		along North Lane and is in a		resubmitted to		achievable.	
				landscape		prominent location. The site		the 2022 Call			
						does not have		for Sites or			
						any shared boundaries with the		since.			
						settlement and is not well					
						related to it, and would extend					
						development south of North					
						Lane in an uncharacteristic way.					
						Therefore, the site is not					
						considered suitable for					
						development.					
		Bury	Rejected	•	Moderate landscape sensitivity.	The site is considered unlikely to	No	The site is	Yes	Uncertain subject to	No
	Adjacent				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	be able to accommodate five		being actively		further investigation	
	(north of)			notable loss of trees	seen from the A29. Access to	dwellings or more due to		promoted and		regarding access and	
	Hollow Croft			and impact on	parts of the site is via a public	impacts on trees and ecology.		is available for		loss of trees.	
	and Quince			ecology of the site.	footpath and this shows a dense	Topography and access is also a		development.			
	Cottage			Provision of a	area of overgrown trees and	limiting factor for the scale of					
				suitable and	shrubs. There are limited views of	development that could be					
				achievable access is	the site from public points, and it	accommodated.					
				uncertain.	cannot be viewed or accessed						
					from The Hollow. The site rises						
					away from the road, but The						
					Hollow is a sunken Lane.						
					However, several of the trees						
					appear to be fine examples and						
					those on the A29 provide a tree						
					dominant landscape impact						
					when using the road.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'		Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
$\vdash$				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH194	Land south of	Bury	Rejected	The site is not	High Landscape Sensitivity	The site is not considered	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	The access is	No
	The Squire &			considered suitable	It is a visible site as you enter	suitable due to the topography		site was		considered	
	Horse PH			due to the	Bury from the South. The	of the site, the impact on views		considered in		inadequate, the	
				topography of the	gradient of the site slopes steeply	and the rural setting of the		the Bury		existing access is at	
				site, the impact on	toward the centre of the site.	village and access issues.		Neighbourhoo		the foot of Bury Hill	
				views and the rural	Development of this site could			d Plan process		on the A29 at the	
				setting of the village	have an impact upon the rural			but has not		point which the road	
				and access issues.	feel of the Parish and			been		widens to three	
					development of the site could			submitted for		lanes. Access would	
					have an adverse impact on the			consideration		be very difficult	
					views from Bury Hill.			to the Land			
								Availability			
								Assessment.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Kei	Address	Jettiement	Recc'	rejection	Lanuscape Assessment	Juitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
CH195	Part of	Bury	_	Development would	High Landscape Sensitivity	The site lies within the curtilage	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	Access issue could	No
	Copyhold,			intrude into the	The proposal is for backland/infill	of Copyhold (Grade II), Church		site was		prevent the site	
	East of the			sensitive landscape	development. It would intrude	Lane and is entirely within the		considered in		being achievable as	
	Village Hall			to the east and be	into the sensitive landscape to	Conservation Area. There are		the Bury		there isn't a clear	
				visible from short	the east and from public rights of	limited access points to the site		Neighbourhoo		point of access. It is	
				and long ranging	way across The Glebe Field and	and these are not considered		d Plan process		assumed this will be	
				views, in particular	from the Coffin Trail. It would	adequate. Development could		but has not		via the access to the	
				from public rights of	have a detrimental impact on the	also impact upon a number of		been		village hall – this is	
				way. It would have	Conservation Area and the	trees, including a small orchard.		submitted for		not suitable or	
				a detrimental	heritage character of the area.			consideration		achievable.	
				impact on the	Development could result in the			to the Land			
				Conservation Area	felling of numerous mature trees			Availability			
				and the heritage	in the Conservation Area.			Assessment.			
				character of the							
				area. Development							
				could result in the							
				felling of numerous							
				mature trees in the							
				Conservation Area.							
.											
. [											

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH196	Land at	Bury			High Landscape Sensitivity	The site would be accessed from	No	Unknown. The	Unknown		No
	Houghton		•	from the existing	Public Right of Way runs across	an existing access point on		site was		flooding will impact	
	Lane			village of Bury and	the eastern boundary of the site.	Houghton Lane. Flood Zone 3		considered in		on achievability.	
				is subject to	It is detached from the	(small part in Zone 2). The site		the Bury		,	
				flooding. The site is	settlement of Bury and is	adjoins the Site of Nature		Neighbourhoo			
				not considered	surrounded on all sites by open	Conservation Importance that		d Plan process			
				appropriate for	countryside. It is visible at the	runs along the River Arun. It is		but has not			
				development. It is	entrance to the village. The	not considered suitable due to		been			
				located at the	landscape is of high sensitivity	the flood risk, the proximity to		submitted for			
				entrance to the	would have an adverse impact on	I		consideration			
				village in an area of	-	landscape and views into the		to the Land			
				high landscape	public rights of way that cross	site.		Availability			
				-	the land.			Assessment.			
				Development would							
				result in an							
				unsympathetic							
				development in the							
				rural landscape and							
				on a site that forms							
				part of the setting							
				of Bury. Parts of the							
				site are within a							
				SNCI.							
CH009	Charlton	Charlton	Rejected	Development on	Medium/High Landscape	The village of Charlton offers no	No	The site is	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Sawmill,				Sensitivity. The western side of	access to local services except a		being actively		indicate that	
	Knights Hill				the is currently open space and	pub, and there are significant		promoted for		development of the	
				and appearance of	provides good local views and is	landscape sensitivities		development		site would not be	
				the landscape in		associated with the site. The site		however the		achievable.	
					to the east contains the existing	is in active industrial use and		site is in active			
				landscape	sawmill and industrial units and	alternative locations needed for		industrial use.			
				<u> </u>	is medium sensitivity owing to its						
				Development on	elevated position on the valley						
				the site would not	side, its proximity to existing						
				provide adequate	important public right of way to						
				·	the east of the site and its						
				services. The site is	relationship with the						
				currently in active	conservation area to the north.						
				industrial use.							
					, D	7					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH011	Charlton	Charlton	Rejected	There is no	Medium/high landscape	The site is within the Charlton	No	Understood in	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	Farm, Carlton			evidence the site is	sensitivity due to the location of	Conservation Area. There is a		active		indicate the site is	
	Road			available.	the site within the conservation	Grade II listed building on the		employment		not achievable.	
				Redevelopment of	•	site and a number of listed		use. At time of			
				the site would have	on the main road through the	buildings in the vicinity.		2016 SHLAA,			
				a potential adverse	village. Significant cultural	Archaeological investigation		there had been			
				impact on the	heritage impacts would need	prior to development or during		a recent			
				character and	further advice.	construction may be required.		planning			
				appearance of the		The site is within a Site of		permission for			
				landscape and may		Special Scientific Interest (SSS)		employment			
				impact on heritage		Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) (requiring		uses (B8 with			
				assets.		additional advice from Natural		B1) suggesting			
						England). Existing employment		no intention to			
						uses would need alternative		provide			
						site. Unsuitable due to heritage		housing. It has			
						constraints.		not been			
								resubmitted to			
								the Local Plan			
								Review Call for			
								Sites and there			
								is no evidence			
								that the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	-		Assessment		Assessment	
EA008	Land	Chawton		Potential adverse	The site was is assessed as having	The site is in a prominent	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	adjoining			impact on the	a high landscape sensitivity due	position along Winchester Road.		site was		indicate why	
	Winchester			character and	to: its location at the entrance of	The site is visible in glimpsed		considered		development on the	
	Road			appearance of the	the settlement; its location	(and some open) views from		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				landscape, and the	adjacent to the Chawton	both Winchester Road (north)		2016 SHLAA			
				setting of heritage	Conservation Area and three	and the A32 (west) and is open		but has not			
				assets.	Grade II listed buildings; and its	to views from the PRoW		been			
					scale in that development would	network. The latter includes		submitted for			
					be dominant in relation to the	views from St Swithun's Way		consideration			
					existing settlement and its	which delineates the site's		to 2022 Call for			
					features. There is also an Area	southern boundary. Given the		Sites or since.			
					TPO adjacent to the site's	above and the findings of the					
					southern boundary.	landscape assessment, the site					
						is not considered to be suitable.					
WI043	The Hinton	Cheriton	Pajacted	Potential adverse	The site has a high community	The site is adjacent to the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Voc
W1043	Arms PH	Cheriton	Rejected	impact on the	,	settlement boundary of New		site was		indicate why	163
	Allis FII			character and	_	Cheriton by virtue of site		considered		development on the	
				appearance of the	car park, garden, and play	allocation SD63 which is		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.	equipment. The site also has a	adjacent to the west; however,		2016 SHLAA		site is flot acfilevable.	
				lanuscape.	1	this allocation is yet to be built		but has not			
						out. Regardless of the adjacent		been			
					-	site allocation, development on		submitted for			
					rounded rising topography	this site would create an		consideration			
						incongruous eastern extension		to 2022 Call for			
					-	to New Cheriton which would		Sites or since.			
					adjacent Hinton Ampner	encroach closer to the Hinton		Sites of since.			
					designed landscape. At present, a						
					field buffer has been retained	Given the above and the					
						findings of the landscape					
					·	assessment, the site is not					
						considered to be suitable.					
					contravene this good design	considered to be suitable.					
					principle. The site is also						
					, ,						
					surrounded by priority habitat on						
					three sides.						
			1								

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jite Kei	Address	Settiement		rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
WI059	Land at	Cheriton		The site is not	The site is assessed as having a	The site entrance is in Flood	Yes	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Marriners			considered to be	high landscape sensitivity overall.	Zones 2 and 3. The site is		site was		indicate why	
	Farm			available for	However, the landscape	enclosed by a PRoW on its		considered		development on the	
				development.	sensitivity varies across the site	western boundary and by		available in the		site is not achievable.	
					due to its large scale, vertical	mature trees and hedgerows on		2016 SHLAA			
					alignment, and rising topography	all boundaries. All trees		but has not		However, the site is	
					to the north. The northern area	(whether subject of a TPO or		been		accessed off a 30mph	
					has a high landscape sensitivity	not) appear to provide		submitted for		bend which is used	
					owing to its higher location, its	significant landscape value,		consideration		by pedestrian and	
					proximity to the PRoW network,	especially along the east		to 2022 Call for		vehicular traffic.	
					and its relationship to areas	boundary as viewed from the		Sites or since.		Further investigation	
					beyond the influence of the	A272. The significant removal of				into visibility splays,	
					settlement. In comparison, the	trees, especially on the north				HGV movements, and	
					existing dwelling and garden area	and east boundaries, would be				interactions with	
					in the south of the site have a	harmful to the appearance of				neighbouring	
					medium/high landscape	the countryside. Given the				property entrances	
					sensitivity depending on	above and the landscape				would need to be	
					proposed development density.	assessment, the site may only				explored further. The	
					The Marriners Farmhouse is not	be considered suitable for small-				above may limit the	
					listed but is considered worthy of	scale development in the				capacity for	
					retention.	southern area subject to				development.	
						arboricultural, flooding, and					
						transport assessments.					

Cit - D C	A d dua c -	C-441	Duni	Duand Dagger for	Landson Assessment	Cuita bilita . A a a a a a a a a a	Suitabla	A	Available	A alai a va lailite	Achievable
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
14/1074	1 1 - 1 - 6	Clara with a va	Recc'	rejection	The size is in the country of the	A managed for Control described	V	Assessment	NI -	Assessment	NI -
	Land at Grey	Cheriton	Rejected	Not considered to	The site is in the setting of the	A proposal for 6no. dwellings	Yes	The site was	No		No
	Farm House,			be available or	Hinton Ampner Designed	was dismissed at appeal (ref.		considered		Flood Zones 2 and 3.	
	Kilmeston			achievable for	Landscape, is within 20m of the	SDNP/16/04957/OUT). The		available in the		A highway objection	
	Road			residential		appeal Inspector concluded that		2016 SHLAA		was raised at the	
				development.	in proximity to priority habitat	the scheme was an		but has not		above dismissed	
					and ancient woodland to the east	unimaginative and urbanising		been		appeal due to lack of	
					and south-west. Kilmeston Rd is	form of development in a		submitted for		adequate visibility.	
					characterised as semi-rural, and	sensitive rural area, and that it		consideration		Improvements to the	
					the site includes a new two-	would represent an intrusive		to 2022 Call for		south would be	
					storey dwelling within an "L-	development in both design and		Sites or since.		necessary to provide	
					shaped" land parcel which wraps	landscape terms. In reviewing		The approval		a safe access but	
					around Grey Farm Close. The	the above and the landscape		of application		would require tree	
					land rises to the east and is	assessment, it is considered that		ref.		removal (in third	
					visible from the highway. The site	a very modest scheme (i.e., 5		SDNP/23/0416		party land) which	
					has the kept appearance of wider	dwellings or less) could be		2/FUL (solar		would be harmful to	
					garden space and is enclosed by	suitable. However, any future		panels) also		the appearance of	
					mature hedgerows and	scheme would need to be		suggests the		the countryside.	
					protected trees. The landscape	informed by sufficient evidence		site is no			
					assessment concludes the site	and contextual analysis to		longer			
					had a medium/high and medium	inform an acceptable high-		available for			
					landscape sensitivity in the east	quality design and rural village		residential			
					and west respectively and	edge and would need to		development.			
					highlighted the need for a field	positively respond to the River					
					buffer between any built	Itchen and Hinton Ampner					
					development and the Hinton	Designed Landscape.					
					Ampner Designed Landscape.	besigned Landscape.					
					Ampher Designed Landscape.						
		1	1	1							

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection		-		Assessment		Assessment	
EA009	Land west of	Clanfield	Rejected	Does not relate well	High Sensitivity. The site does not	The site rises up to the north	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	North Lane			to the existing	relate to the settlement pattern	and development of the site		site was		indicate why	
				settlement pattern.	and highway access would have	would be inconsistent with the		considered		development on the	
				Potential adverse	negative impact on the rural lane	surrounding character and		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				impact on the	alongside the site. The site would	settlement form which consists		2016 SHLAA			
				character and	have a detrimental impact on the	of mostly		but has not			
				appearance of the	surrounding downland.	dispersed dwellings and		been			
				landscape.		farmsteads. The site is adjacent		submitted for			
						to a Grade II Listed Building		consideration			
						(located to the south of the		to 2022 Call for			
						site). Given the potential		Sites or since.			
						detrimental impact on the					
						landscape character and the					
						relationship with the					
						settlement, the site is not					
						considered suitable for					
						development.					
EA010	Land East of	Clanfield	Rejected	Does not relate well	High Sensitivity. The site does not	The site rises up to the north	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	The site access would	No
	Little Hyden			to the existing	relate to the settlement pattern	and development of the site		site was		be via Little Hyden	
	Lane			settlement pattern.	and highway access would have	would be inconsistent with the		considered		Lane, which is a	
				Potential adverse	negative impact on the rural lane	surrounding character and		available in the		narrow lane. Further	
				impact on the	alongside the site. The site would	settlement form. The site does		2016 SHLAA			
				character and	have a detrimental impact on the	share boundaries with		but has not			
				appearance of the	surrounding downland.	surrounding residential		been			
				landscape. Suitable		development, but it is not		submitted for			
				access may not be		considered to relate well to the		consideration			
				achievable.		settlement pattern. Therefore,		to 2022 Call for			
						given the potential detrimental		Sites or since.			
						impact on the landscape					
						character and the relationship					
						with the settlement, the site is					
						not considered suitable for					
						development.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Kei	Address	Settlement	Recc'	rejection	Lanuscape Assessment	Juitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
	Land North of Hambledon Road	Clanfield			High Sensitivity. The site does not relate to the settlement pattern and highway access would have negative impact. The site would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding downland.	development of the site would be inconsistent with the surrounding character and settlement. The site		The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes		Yes
	Land east of East Meon Road	Clanfield	Rejected	Does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern. Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	High Sensitivity. The site does not relate to the settlement pattern and highway access would have negative impact on Little Hyden Lane, the rural lane alongside the site. The site would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding downland.	and development of the site would be inconsistent with the surrounding character and		The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection	·	•		Assessment		Assessment	
EA013	Land west of East Meon Road	Clanfield	·	to the existing	High Sensitivity. The site does not relate to the settlement pattern and highway access would have negative impact on the rural lane alongside the site. The site would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding downland.	The site rises up to the north. The site is not well contained and a new boundary would need to be created along the western edge of the site. The site shares a boundary with settlement along the eastern edge, but it is not considered to relate well to the existing settlement pattern. Therefore, given the potential detrimental impact on the landscape character and the relationship with the settlement, the site is not considered suitable for development.	No	The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA026	Land at Hinton Manor Farm	Clanfield		to the existing settlement pattern. Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the	Medium/High Sensitivity. The site is exposed to high levels of visibility in a valley side location. The site is inconsistent with surrounding development patterns and would introduce a large visible site which would appear isolated and remote.	The site rises to the south west and is in a prominent position along Downhouse Road. The west of the site is bounded by significant topography. There are power lines which run through the site. There is a grade II listed building to the north. The eastern edge of the site is located within flood zone 2 and is susceptible to surface water flooding. As the landscape assessment concludes, the site is not well related to the existing settlement pattern is detached from it by the road. Therefore, the site is not considered suitable for development.		The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	•	_		Assessment		Assessment	
EA136	Manor Farm	Clanfield		Development on	settlement edge into the wider downland mosaic is considered to have High Sensitivity due to it's poor relationship with the settlement pattern and the	The part of the site within the SDNP is of high landscape sensitivity (including low density modern farm buildings). There are un-designated heritage asset agricultural buildings on the part of the site outside the National Park.	No	Unknown. The 2016 SHLAA considered the site to be available however the site has not been resubmitted to the 2022 Call for Sites. There is currently no evidence to indicate the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Observatory House	Clanfield		Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is assessed as High Landscape Sensitivity owing to its hilltop location exposing it to views in the wider landscape, poor relationship with the settlement pattern meaning that development of the site would intrude and expand the perceived extent of the settlement into the wider landscape beyond the valley in which it sits. The impact of increased density of built form in this sensitive location would be inconsistent with the low density and dispersed nature of settlement in this location.	on the character and appearance of the landscape.	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Sito Pof	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jane Kei	Audiess	Settlement	Recc'	rejection	Lanuscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
EA206	Land off	Clanfield			Medium/High Sensitivity. The site	The site is in a prominent	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Voc
	Downhouse	Clarifield	Mejecteu	to the existing	is exposed to high levels of	position along Downhouse	1	being actively	163	indicate why	
	Road			settlement pattern	visibility in a valley side location.	Road. The west of the site is	1	promoted and		development on the	
	Noau			and potential	The site is inconsistent with	bounded by significant	1	is considered		site is not achievable.	
				1		topography. There is a grade II	1	available.		isite is not acmevable.	
				adverse impact on the character and	surrounding development patterns and would introduce	listed building to the north. The		avallable.			
					•	1					
				appearance of the	new development on the	eastern edge is located within					
				landscape including	opposite side of Downhouse	flood zone 2 and susceptible to					
				adjacent	Lane that would appear	surface water flooding. The site					
				topography.	incongruous with the settlement	is not well related to the existing					
					pattern and landform.	settlement pattern and					
						detached from it by the road.					
						The site is not considered					
						suitable for development.					
	Land at	Clapham	Rejected	Loss of employment	Brownfield site within small	1 , ,		Existing	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Gosling Croft			use	cluster of development to the	not protected by the Clapham		employment		indicate why	
	Business				south of the village. Low	Neighbourhood Plan. Any		site. There is		development on the	
	Centre				landscape sensitivity.	redevelopment would be		currently no		site is not achievable.	
						subject to relocation of business		evidence that			
						uses. Separated from main		the site is			
						village but opposite village hall		available or			
						and in similar location to		being actively			
						allocated residential site further		promoted for			
						south.		development'.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
AR035	Clapham	Clapham	Rejected	Loss of employment	Brownfield site within developed	Adjacent site allocated for 30	No	Allocated for	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	Depot			use with NDP	area south of village.	homes and existing residential		employment		indicate why	
				safeguard policy		development to south.		land in the		development on the	
				(Policy BT3) for		However, this site is allocated in		Clapham		site is not achievable.	
				continued use.		the Clapham Neighbourhood		Neighbourhoo			
						Plan for employment use -		d Development			
						Policy BT3.		Plan. There is			
								no evidence			
								that the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								residential use.			
CH170	Land west of	Cocking	Rejected	Development of the	Medium/High to High Landscape	Not suitable due to the	No	The site is	No	It would be	Yes
	A286 & North			site would have a	Sensitivity due to the open and	conclusions of the landscape		being actively		challenging to	
	of Bell Lane			potential adverse	extensive visibility of the site, the	assessment.		promoted for		achieve appropriate,	
				impact on the	poor relationship with the			development.		safe access given the	
				character and	settlement pattern and the			However it is		steep gradient and	
				appearance of the	intrusion into the surrounding			noted that		narrow width of the	
				landscape.	rural landscape that			alternative		existing driveway	
					development of this site would			facilities would		access, and the need	
					result in. The scale of the site is			need to be		to protect the	
					not in proportion to the			found for a		character of the rural	
					settlement size and would not sit			replacement		lane. Likely to be	
					unobtrusively at the settlement			village hall.		mitigable with careful	
					edge. The recreation ground part					planning. Access	
					of the site is an appropriate					from the A286 at this	
					settlement edge use in that					location is not	
					location.					considered to be	
										suitable.	

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH200	Land west of	Cocking	Rejected	Development of the	Moderate to high landscape	Crypt Lane, due to height	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Crypt Lane			site would have a	sensitivity. The site is part of the	difference and topography is		being actively		indicate why	
	and south of			potential adverse	undeveloped context of Cocking.	not a suitable access. There is		promoted and		development on the	
	Bell Lane			impact on the	The site is a relative high point	another access from the A286		is considered		site is not achievable	
				character and	and is visible from Cocking Hill to	which provide rear access and		available.		although lack of	
				appearance of the	the south. The site sits well	parking to existing properties				suitable access for	
				landscape. Access is	above the sunken Crypt Lane,	along the A286. The A286 access				significant	
				not suitable.	which then further drops down	is not suitable for use by a				development is	
					to the watercourse along Crypt	significant level of development.				noted.	
					Lane.	Due to the topography, visibility					
						and openness of the site a					
						smaller parcel suitable for					
						development using this access					
						has not been identified. A					
						historic memorial is located on					
						the site. Potential impacts could					
						occur on the water quality,					
						quantity and experiential					
						qualities of the brook running					
						along Crypt Lane.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection		.,		Assessment		Assessment	
HO008	Land north of	Coldwaltha		Development on	Moderate Sensitivity due to	The site is well contained and	No	The site is	Yes	Access from Brook	No
	Brook Lane /	m	1	the site would have	proximity to Ramsar and SPA site	bounded by adjacent residential		being actively		Lane not considered	
	Land at			a potential adverse	<b>1</b>	development, roads and the		promoted and		achievable due to the	
	Bridge			impact on the	river valley and also rural setting	railway line. The site is in close		is considered		narrow nature and	
	Nurseries			character and	and character of the site as a	proximity to a Site of Special		available.		the rural character.	
				appearance of the	buffer between modern	Scientific Interest, a Ramsar Site				Access could be via	
				landscape. Access	residential development and the	and Special Protection Area to				existing residential	
				from Brook Lane is	country Brook Lane.	the south. The site is within a				development, but	
				not considered		Site of Special Scientific Interest				this could require	
				acceptable and may		(SSSI) Impact Risk Zone. Access				removal of an	
				result in the need to		could impact on the rural				existing property.	
				remove parts of		setting. Access via Brook Lane					
				hedgerow and tress.		considered unsuitable.					
				Visibility over							
				railway bridge is							
				poor. Site is close							
				proximity to Site of							
				Special Scientific							
				Interest, a Ramsar							
				Site and Special							
				Protection Area to							
				the south.							
HO010	Coldwaltham	Coldwaltha	Rejected	Development on	Medium/High Sensitivity	The majority of the site is	No	There is no	No	It is not clear how the	No
	Glebe, Church	m		the site would have	Due to the existing woodland	wooded, with a variety of		evidence that		site will be accessed,	
	Lane			a potential adverse	setting, the proximity of the	mature trees. It is not well		the site is		and this could	
				impact on the	listed church, access problems	related to the existing		being actively		include accessing the	
				character and	and poor relationship with the	settlement pattern and is more		promoted or is		site via land in	
				appearance of the	settlement pattern.	rural in character. The site is		available for		another ownership.	
				landscape.		adjacent to the Parish Church of		development.			
				Development on		St Giles, a grade II* listed					
				the site would have		building. The site is within 5km					
				a potential adverse		of a Special Protection Area. The					
				impact on heritage		site is within a Site of Special					
				assets. Loss of		Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact					
				woodland.		Risk Zone. Due to conclusions of					
						the landscape assessment, not					
						suitable.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
	7100100							<u> </u>		•	
	Land east of London Road	Coldwaltha	Recc'	rejection The landscape sensitivity is high. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets due proximity to conservation area. It is not clear the	High landscape sensitivity Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact	The site is visible as one enters Coldwaltham from the north and the open and rural nature	No	Assessment There is no evidence that the site is being actively promoted or is available for development.	No	Assessment  Development of the site can be achieved but further work is required for access to ensure this is acceptable and safe.	Yes
	The Priory, Coldwaltham	Coldwaltha	Rejected	Coldwaltham being located abutting the conservation area and the north of the A29. Access may not be possible onto the A29. The site forms part of the wider, rural	the public footpath) feels rural in	landscape and conservation area – site not considered	No	The site is being actively promoted or development and is considered available. It is noted that there are existing stables and grazing area on the site.	Yes	Access issue would need to be considered. Access onto A29 may not be possible and further transport evidence would be required. Access onto Kings Lane not suitable due to impact on conservation area and listed buildings.	No

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Malthouse Field	Cooksbridge	Rejected	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	open and undeveloped character	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Adjacent to listed buildings.	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Land east of Rectory Lane	Corhampton / Meonstoke	_	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	its limited containment / open views from surrounding higher ground. The topography is apparent onsite and the site forms part of a wider field pattern of undulating countryside to the east and south. Moreover, the site does not relate well to the existing	The site is not considered to be suitable for residential development as confirmed by the dismissed appeal for 2 dwellings under ref.  SDNP/12/02464/FUL. The site sits above the settlement and existing highway, and is highly visible to views from all sides, especially from the wider, open, and undulating countryside to the north, east and south, which also includes the South Downs Way (SDW).		Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		The above dismissed appeal concluded that the presented highway scheme would unacceptably increase the risk to users of the highway. However, this was in relation to the highway scheme proposed at the time. The site has an existing access and there is no reason to indicate why a more appropriate, acceptable, and safer highway scheme is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI021	Land at	Corhampton	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site has a moderate	` ,	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Corhampton	/ Meonstoke		impact on the	landscape sensitivity given that	slightly) the Corhampton &		site was		indicate why	
	Lane			appearance,	its relatively flat and contained	Meonstoke Conservation Area,		considered		development on the	
				character and	by existing woodland. Any loss of	and is within the setting of the		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				setting of the	trees to facilitate development	Grade I Listed Corhampton		2016 SHLAA			
				landscape and		Church. Although existing		but has not			
				heritage assets.	and character of the area,	woodland / tree cover helps to		been			
					1	contain and screen the site,		submitted for			
					heritage assets to the north and	built development would erode		consideration			
					east, and the designed landscape	· 1		to 2022 Call for			
					adjacent to the south.	sparse and rural character of		Sites or since.			
					1	this area. In addition,					
					village to the west, when the	development would expand the					
						village to the west when the					
					_	natural evolution of the village					
					1 5	has been north-south. Given the					
					the A32, disused railway line, and	_					
					the River Meon.	landscape assessment, the site					
						is not considered to be suitable					
						for development.					
LE005	103a Lewes	Ditchling	Rejected	Development above	Medium/High Sensitivity Medium	The site is within 250m of an	No	There is	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	Road			the LAA threshold	sensitivity for lower section	Historic Landfill Site. Settlement		currently no		indicate why	
				would conflict with	closest to Lewes Road. Higher	pattern low density and linear		evidence that		development on the	
				the settlement	sensitivity towards the north	along Lewes Road reflecting		the site is		site is not achievable,	
				pattern and harm	section of the field due to	edge of settlement location. Any		available or		although there is	
				the character of the	visibility from the scarp. Local	significant in-depth		being actively		limited opportunity	
				area.	visual sensitivity is limited.	development would conflict		promoted for		to widen the existing	
					Relatively recent landscape and	with this settlement pattern and		development.		access.	
					settlement pattern. Limited	be out of character with the					
					impact on public right of way.	area. May be opportunity for 1-					
						2 dwellings on southern part of					
						the site but this would fall					
						below the Land Availability					
						Assessment (LAA) threshold.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jane Nei	Address	Jettiement	Recc'	rejection	Lanascape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
	Land at North End	Ditchling		Access constraints and impact on	Medium/High Sensitivity Site is related to historic core of village in a prominent location. Access is not clear. A new access off North End or access to Macs Farm would require removal of woodland in centre of site and be potentially detrimental to landscape /townscape character and residential amenity.	Conservation Area and in close proximity to a grade II listed building. There is a Tree Preservation Order area adjacent to the western		There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Land adjoining Park Barn Farm, Beacon Road	Ditchling	Rejected	Site access deemed available at time of allocation is now unavailable.	Road, Sussex border path and	The site is bordered by deciduous woodland with ancient woodland located in close proximity. There is a public right of way running along the southern boundary of the site. There is unknown archaeological potential and likely to be ecological value as site has been left unmanaged for several years. However, the site is allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan for 9 dwellings with access via a garage court off Long Park Corner.		The site is allocated in the Neighbourhoo d Plan for 9 dwellings with access via a garage court off Long Park Corner. However, the access is not available as Lewes District Council has withdrawn proposals to demolish the garages.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Land west of Nye Lane	Ditchling	Rejected	Unsuitable for development due to impact on highly sensitive landscape character of the area.	High landscape sensitivity due to open views across the site to escarpment and general rural and tranquil character of the site.	to impact on character of the area.		There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI023	Land at Union	Droxford	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site has a high landscape	The eastern boundary is	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Lane			impact on the	sensitivity given its large scale,	adjacent to existing residential		being actively		indicate why	
				character and	dominant topography, and that it	development, whilst all other		promoted and		development on the	
				appearance of the	is visible within open and	boundaries face onto open		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.	unfiltered views from the	countryside. Although there is		available.		However, existing	
					Wayfarers Walk PRoW.	some existing and well-				highways, vegetation,	
					Development would create an	established boundary				and topography may	
					incongruous extension to north-	vegetation, the site is visible and				limit the scale of	
					west Droxford and would be out	comprises a large open field				development given	
					of scale with the existing	adjacent to the settlement				that a safe and	
					settlement.	boundary and priority habitat.				appropriate access	
						Given the above and the				would need to be	
						findings of the landscape				created.	
						assessment, the site is not					
						considered to be suitable for					
						development.					

Cito Pof	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landssana Assassment	Suitability Assassment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Ket	Address	Settlement			Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable		Available	1 '	Acilievable
144004		D ( )	Recc'	rejection		- C. I.I		Assessment		Assessment	
WI024	Land	Droxford	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site is assessed as having a	The site is an open field with no	No	Unknown. The	Unknown		Yes
	adjoining			impact on the	high landscape sensitivity. The	distinct boundaries and so is		site was		and is used to access	
	Droxford			character and	site is readily visible from all sides	open to views from all sides –		considered		the recreation	
	Primary			appearance of the	and comprises a dry, bowl valley	incl. the Wayfarers Walk which		available in the		ground, school, and	
	School			landscape.	with limited access. Development	is a long-distance way marked		2016 SHLAA		both existing and	
					would create a poor relationship	trail. This is exacerbated by the		but has not		allocated residential	
					and incongruous extension to the	bowl-shaped valley in which the		been		development.	
					settlement pattern, and would	site is located. The site is not		submitted for		Development is	
					impact on local views from the	considered to be well related to		consideration		technically	
					PRoW network.	the existing settlement pattern.		to 2022 Call for		achievable; however,	
						The site is adjacent to a SINC at		Sites or since.		the lane may not be	
						its north-west corner. Given the				suitable for a further	
						above and the findings of the				increase in use	
						landscape assessment, the site				(beyond the existing	
						is not considered to be suitable.				uses and allocation)	
										and is likely to	
										require a design	
										which would have an	
										impact on the	
										existing character of	
										the area. This raises	
										further questions	
										about the site's	
										suitability – see	
										"suitability" above.	
										1	

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	-		Assessment		Assessment	
WI025	Northend	Droxford	Rejected	Site is not currently	The site is assessed as having a	The site is a long and narrow	Yes	Unknown. The	Unknown	The site appears to	No
	Lane			considered to be	medium landscape sensitivity.	parcel of land which is adjacent		site was		be landlocked, and it	
				achievable.	The site is small, well hidden, and	to the rear gardens of		considered		is not clear if the	
					is not characteristic of its wider	neighbouring properties. The		available in the		existing access track	
					landscape. However, there may	site is relatively flat and is not		2016 SHLAA		off Northend Lane is	
					be some likely negative impacts	widely visible given that it is		but has not		available, nor able, to	
					from gaining vehicular access.	largely contained by existing		been		accommodate and	
						built form to the south, and		submitted for		achieve a sufficient	
						undulating topography to the		consideration		and safe vehicular	
						north. Given the above and the		to 2022 Call for		access solution.	
						findings of the landscape		Sites or since.			
						assessment, the site is					
						considered suitable for small-					
						scale residential development					
						providing that the layout and					
						design is in keeping with the					
						adjoining residential properties,					
						and does not adversely impact					
						existing residential amenities					
						and other usual development					
						management considerations.					
WI047	Land at	Droxford	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site is assessed as having a	The site is located to the north	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Garrison Hill			impact on the	high landscape sensitivity. The	of the settlement and is both		site was		indicate why	
				character and	site is highly visible due to its	large and prominent. The site		considered		development on the	
				appearance of the	rising topography. Development	slopes up to the north, is readily		available in the		site is not achievable	
				landscape.	would create a poor relationship	visible, and is not considered to		2016 SHLAA		subject to creating a	
					and incongruous extension to the	be well related to the		but has not		safe and appropriate	
					settlement pattern.	settlement. Indeed,		been		access.	
						development would result in an		submitted for			
						incongruous urban extension to		consideration			
						the existing nucleated		to 2022 Call for			
						settlement pattern. Given the		Sites or since.			
						above and the findings of the					
						landscape assessment, the site					
						is not considered to be suitable					
						for development.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement		Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH065	Rothersfield	Easebourne	Rejected	Development on	Assessed as Medium Landscape	Currently public open space.	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
				the site would have	Sensitivity due to existing uses,	Alternative provision of equal or		site was		indicate why	
				a potential adverse	local community value and	better open space would be		considered		development on the	
				impact on the	existing trees. Connection to	required and no indication that		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				character and	River Rother Site of Nature	such provision is being made.		2016 SHLAA,			
				appearance of the	· '	Most of the site is within flood		but has not			
				landscape.	also important. Boundary along	zone 2. There are many mature		been			
				Alternative	Dodsley Lane is locally distinctive.	·		submitted for			
				provision of equal		the site, which may be		consideration			
				or better open		important to retain to ensure		to 2022 Call for			
				space would be		landscape impact is		Sites or since.			
				required and no		minimised/mitigated. There is a					
				indication that such		Site of Nature Conservation					
				provision is being		Interest (SINC) adjacent to the					
				made.		site. Site is therefore unsuitable					
						for development.					
CH162	Land east of	Easebourne	Rejected	Development on	The site is assessed as High	Development of this extensive	Yes	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Buddington			the site would have	Landscape Sensitivity owing to its	site, including gaining access		being actively		indicate why	
	Lane and			a potential adverse	elevated position above the	from either Hollist or		promoted and		development on the	
	north of			impact on the	Rother Valley, the poor	Buddington Lane is unlikely to		is considered		site could not be	
	Hollist Lane			character and	relationship with the settlement	be suitable due to the elevated		available for		achieved.	
				appearance of the	pattern and its exposure to views	and exposed nature of the site		development.			
				landscape.	from the PROW network. Access	and that it is poorly related to					
					to the site would potentially have	the existing settlement. It is					
					detrimental urbanising impacts	considered that extending					
					on the existing rural character of	development westwards on this					
					Hollist Lane.	prominent and open site along					
						Hollist Lane into the open					
						countryside would have a					
						detrimental urbanising impact					
						on the sensitive and rural					
						landscape character of the area					
						including the narrow rural					
						lane/s.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH163	Land south of	Easebourne	Rejected	Development on	The site is High Landscape	Development including gaining	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Hollist Lane			the site would have	Sensitivity owing to its elevated	access to the site is unlikely to		being actively		indicate why	
				a potential adverse	position above the Rother Valley.	be suitable due to the fairly		promoted and		development on the	
				impact on the	The site as a whole has a poor	detached and rural character of		is available for		site could not be	
				character and	relationship to the settlement,	this location that would extend		development.		achieved.	
				appearance of the	extending much further south	development westwards along					
				landscape.	and west that then current	Hollist Lane into the open					
					settlement. The site is visible	countryside. The ground slopes					
					from the PRoW network. Access	down south away from the					
					to the site would have	road. There is concern over the					
					detrimental urbanising impacts	proximity to the river and there					
					on the existing rural character of	are also possible flooding issues					
					Hollist Lane.	at the southern end of the site.					
CH204	Land south	Easebourne	Rejected	Development on	The site has High Landscape	The site is not well related to	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	east of			the site would have	Sensitivity owing to its elevated	the settlement, with the focus		being actively		indicate why	
	Easebourne			a potential adverse	position and its proximity	of development on the other		promoted and		development on the	
	Street			impact on the	adjacent to the Conservation	side of Easebourne Street. The		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				character and	Area and listed buildings on	elevated position of the site and		available.		However, whilst	
				appearance of the	Easebourne Street.	its topography result in long				technically possible,	
				landscape.		views. The well used and				it is considered	
						historic footpath, the Race, and				gaining access to the	
						the designated Cowdray House				site could potentially	
						Registered Garden are adjacent				cause significant	
						to the site and would be				landscape character	
						negatively impacted by				harm to Easebourne	
						development. Due to the				Street.	
						elevated position above					
						Easebourne Street, access to the					
						site would not be possible					
						without significant landscape					
						character impact to Easebourne					
						Street.					
1	1		I	1		1	I	1	I	I	1 1

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH205	Land north of Easebourne Primary School		Rejected	Development on	The site has High Landscape Sensitivity owing to its elevated position and poor relationship to the settlement pattern of Easebourne.	The site is not well related to the settlement. Its scale is disproportionate to the size of Easebourne and due to the open character, topography and wide views, there is not a logical smaller parcel of this site that could be brought forward in a characteristic manner. Access options from A286 are limited by the habitat corridor and topography, and is not considered to be suitable for the narrow, winding Glaziers Lane.	No		Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site could not be achieved.	Yes
CH014	Site 30, Former East Dean Service Station, Charlton Road / Land at Manor Farm House, Charlton Road	East Dean		a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, there is	Medium/High Landscape Sensitivity due to its location within the conservation area and historic core of the village. In a less sensitive location there would have been potential for the Previously Developed Land (PDL) status to lower the sites' sensitivity, however this is a prominent site at the entrance to the village and while there may be opportunity to enhance character at this location; careful bespoke design would be required to address the sensitivity.	conservation area. The northern boundary, site entrance and Charlton Road is within flood zone 2 and within the watercourse buffer of the River Lavant and has potential for surface water flooding. The site is understood to be in active		The site is being actively promoted for development however the site is in active employment use.	No	There is potential for contamination from the former use as a motor vehicle service station. There are no other reasons to indicate why development of the site would not be achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
	Address	Settiement		rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
	Land south of Butchers Lane	East Dean			Medium high landscape sensitivity.	The site is within the East Dean Conservation Area and contributes significantly to the character of the settlement as an open undeveloped space as viewed from surrounding rights of way. Not suitable.	No	The site has not been promoted since 2008. Insufficient evidence of availability.	No	There is no reason to indicate the site is not achievable.	Yes
	East Dean Extension	East Dean	1 1	Development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The sites was previously assessed as high sensitivity. The site is highly sensitive due to the prominence of the site within the contours of the land and the extension of built form out into the wider downland. The site would appear as an intrusive form of development in the landscape. The existing farm buildings are well located within the contours and are medium high sensitivity due to the vulnerability of the surrounding landscape to inappropriate built form and/or conversion	Due to the conclusions of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable.	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Land adjoining The Vicarage, East of Gilberts Drive	East Dean		High landscape sensitivity. Development of five or more dwellings nearer the road considered out of keeping with the character of existing residential development.	especially the area on higher ground. Its position in the lower part of the valley adds to the tranquillity in this part of the village. Development of five or more dwellings on smaller portion on lower slope would be inappropriate and out of keeping with the character of the existing	_		Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since		Subject to creating improved access - there is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	-	-		Assessment		Assessment	
WE002	Land behind	East Dean	Rejected	Part of site built	The eastern (lower) part of the	The SHLAA had concluded	No	There is	Unknown	The area of the site	Yes
	The Fridays,			out. Remaining site	site was assessed as having	development should be focused		currently no		considered suitable	
	Gilberts Drive			area considered	potential in the SHLAA. This part	in the south-east corner of the		evidence that		in the SHLAA	
				unsuitable in	of the site subsequently received	site. This area subsequently		the remaining		subsequently	
				landscape terms.	planning permission and has	received planning permission for		western		received planning	
					been built out.	residential and has been built		(upper) area		permission for	
					The SHLAA stated that the	out.		site is available		residential and was	
					western (upper) part of the site	The remaining western (upper)		or being		built out.	
					which relates to the setting of	area is considered of high		actively		The remaining area	
					the village is of high sensitivity.	sensitivity and is therefore		promoted for		has an access leading	
						unsuitable for development.		development'		to Gilberts Drive.	
										There is no reason to	
										indicate why	
										development on the	
										remaining area could	
										not be achieved.	

							r				
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land adjacent	East Dean	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site was previously assessed	The site is located within the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown		Yes
	to the Village			impact on the	as having Medium/High	East Dean Conservation Area		site was		indicate why	
	Hall, Gilberts			character and	Sensitivity. Due to conservation	(CA) and there are a number of		considered		development on the	
	Drive			appearance of the		listed buildings surrounding the		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				landscape and	within the historic core of the	site. The site is considered to be		2016 SHLAA			
				heritage assets.	village and on main route	a significant open area within		but has not			
				Considered	through village to the south.	the CA, which has an important		been			
				inappropriate harm		role, including as a buffer		submitted for			
				to the Local Green		between the historic village and		consideration			
				Space.		the surrounding residential		to 2022 Call for			
						development. The assessment		Sites or since.			
						conclusion is that development					
						of the site would have a harmful					
						impact on the setting of the					
						village and the on the CA. It					
						would also have potential					
						harmful impact on the setting of					
						the surrounding listed buildings.					
						Since the previous SHLAA, the					
						South Downs Local Plan					
						designated this site also known					
						as "The Horsefield" as a Local					
						Green Space. This recognised					
						the role of the site in the					
						historic core of the village. In					
						addition to the conclusions					
						above, development would be					
						inappropriate as it would be					
						harmful to the Local Green					
						Space.					

Sito Pof	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Kei	Address				Lanuscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Juitubie	1	Available	I -	Acinevable
CHOO	The Destant			rejection	History description of the state of the stat	Adia and to the Diversity	NI -	Assessment	Literature account	Assessment	V
CH209	The Rectory	East Lavant	1 -	Development on	High landscape sensitivity due to	Adjacent to the River Lavant	No		Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
					l '	within an Environment Agency		site was		indicate why	
				a potential adverse	site in East Lavant. The site is	Flood Alert Area. Due to the		considered in		development on this	
				impact on heritage	within the historic core of the	findings of the landscape		the Lavant		site couldn't be	
				and the character	Lavant, and within the	assessment the site is not		Neighbourhoo		achieved.	
				and appearance of	conservation area. Development	considered suitable.		d Plan process			
				the landscape.	extending back into the plot			but has not			
					would not be consistent with the			been			
					settlement pattern and character			submitted for			
					of East Lavant.			consideration			
								to the 2022			
								Call for Sites or			
								since. There is			
								currently no			
								evidence that			
								the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			
EA014	Land north of	East Meon	Rejected	Not currently	The site has a moderate	The site is large-scale, open,	No	The site is	Yes	There is an existing	No
	Coombe Road			considered to be	landscape sensitivity. This	predominantly flat, and is		being actively		narrow access which	
	and west of			achievable and	broadly aligns to the medium	visually exposed from all sides		promoted and		connects the site to	
	Duncombe			potential adverse	landscape sensitivity concluded	by higher ground, especially to		is considered		Coombe Road (a	
	Road			impact on the	in the SHLAA (2016). Conversely,	the north and west.		available.		rural and narrow	
				character and	the NDP Group previously	Development would create an				country lane). It is	
				appearance of the	assessed the site as having a high	incongruous western extension				considered that this	
				landscape.	landscape sensitivity due to its	to the nucleated, grid/cluster				is not sufficient to	
					scale and visual prominence from	pattern of East Meon. Given the				accommodate an	
					higher ground to the north and	above and the findings of the				appropriate and safe	
					west.	landscape assessment, the site				vehicular access. In	
						is not considered to be suitable.				addition, it is	
										understood that	
										Workhouse Lane has	
										sewerage capacity	
										issues.	
										133463.	

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land east of Chapel Street	East Meon		Not currently considered to be achievable and potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	character of the existing settlement edge. The site is raised above the adjacent sunken lane and development would interrupt the existing landscape	The site is adjacent to the Grade II listed Sebastopol Cottages (to the north) and is raised above Coombe Road. The site is not currently visible from the highway given its well established boundary trees and other vegetation. Nevertheless, development would be visible from the highway and the wider open countryside and would be imposing and detrimental to the sunken lane qualities of Coombe Road. Given the above and the previous landscape assessment, the site is not considered to be suitable for development.		Assessment Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		Assessment There is no existing safe vehicular access. The previous assessment alluded to the creation of a new access via the existing access to Coppice Cottages. However, in June 2023, planning officers visited the site and concluded that the above was not achievable, appropriate, nor safe given the raised topography, sunken lane qualities, and location on the corner of a bend.	No
EA128	Land rear of Coombe Road Terrace	East Meon	Rejected	The site is not available for development. Requirement to retain trees limits yield to less than 5 dwellings.	The site is assessed as having a low landscape sensitivity due to the existing suburban character and its location within the settlement boundary.	The site is located within the settlement boundary and comprises (parts of) the rear gardens of a row of semidetached houses. Given the need to retain the existing trees onsite, it is unlikely that development would yield 5 dwellings or more.	No	Unknown. The site was considered in the East Meon Neighbourhoo d Plan process but has not been submitted for consideration to the 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Cito Bof	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landssana Assassment	Suitability Assassment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Ker	Address	Settlement	Recc'		Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Jantable	Assessment		Assessment	Acilievable
EA166	Belmont	East Meon		rejection The site is not	The site is flat and has a	The site is adjacent to the East	Yes	Unknown. The			Uncertai
	Farm off	Last Meon	Mejecteu	considered to be	moderate landscape sensitivity	Meon Conservation Area and is	l	site was	Olikilowii	indicate why	n
	Temple Lane			available for	which aligns with the NDP	in proximity to two listed		considered in		development on the	''
	· ·				_	l · ·				· ·	
	(North)			development.	Group's previous landscape	cottages. The site is part of a	l	the East Meon		site is not achievable	
					assessment of the site. The site is	l	l	Neighbourhoo		per se. However, foul	
					adjacent to the East Meon	the view between the PRoW	l	d Plan process		water infrastructure -	
					Conservation Area and listed	and the listed church. The		but has not		and access, capacity,	
					buildings, has views to the listed	remaining areas of this larger		been		and potential traffic	
					church, and is visible from both	field have been considered		submitted for		safety issues	
					the PRoW to the south and Park	separately as per previous site		consideration		associated with	
					Hill to the north. The site is	submissions. The three land		to the 2022		Temple Lane - may	
					surrounded by existing built	parcels could be considered and		Call for Sites or		limit development.	
					development on three sides and	conceptually master planned		since.		Further investigation	
					so could provide an appropriate	together to ensure an				is required into	
					infill development if	appropriately and				sewerage and	
					appropriately and	sympathetically designed				highway	
					sympathetically designed.	development which enhances				infrastructure.	
						the PRoW, retains views of the					
						listed church, delivers onsite					
						BNG and open space, and					
						provides an enhanced					
						settlement edge. The above					
						would need to be investigated					
						further through a detailed					
						contextual analysis and					
						landscape appraisal.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA167	Belmont	East Meon	Rejected	The site is not	The site has a moderate	The site is adjacent to the East	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Uncertai
	Farm off			considered to be	landscape sensitivity. Conversely,	Meon Conservation Area and is		site was		indicate why	n
	Temple Lane			available or suitable	the East Meon NDP Group	in proximity to two listed		considered in		development on the	
	(South)			for development.	previously assessed the site as	cottages. The site is part of a		the East Meon		site is not achievable	
					having a high landscape	larger field which is visible		Neighbourhoo		per se. However, foul	
					sensitivity due to its open nature,	between the PRoW and the		d Plan process		water infrastructure -	
					amenity value, footpath access,	listed church. This site		but has not		and access, capacity,	
					and views to and from the listed	delineates the southern area of		been		and potential traffic	
					Church and Park Hill.	the larger field. It is open and		submitted for		safety issues	
						readily visible from the PRoW		consideration		associated with	
						network and wider landscape. It		to the 2022		Temple Lane - may	
						is unlikely that development of		Call for Sites or		limit development.	
						the whole site (i.e., both		since.		Further investigation	
						northern and southern areas)				is required into	
						could be supported by existing				sewerage and	
						infrastructure. The northern				highway	
						area (adjacent site) has more				infrastructure.	
						potential for development					
						compared to the southern area					
						(this site). As such, the southern					
						area should be considered for					
						uses which would support,					
						facilitate, and complement any					
						potential future development in					
						the northern area – i.e., public					
						open space, biodiversity net					
						gain, landscape buffering, re-					
						nature, and PRoW					
						enhancements.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jone Her	71441 000		Recc'	rejection	Zanascape Assessment	January 7 183 253 III circ		Assessment		Assessment	
EB002	Land at	Eastbourne			The site was previously assessed	Development on the site would	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	νος
	Paradise	Lastboarne	Nejecteu	to the existing	as high sensitivity due to the	have a potential adverse impact	140	site was		indicate why	163
	Drive			settlement pattern	location within a continuous belt	1		considered		development on the	
	Drive			and potential	of woodland along the scarp	appearance of the landscape.		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				adverse impact on		The site is part of the golf course		2016 SHLAA		site is not acmevable.	
				the character and				but has not			
						and is completely covered in					
				appearance of the		trees. It is physically adjacent to		been			
				landscape.	Way and Open Access Land upon			submitted for			
					entering the town and the	is not well related to the existing		consideration			
						settlement pattern.		to 2022 Call for			
					towards the scarp slope.			Sites or since.			
EB003	Land	Eastbourne	Rejected	Does not relate well	The site was previously assessed	Development on the site would	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	It is not clear if access	No
	bounded by		,	to the existing	as high sensitivity. The site is part	· ·		site was		to the site could be	
	Peppercombe			settlement pattern	of the continuously wooded	on the character and		considered		achieved, and the	
	Road and			and potential	-	appearance of the landscape.		available in the		site rises steeply to	
	Longstone			adverse impact on	Eastbourne to the west. It is	The site is mainly woodland with		2016 SHLAA		the west.	
	Road			the character and	elevated on a promontory above	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		but has not		Development is not	
	Noau			appearance of the	·	not well related to the existing		been		considered	
				1		settlement pattern. It is located		submitted for		achievable on this	
				landscape.	_						
				Development not	development line. Access likely to	1 1 1		consideration		site.	
				considered to be	· •	the nearest point of an ancient		to 2022 Call for			
				achievable.	way and local amenity.	woodland.		Sites or since.			
EB006	Field at	Eastbourne	Dojostod	Dags not relate well	The site was proviously assessed	Development on the site would	No	Unknown. The	Linkanana	It is not clear if access	No
		Eastbourne	Rejecteu		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	·	INO				INO
	Burown			to the existing	as high sensitivity. The site is	have a potential adverse impact		site was		to the site could be	
	Down			settlement pattern	open downland below the	on the character and		considered		achieved, the site	
	Close/Priory			and potential	continuously wooded scarp	appearance of the landscape.		available in the		rises steeply to the	
	Heights			adverse impact on	which forms the western setting			2016 SHLAA		west and there are a	
				the character and	of Eastbourne. It is elevated			but has not		number of changes in	
				appearance of the	above surrounding development			been		levels. Development	
				landscape.	and is inconsistent with the			submitted for		is not considered	
				Development not	adjacent development line.			consideration		achievable on this	
				considered to be	Access likely to be detrimental to			to 2022 Call for		site.	
				achievable.	public right of way and local			Sites or since.			
					amenity.						
				l							

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
LE013	South of Mill	Falmer	Rejected	Landscape impacts	The site was previously assessed	The site is a prominent green	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	Development on the	No
	Street			on the character of	as having high sensitivity. The site	space within conservation area		site was		site is not currently	
				the settlement.	is within the Conservation area of	and is within the curtilage of a		considered		considered to be	
					Falmer. In landscape terms the	grade II listed building. Access		available in the		achievable.	
					boundary features of the	could not be achieved without		2016 SHLAA			
					curtilage to Falmer are important	the removal of an historic		but has not			
					to local distinctiveness and the	boundary feature.		been			
					site would be regarded as having			submitted for			
					high sensitivity as a result.			consideration			
								to 2022 Call for			
								Sites or since.			
								The University			
								of Sussex are			
								carrying out a			
								project on			
								pollinators on			
								the site.			
								Unclear the			
								timetable for			
								this use of the			
								land.			
			1								

		•									
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA017	Land at	Farringdon	Rejected	The site is in active	The site is assessed as having a	The site is within 250m of	No	The site is in	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	Farringdon			employment use	low landscape sensitivity given	historic landfill, is opposite a		active		indicate why	
	Mill, Gosport			and the site is not	that it is previously developed	Grade II listed building, and		employment		development on the	
	Road			considered to be	land (PDL). Redevelopment	includes Area TPOs on the		use and the		site is not achievable	
				available.	would provide an opportunity to	south, south-eastern, and south-		site is not		subject to retaining a	
					reduce visibility in the wider	western boundaries. There is a		considered to		suitable access to the	
					landscape by reducing the height	PRoW running through the site		be available.		adjacent business	
					and scale of existing buildings.	and there is potential for				park.	
						contamination due to the					
						existing and previous uses.					
						Although any potential impacts					
						arising from the above could be					
						avoided and/or mitigated					
						through land remediation and					
						careful and sympathetic design					
						and layout, the site is still in					
						active employment use. It has					
						not been demonstrated that the					
						loss of employment space would					
						be acceptable.					
				Į.							

		I	1	1				<b>r</b>			
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land south of	Farringdon	Rejected	Development on	The site has high landscape	,	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	1 '	No
	Shirnall Hill			the site is not		landfill and is in proximity to the		site was		significant works	
				considered to be	topography and its prominent	Upper Farringdon Conservation		considered		would be required to	
				achievable and	location above the historic, rural,	Area and the "Jordans" listed		available in the		achieve access.	
				would have a	and sunken lane on Shirnall Hill.	building to the east. Given the		2016 SHLAA			
				potential adverse	There are glimpsed views of the	above and the findings of the		but has not			
				impact on the	site from its immediate	landscape assessment, the site		been			
				character and	surroundings, and the site is	is not considered to be suitable		submitted for			
				appearance of the	readily visible in distanced views	for residential development.		consideration			
				landscape,	from the PRoW network to the			to 2022 Call for			
				settlement pattern	south and south-west. The site is			Sites or since.			
				and heritage assets.	not directly adjacent to the						
					defined settlement boundary,						
					but instead is located in the						
					"gap" between Lower Farringdon						
					and Upper Farringdon. The						
					former has developed around the						
					A32 transport corridor, whilst the						
					latter is of Anglo-Saxon origin						
					and is broadly delineated by the						
					Upper Farringdon Conservation						
					Area. Development within this						
					gap would coalesce two distinct						
					areas of settlement which would						
					conflict with the historic						
					settlement pattern in that the						
					separate historic areas would no						
					longer be legible in the						
					landscape.						

		•							,		
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA180	Land	Farringdon	Rejected	The site is not	The site has low landscape	The site is in the setting of the	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	between The			considered suitable	sensitivity owing to its relatively	Grade II listed Street House		being actively		indicate why	
	Cottage &			to yield 5 dwellings	flat, small-scale, and enclosed	Farmhouse which is in proximity		promoted and		development on the	
	The Wheels				nature. Development would	to the north-west. The site has		is considered		site is not achievable	
					need to front onto the A32	existing noise, and potential		available.		subject to further	
					Gosport Road and would need to	contamination, issues. Although				investigation about	
					follow the historic and simple	the site has a low landscape				an appropriate and	
					linear pattern of development	sensitivity, the site is not				safe access off the	
					rather than the more recent	considered suitable to yield 5 or				A32. Loss of trees	
					atypical development at the	more dwellings given the				along the A32	
					Shirnall Meadows Estate.	historic/typical residential				frontage may impact	
					Notwithstanding the above, any	density, the historic/typical				the appearance and	
					loss of trees along the A32	linear settlement pattern, and				character of the area,	
					frontage would have an impact	the need to retain existing trees.				which raises	
					on the appearance, biodiversity,					questions as to the	
					and character of the area. Given					site's suitability – see	
					the above and the density of					above.	
					existing development adjacent to						
					the north and south, the site is						
					not considered suitable to yield 5						
					dwellings or more.						
i İ											
		·		ļ	l		<u> </u>	!		<u> </u>	

	1			1							
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH024	Land at Chase	Fernhurst	Rejected	Development on	Medium/High Sensitivity	There is ancient woodland	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	It is not clear where a	No
	Manor Farm			the site would have	The site has medium high	within the site along the eastern		site was		safe access could be	
				a potential adverse	sensitivity due to its reference as	boundary and a Tree		considered to		achieved.	
				impact on the	an assart fieldscape, poor access	Preservation Order area on the		be available for			
				character and	and likely impacts therein and	boundary. Development on the		development			
				appearance of the	poor relationship with the	site would have a potential		at the time of			
				landscape. Impact	settlement	adverse impact on the character		the 2016			
				on ancient	pattern of Fernhurst.	and appearance of the		SHLAA,			
				woodland.		landscape.		however the			
				Development on				site has not			
				the site is not				been			
				currently				submitted to			
				considered to be				the 2022 Call			
				achievable.				for Sites. There			
								is currently no			
								evidence that			
								the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
							1	promoted for			
								development.			
								,			
I	1		1	1			I				

Cit - D - f	0 -1 -1	6-44	InI	D 1 D	11	Corta hillian Annon ann	Cuitable	A 21 - 1-2124	Available	A - l-1 l-114	Achievable
Site Ket	Address	Settlement	Prov' Recc'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Juitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Acilievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH025	Fernhurst	Fernhurst	Rejected	The site is not	Medium/High Sensitivity	Parts of the northern portion of	Yes	The site was	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	Glebe			considered to be	The site has Medium High	the site (excluding the wooded		considered to		indicate why	
				available for	sensitivity due to its relationship	area) may be suitable for		be available for		development on the	
				development.	in the southern part with the	carefully designed and laid out		development		site is not achievable.	
					conservation area and the old	development, being of medium		at the time of			
					rectory. The northern part of the	sensitivity in landscape terms.		the 2016			
					site is Medium sensitivity due to	All mature trees should be		SHLAA, but			
					the surrounding housing	retained. The southern		was not			
					development and weaker	part of the site is within the		submitted to			
					relationship with the historic	conservation area and covered		the 2022 Call			
					core of the village.	by a Tree Preservation Order		for Sites or			
						area. The site is adjacent to		since. As of			
						three grade II listed buildings.		2024, there is			
						Archaeological investigation		no evidence to			
						prior to development or during		suggest that			
						construction may be required.		the site is			
								being actively			
								promoted or is			
								still available			
								for			
								development.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	•	•		Assessment		Assessment	
CH150	Land west of	Fernhurst	Rejected	Development on	High Sensitivity	The site is adjacent to ancient	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Haslemere			the site would have	High Landscape Sensitivity due to	woodland. There is a row of		site was		indicate why	
	Road (north			a potential adverse	settlement edge being notably	mature trees through the		considered		development on the	
	of Fernhurst			impact on the	defined in this area by the public	middle of the site. Due to the		available in the		site is not achievable.	
	Primary			character and	right of way which runs along the	conclusions of the landscape		2016 SHLAA			
	School)			appearance of the	southern boundary of the site,	assessment the site is not		but has not			
				landscape.	the site is highly visible and	considered suitable for		been			
					development would be	development.		submitted for			
					detrimental to users of the public			consideration			
					right of way.			to 2022 Call for			
								Sites or since.			
								There is			
								currently no			
								evidence that			
								the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			

	1	1	1	I	T	T	la 1. 1.	I		T	1
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
AR005	Savi Maski	Findon	Rejected	Planning permission	The site was assessed in the	Since the last SHLAA was	No	Since the last	No	Since the last SHLAA	No
	Granza,			granted for a mixed	SHLAA which stated; "The site is	published permission was given		SHLAA was		was published	
	Findon Road			use including	Low Medium Sensitivity where	for a mixed use including		published		permission was given	
				residential (mobile	currently developed and	residential on the site		permission was		for a mixed use	
				home unit), now	screening can be retained. The	(SDNP/19/00360/FUL). The site		given for a		including residential	
				complete. Site not	fields to the south of the site are	was included in monitoring		mixed use		on the site	
				considered available	Medium High Sensitivity due to	which shows the new additional		including		(SDNP/19/00360/FUL	
				for development.	the poor relationship with the	mobile home was completed.		residential on		). The site was	
					settlement pattern and the			the site		included in	
					intrusion into views from the			(SDNP/19/003		monitoring which	
					surrounding public right of way.			60/FUL). The		shows the new	
					The site also contributes to the			site was		additional mobile	
					Local Gap."			included in		home was	
								monitoring		completed.	
								which shows			
								the new			
								additional			
								mobile home		,	
								was		,	
1								completed.		,	
										,	
		Į	ļ	1						<u> </u>	ь

	I	I	Τ	I	T	T	la 1. 1.			T	T
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment	•	Assessment	
AR013	Land to the	Findon	Rejected	Potential adverse	Medium/High Sensitivity due to	The site is adjacent to existing	No	There is	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Rear of Pony			impact on the	edge of downland location, poor	residential development on the		currently no		indicate why	
	Farm Training			character and	access and impact on the public	sensitive eastern side of the		evidence that		development on the	
	Stables			appearance of the	right of way which runs along the	settlement. Public right of way		the site is		site is not achievable	
				landscape	settlement edge. Views to the	(ProW) to south of site. Given		available or			
					east are sensitive from the wider	the landscape assessment, site		being actively			
					downland however a belt of	is not considered suitable for		promoted for			
					mature trees currently restricts	residential development due to		development			
					views into and out from the site.	the effect of development on		but there has			
						the character and appearance of		been recent			
					Site and neighbouring fields	the area.		planning			
					currently provide a rural edge to			activity on the			
					the built up area and setting for			site			
					the village. An appeal decision in						
					2019 found that "at a localised						
					level there would be a degree of						
					harm on the ground through the						
					loss of part of a rural landscape						
					which provides a setting for the						
					village and contributes positively						
					to its character."						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
		Findon	Rejected	Site is not	Site is considered to have High	The site comprises a Grade II		There is	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	Manor Hotel,			considered	landscape sensitivity due to the	listed building (hotel) and its		currently no		indicate why	
	High Street			available.	historic continuity and prominent			evidence that		development on the	
					position on the High Street.	composed of mature trees		the site is		site is not achievable.	
						covered by group Tree		available or			
						Preservation Order. There will		being actively			
						be constraints associated with		promoted for			
						the listed building status and		development.			
						the works required for		It is currently			
						conversion of the building,		in active use as			
						however site is in a sustainable		a hotel			
						location and is considered		business. In			
						suitable for conversion to		2022 planning			
						residential use.		permission was			
								granted for a			
								wedding			
								pergola,			
								indicating			
								continuation of			
								existing use. In			
								addition, a			
								2015 planning			
								application for			
								a substantial			
								extension to			
								the hotel (10			
								additional			
								bedrooms)			
								(subsequently			
								withdrawn).			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	1	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Open space between the High Street and the A24	Findon		Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape	High Sensitivity due to the scale and sensitive location of the site in relation to the public right of way network, mature trees and relationship with Findon Place.	The site is adjacent to listed buildings on the High Street and crossed by group Tree Preservation Order. There are public rights of way running across the site. Due to the conclusions of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable for development.		There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Steep Side, Cross Lane	Findon	Rejected	Site is not considered available.	Medium sensitivity due to existing trees and access having potential for impacts.	Site suitable for a modest number of homes, sensitive design required to ideally retain mature trees on site and maintain character of the area.		There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
AR020	Findon Towers, Cross Lane	Findon	Rejected	Site is not considered available.	Medium sensitivity due to existing trees and access having potential for impacts.	The whole site is covered by group tree preservation order (TPO) which is expected to restrict development to the centre of the site, on and around the footprint of the existing dwelling. May be suitable for extension and conversion or redevelopment		There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development'		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Well Cottage/ Priory Cottage, Crossways, Cross Lane	Findon		Site is not considered available.	Medium sensitivity due to existing trees and access having potential for impacts.	The site comprises of three large residential plots, surrounded by mature trees. The site is considered suitable for a small number of dwellings.		There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, a safe and appropriate access will need to be achieved.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
AR022	Field south of	Findon	Rejected	Development would	Landscape sensitivity is	Site is key in the setting of the	No	The site is	Yes - part	There is no reason to	Yes
	Findon			have an adverse	determined as high, a similar	Nepcote Conservation Area.		currently		indicate that	
	(Wyatts			impact on local	conclusion to the previous	Historic elements and features		available.		development on the	
	Field),			landscape character	SHLAA. The site retains many	are retained in and around the				site is not achievable.	
	Nepcote Lane			and the site is key in	features and elements that are	immediate environs of the site.					
				the setting of the	historic and is the last remaining	The landscape assessment is					
				Nepcote	open field in this part of the	determined as high. Taking all					
				Conservation Area.	village. There is a sense of	these factors into account it is					
					tranquillity in the environs of the	concluded development would					
					site in the south and east on	have an adverse impact on the					
					Nepcote including the historic	local landscape character.					
					assets on the eastern boundary.						
AR046	Former	Findon	Rejected	Planning permission	Medium Landscape sensitivity,	Greenfield site, edge of	Yes	PP	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	Soldiers Field		'	for large site area is	the existing use of the site and	settlement location with		SDNP/19/0291		indicate	
	Stables			1 -	_	pedestrian access (PRoW). Open		9/FUL is being		development of the	
				site no longer	west and south would reduce	within wider undeveloped		implemented,		site is not achievable.	
				considered to be	impact on character. Access to	landscape with no existing		site no longer			
				available.	the site, screening/boundary	screening/boundary features.		considered			
					planting and the setting of the	Ground level is somewhat		available			
					public right of way (PRoW) would	higher than surroundings.					
					need to be carefully considered	Visible from surrounding higher					
					together with the desirability of	ground. Careful					
					developing an isolated section of	landscaping/screening and					
						building design will be essential					
					_	to ensure views from PRoW and					
					•	the Downs are enhanced or					
					character (i.e. low/very low).	protected.					
					,						
			1								

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	reiection	•		l	•		·	
AR047	Atalanta and Mayland, Findon Bypass	Findon	Recc'	rejection Site is not considered	This site was assessed by the SHLAA as having medium landscape sensitivity.	The site is entirely within the defined settlement boundary, previously developed, and therefore acceptable in principle. However, question over appropriateness in terms of design and layout and impact on neighbouring properties. Plots have dwellings set back from main road. To accommodate five dwellings the set back from the main road would likely be lost. The site could come forward without the need for allocation as within the settlement boundary for Findon.	Yes	Assessment There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development. Pre-application advice was sought in 2016.	Unknown	Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development would not be achievable on this site.	Yes
	Findon Garden Centre and adjacent land to the south	Findon	Rejected	Part of site considered suitable (garden centre, car park and storage yard) but currently in commercial use and deemed unavailable within reasonable timescale.	and C4S_080 (former Allotments). Area within Savi Maski Granza considered no	Two parts of site considered suitable, the area of the existing Findon Garden Centre, car park and storage yard (see C4S_068) and the former allotments (see C4S_080). Area within Savi Maski Granza considered no longer available for development due to permission in 2019, see AR005.	part	Two part of site are available, see C4S_068 (Findon Garden Centre) and C4S_080 (former allotments). Area within Savi Maski Granza considered no longer available for development due to permission in 2019, see AR005.		Based on existing information two parts of the site are achievable, see C4S_068 (Findon Garden Centre) and C4S_080 (former allotments). Area within Savi Maski Granza considered no longer available for development due to permission in 2019, see AR005.	Yes - part

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land between Downview Rd & Stable Lane	Findon		Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	Site considered to have moderate landscape sensitivity owing to its proximity to public rights of way (PRoWs) and location in the transition area to open downland. Existing hedgerows provide some enclosure although further planting would not be characteristic of open downland.	PRoW along northern boundary and views from PRoW to the East. Site is not considered suitable as development would further extend the settlement edge into open downland having an unacceptable impact on landscape character.	No	Site is available for development.		There is no reason to indicate development of the site would not be achievable	Yes
	Land north of Nightingales	Findon	Rejected	Site is not considered available.	Site considered to have low sensitivity for landscape due to being relatively well screened from long distance views by existing boundary trees/vegetation and few if any historic features. Due to the existing boundary vegetation, development is unlikely to impact negatively on settlement edge.	Site has low landscape sensitivity and development unlikely to have negative impact on settlement edge. Considered to have potential as rural exception site notwithstanding securing suitable access.	Yes	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development'		Would need to secure western part of the garden of No.14 The Oval for the access. Further work would be needed to determine if this was feasible and viable. Aside from the access, there is no other reason to indicate that development on the site is not achievable	Yes
	Former Findon Fire Station, Horsham Road	Findon	Rejected	Site is not considered available.		Considered to have very low landscape sensitivity and within Findon settlement policy boundary.		There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		Clarification needed over whether five dwellings could be achieved given the area of the site. There is no other reason to indicate that development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address			Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land on	Fittleworth	Rejected	1	High Sensitivity	Much of site is wooded and	No	There is no	No	Access to the site	No
	Church Lane			the site would have	The site is not well connected to	there is a Local Wildlife Site		evidence the		may be difficult due	
				a potential adverse	the settlement and would extend	adjacent. The eastern half of the		site is being		to topography.	
				impact on the	it into the surrounding	site is in a Conservation Area		actively		Surrounded on two	
				character and	countryside in a visible and	and site adjacent to a Grade I		promoted or is		sides by busy roads	
				appearance of the	intrusive location. The site is	listed church. The site is		available for		(A283, B2138) to	
				landscape. The site	within the conservation area in	Registered Common Land. The		development.		which it would be	
				is Registered	part and would impact on the	site is within 5km of a Special		The site is		difficult to arrange	
				Common Land and	setting of the listed building. The	Protection Area. Due to the		Registered		access. The third side	
				is not available.	site is wooded over common and	numerous constraints and		Common Land		(Church Lane) passes	
					is sloping to the south east. The	conclusion of the landscape		(Hesworth		the Grade 1 listed	
					land is elevated above the	assessment, not suitable. In		Common) and		church, and is used	
						addition, there are a number of		not available.		for parking for church	
					the Greensand Character area.	PROW across and within the				events.	
						site. The site also includes a					
						bowling area and scout/guide					
						building which are of					
						community use.					
	Land north of	Fittleworth	Rejected	The site is an	Moderate Landscape Sensitivity			The site is	Yes	Access onto the A283	Yes
	A283 Upper			example of a	This site occupies a prominent	the existing settlement. A small		actively being		would need to be	
	Street			positive space,	l. –	part of the site is within the		promoted and		considered.	
	(Sorrel's			which contributes	adjacent to the A283 and the	conservation area. There are		is considered			
	Farm)			well to village	Serpents Trail PROW. Abutting	adjacent grade II listed		available for			
				context and sense	the conservation area, the site	buildings. Due to the landscape		development.			
				of place. The	forms part of the historic	assessment, the site is not					
				development of the	landscape pattern for which this	suitable.					
				site have a potential	character area is noted. It is a						
				adverse impact on	large site and is poorly contained						
				the character and	within the surrounding landscape						
				appearance of the	pattern and is open to the north.						
				landscape and							
				would lead to the							
				loss of a big space							
				setting to the							
				conservation area.							

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
MI001	Land at Clappers Lane	Fulking		Development would be harmful to settlement and landscape character and adversely impact views from the scarp slope.	to the high visibility of the village from the scarp slope and the proximity of destination viewpoints on the downs to the village. There is significant potential for inappropriate development to intrude on the	the settlement and is a large in	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH211	Land south of Laxton Meadow, Church Lane	Funtington		Development on the site and access to the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and heritage assets.	Moderate to high landscape sensitivity due to its location adjacent to the historic village church and within the conservation area, the site providing an openness and setting to these and transition at the edge of the settlement which is characteristic of Funtington. Access to the site is likely to impact the character of the rural lane and setting of the Church.	Not suitable given the conclusions of the landscape assessment.	No	The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.		May be achievable but more information needed to confirm regarding highways and whether a suitable access is possible, and status of section 106 requirement for agricultural use.	Uncertai n

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH177	Land at the	Funtington	Rejected	Development of the	High landscape sensitivity owing	Not suitable given the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	No reason to indicate	Yes
	Grange			site would have a	to its location in the conservation	conclusions of the landscape		site was		why site is not	
				potential adverse	area at the entrance to the	assessment.		considered		achievable.	
				impact on the	settlement where the site marks			available in the			
				character and	the change in scale from an open			2016 SHLAA			
				appearance of the	large scale agricultural landscape.			but has not			
				landscape.	The existing oak tree has			been			
					significant local amenity value.			submitted for			
					The northern part of the site is			consideration			
					marginally less sensitive as a			to 2022 Call for			
					parcel of land however it is			Sites or since.			
					located outside the South Downs			There is			
					National Park and gaining access			currently no			
					to the site would incur harm to			evidence that			
					the site and the surrounding			the site is			
					settlement character.			available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			
CH035	Land at	Graffham	Rejected	Development on	High Sensitivity	The site is adjacent to ancient	No	There is no	Unknown	Access is difficult. Site	Yes
	Popple Hill			the site would have	This is a large site which currently	woodland and in close proximity		evidence that		sits higher than road	
	Cottage			a potential adverse	forms part of the dispersed	to a Local Wildlife Site. There is		the site is		but assume it can be	
				impact on the	settlement pattern and	a public right of way along		available or		achieved.	
				character and	contributes to the experience of	western and southern		being actively			
				appearance of the	a large tract of undeveloped	boundary. Access to the site is		promoted.			
				landscape. Impact	countryside along the public right	unlikely to be adequate as is.					
				on Ancient	of way network. Road frontage	For a site of this scale access					
				Woodland. There is	would also truncate this	provision is likely to be					
				no evidence that	experience within the village.	detrimental to the surrounding					
				the site is available		rural character and would					
				or being actively		introduce incongruous					
				promoted.		urbanising influences.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection		.,		Assessment		Assessment	
	Land at Graffham (east)	Graffham	_	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.	High Sensitivity The site is High Sensitivity due to its high level of visibility from the village, public right of way and scarp slope, and its assart fieldscape status. The site opens to offer wide views of the surrounding countryside The site is increasingly sensitive towards the west where the relationship with the adjoining properties becomes weaker. Beyond the houses along the PROW and the PROW appears to be well used as there are good circular routes from the village. The scarp slope is a dominant landform.	conservation area and two grade II listed buildings. There is a public right of way running along the northern boundary. Not suitable given the conclusions of the landscape assessment.	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown		Yes
	Land to the rear of Almshouses	Graffham	Rejected	a potential adverse impact on the	Medium/High Sensitivity The site is an assart fieldscape, adjacent to distinctive listed building (Almshouses) and is not well related to the settlement. Access likely to be detrimental to local character.	The site is adjacent to the conservation area and a grade II listed building. Given conclusions of landscape assessment, not suitable.	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown	Matters regarding access would need to be considered. Due to this – the site is not considered achievable.	No

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
	714411033					January 7 183 283 111 211 2		•		•	
EA024	Land North of Longmoor Road	Greatham	Recc' Rejected	rejection Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, and part of the site is within 400m of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA.	The site is assessed as having a high landscape sensitivity. The site comprises deciduous woodland priority habitat. The woodland is contiguous with the western extremity of the Woolmer Forest SAC & SSSI to the east, which is also part of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA. The site would require tree felling which would significantly affect local amenity, the appearance and character of the area, and the enjoyment of the adjacent PROW network.	·		Assessment Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA140	EuroTec, Petersfield Road	Greatham	Rejected	The site is in active employment use and part of the site is within 400m of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA.	buildings of red brick	area is within 400m of the Wealden Heath Phase II SPA.	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	•	,		Assessment		Assessment	
CH152	Land west of	Halnaker	Rejected	Development on	existing landscape character.	The site is adjacent to the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Park Cottage			the site would have		conservation area. The site is		site was		indicate why	
				potential adverse		opposite Halnaker House a		considered		development on site	
				impact on the		grade II listed building. There is		available in the		is not achievable.	
				character and		a Scheduled Ancient Monument		2016 SHLAA			
				appearance of the		along the northern boundary		has not been			
				landscape and		and Ancient Woodland located		submitted for			
				heritage assets.		adjacent to the site (which		consideration			
						abuts the western boundary).		to 2022 Call for			
						Unsuitable due to numerous site		Sites or since.			
						constraints and conclusions of					
						the landscape assessment.					

	T	1	1	1							
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI090		Hambledon	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site has high landscape	·	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Church Lane			impact on the	sensitivity due to its elevated	Hambledon Conservation Area		being actively		indicate why	
				appearance and	position, topography, low-level	and is in proximity to several		promoted and		development on the	
				character of the	boundary vegetation, and	listed buildings, including the		is considered		site is not achievable;	
				landscape, and the	location in the setting of the	church of Sts Peter and Paul.		available.		however, access,	
				setting of heritage	Hambledon Conservation Area	Church Lane is a narrow, single-				capacity, and	
				assets.	and the listed church of Sts	track, and partly sunken lane.				potential traffic	
					Peters and Paul. The church is	Development would increase				safety issues	
					the main landmark of the village.	traffic through the conservation				associated with	
					The site is visible in glimpsed	area and to the primary school				Church Lane may	
					views from the PRoW network	and is likely to impact the rural				limit the	
					and is openly visible from the	character and appearance of the				development	
					recreation ground and Church	historic lane. Given the above				capacity.	
					Lane. The lane is a historic, single-	and the findings of the					
					track, and partly sunken lane	landscape assessment, the site					
					whose rural character would be	is not considered to be suitable.					
					impacted by built development						
					and increased traffic generation.						
					Development would be detached						
					from the defined settlement						
					boundary and would not be in						
					keeping with the distinctive						
					linear and "T-shape" form of the						
					village (which is dictated by the						
					location of the adjacent scarps),						
					nor its historic "one-deep"						
					building pattern (as identified in						
					the conservation area character						
					appraisal).						
1	I	I	1	1		I	I		1	I	

ility ent o reason to	Achievable
o reason to	
	Yes
vhy	
nent on the	
achievable.	
ll need to	
ered and	
ct on	
rees	
	crees

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection		,		Assessment		Assessment	
	Land to the east of Ockley Lane	Hassocks		Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	to the expansive views of the chalk ridge and the well-used public right of way connection to Ditchling. Extensive and wide-	the edge of the settlement. There is a public right of way which runs through the site. Due to the landscape assessment conclusions the site	No	This is part of a large site submitted through the call for sites process.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. The footpath would need to be diverted.	Yes
					open views across the site to the north and south. Views of existing church. Significant trees on road boundary. Views to the scarp slope and the chalk ridge are extensive and impressive from the public right of way (ProW) and development would significantly impinge on these views. Development would be visible from the scarp slope potentially significantly so due to the south facing slope of the site.	is not considered suitable.		Therefore, it is considered available.			
	Land west of Lodge Lane	Hassocks	Rejected	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape,	Sensitivity due to the connections to the wider countryside and the remote nature of the site. It is poorly connected to the settlement	There is a parcel of ancient woodland which abuts the site on the south-western boundary. A public right of way runs through the site. The site is not considered to be well related to the existing settlement pattern.	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown	Access dependant on development of MI003.	No

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		Assessment		Assessment	
MI008	Land east of	Hassocks	Rejected	In part. Potential	Moderate Landscape	Not suitable due to landscape	No	A smaller site	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Lodge Lane		in part	adverse impact on	Sensitivity to the eastern part of	impact and the loss of a		has been		indicate why	
	and south of			the character and	the site which is more visually	strategic gap as set out in the		submitted		development on the	
	Beacon Hurst			appearance of the	sensitive from the high ground to	NDP.		through the		site is not achievable	
				landscape.	the south than the western area			call for sites		Access points will	
					due to it's better proximity to the			exercise but		need to be	
					existing settlement pattern and			unknown if the		considered. Access to	
					retention of outer buffer areas to			larger site is		the north considered	
					the settlement edge. Poor access			available.		unsuitable.	
					and tree/hedgerow loss within						
					the site.						
MI009	23 The	Hassocks	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site has Moderate Sensitivity	Development on the whole site	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Crescent	Trassocks	Incjected		to large scale housing estate	would have a potential adverse	''	site was	Cinciowii	indicate why	
	Crescent				development owing to the	impact on the character and		considered		development on the	
				appearance of the	sensitive entrance within the	appearance of the landscape.		available in the		site is not achievable	
				landscape, access	Keymer Conservation Area	appearance or the famascape.		2016 SHLAA		otherwise the	
					together with the edge of	Update – the site is not		but has not		development could	
					settlement location, existing	considered suitable for		been		be achieved. There	
						allocation due to access		submitted for		are concerns	
					nature conservation interest	constraints and the impacts on		consideration		regarding access.	
					(SNCI) along the northern	surrounding areas of landscape		to 2022 Call for			
					boundary which is fed by the	and nature conservation and		Sites or since.			
					watercourse along the northern	value.					
					boundary.						
					,						
											1

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
MI015	Land east of	Hassocks	Rejected	Potential adverse	High sensitivity	A prominent and visible site on	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Ockley Lane			impact on the	The site has High Sensitivity due	the edge of the settlement.		being actively		indicate why	
				character and	to the expansive views of the	There is a public right of way		promoted and		development on the	
				appearance of the	chalk ridge and the well used	which runs through the site.		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.	public right of way connection to	Due to the landscape		available.		Footpath would need	
					Ditchling. Extensive and wide	assessment conclusions the site				to be diverted	
					open views across the site to the	is not considered suitable.					
					north and south. Views of						
					existing church. Significant trees						
					on road boundary.						
WO001	Land	High	Poinstad	Would extend	Sensitive landscape. Elevated site	Unsuitable as would extend	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Voc
	between	Salvington	Rejected	beyond a strong	with no northern boundary	beyond a strong settlement	l	being actively	165	indicate why	res
	Honeysuckle	Salvington		settlement edge	features – part of a large arable	ledge out into open downland.	l	promoted and		development on the	
				and detrimental to		leage out into open downland.	I	is considered		site is not achievable.	
	Lane, West				field which forms part of wider					isite is not achievable.	
	Hill and			landscape	downland landscape. Southern			available.			
	Heather Lane			character.	boundary provides a strong						
					settlement edge with mature						
					trees. Public right of ways						
					(ProW)s on east and west sides						
					meaning it is highly visible from						
					public viewpoints.						
1		1								l	1

		1		1			,		•	T	
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH262	Land at	Hill Brow	Rejected	The site is in active	The site includes two existing	The site is previously developed	No				Yes
	Vintage			employment use.	commercial units, hardstanding,	land (PDL) accessed off B2070		recently		indicate why	
	Bentley &				car parking, and one existing	London Rd. There is potential		indicated that		development on the	
	White Rose				residential bungalow. The site	for contamination due to		the site is		site is not achievable.	
	Garage				has a low landscape sensitivity	existing and previous uses. The		available for		!	
					given that it is previously	hamlet of Hill Brow includes		development.		!	
					developed land (PDL) and is	numerous care homes.		The existing		!	
					bound on all sides by twentieth	However, these tend to be		occupancy		!	
					century built development.	located further north (in the less		rate, and		!	
						dense areas of the hamlet), set		future of		!	
						back from the road, and within		existing		!	
						larger plots bounded by		businesses, on		!	
						woodland. In comparison, this		site is unclear.		!	
						site is bound by built		The SDNPA		!	
						development on all sides (incl.		would need to		!	
						adjacent employment uses) and		be satisfied		!	
						is directly adjacent to B2070		that the loss of		!	
						London Rd. The site cannot		employment		!	
						provide the level of tranquillity		land is		!	
						desired for a C2 care use. In		acceptable.		!	
						terms of C3 residential use, the				!	
						site is in active employment use				!	
						as documented during the				!	
						officer site visit in July 2023. No				!	
						evidence has been submitted to				!	
						justify the loss of employment				!	
						floorspace.					
										!	
										!	
										1	

					<del>,</del>						
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH263	Land adj.	Hill Brow	Rejected	Development on	The site has a moderate	·	No	The site is in	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Paddock			the site would have	landscape sensitivity given that	excluded as it comprises greenfield		single		indicate why	
	Lodge			a potential adverse	the protected boundary trees	land outside a defined settlement		ownership and		development on the	
				impact on the	ibi ovide oiliv giiilibsed views ovei	boundary. However, it is considered		the landowner		site is not achievable.	
				character and	the relatively flat "scrubland"	further for 100% affordable		recently			
					from the B2070 London Road.	housing. The linear hamlet of Hill		indicated that			
				''	Notwithstanding the above, the	Brow has limited facilities. The site		the site is			
				· ·	site includes priority woodland	is secluded (but not isolated) from the main core further to the south-		available for			
					· · · · · ·	west. The narrow footways are		development.			
						inconsistent and alternate between		development.			
						asphalt and dirt tracks making					
						pedestrian movements difficult					
					the site's centre.	(noting this is a 50mph road). It is					
					the site's centre.	considered to be an unsuitable					
						location for affordable housing.					
						Moreover, a dismissed appeal for a					
						large, Passivhaus dwelling (ref.					
						SDNP/21/00910/FUL) noted that by					
						infilling the centre of the site,					
						development would unduly erode					
						the openness of the area, and result					
						in a notable intensification of					
						residential development which					
						would impact on the character and					
						appearance of the area. The					
						proposal for further (but smaller)					
						dwellings would not overcome this					
						and the construction of 4-5					
						dwellings would produce a density					
						uncharacteristic to the area.					
			1	1							1

					<b>,</b>						
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA223	Land at	Hill Brow	Rejected	As submitted,	The site has a high landscape	The site is in a mineral consultation	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Heathmount,			development would	sensitivity. The site comprises	area and within 5km of the		single		indicate why	
	London Road			result in the loss of	three vacant buildings (Copper	Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA. The		ownership and		development on the	
				a non-designated	i Beeches, Silver Birch and	site comprises three vacant		the landowner		site is not achievable.	
				heritage asset and	Heathmount) on a raised plateau	buildings which were previously		recently			
				would have a	along B2070 London Road.	used for a 98-bed care home (Class C2). The site is submitted for Class		indicated that			
				potential adverse	Heathmount is a non-designated	C3 residential use, but no evidence		the site was			
				impact on the	l	has been submitted to demonstrate		available for			
				·		that C2 use (either whole or in part)		redevelopment			
					the wider wooded estate which	is not economically viable. The		ļ. '			
				landscape.	slopes down to the north-west.	linear hamlets of Rake and Hill Brow					
				'	The whole site (except for	follow B2070 London Road and					
					existing built development)	include existing development on the					
					includes dense, mature	flat raised plateau to a limited					
					deciduous woodland priority	depth from the road. As submitted,					
					habitat which connects to nearby	development would create an					
					o a ala si a al da si a mati a ma /imal CCCI	incongruous extension to the linear					
						settlements and would extend built					
					SINC, and ancient woodland).	development from the raised					
						plateau down the north-western					
						slope. The site is susceptible to					
						groundwater flooding and any					
						redevelopment would need to be					
						supported by a drainage scheme to					
						prevent flooding both on and off site. Any future redevelopment					
						should retain Heathmount and					
						consider a C2 or mixed C2/C3 use					
						focused around the existing built					
						form with any appropriate infill.					
						and a special contract in the					

Sito Pof	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Kei	Address	Settlement	Recc'		Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Juitable		Available	1	Acilievable
FA027				rejection	T : :	<del>-</del> 1		Assessment		Assessment	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Anchor	Horndean	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site is assessed as Medium/			Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Meadow,			impact on the	High Sensitivity landscape	west and is visible from the		site was		indicate why	
	east of			character and	sensitivity with Medium/high	other side of the valley. There is		considered		development on the	
	London Road			appearance of the	sensitivity in the lower part of	a public right of way running		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.	site due to connection with	along the north of the site. The		2016 SHLAA		An appropriate and	
					surrounding development and	south		but has not		safe access to site	
					high sensitivity on the higher part	western corner of the site is		been		would however need	
					of site to the east.	abuts the Conservation Area.		submitted for		to be achieved.	
						There is a Site of Importance for		consideration			
						Nature Conservation (SINC)		to 2022 Call for			
						adjacent. The south eastern		Sites or since.			
						corner of the site is adjacent to					
						a group of trees subject to a					
						Tree Preservation Order.					
						There is an area of ancient					
						woodland adjacent to the site					
						(north eastern corner).					
						,					
110011	11	11	Daiastad	Davida a a a a a a a	Manual and an all sights aids	Flood zone 2 and 3 so would not	NI -	Unknown. The	Uladaa aaaa	There is no reason to	V
	Houghton	Houghton	Rejected	Development on	Very open and visible site		_		Unknown		res
		Bridge		the site would have	adjacent to the river but	be suitable for permanent		site was		indicate why	
	Caravan Site			a potential adverse	currently occupied by caravans	residential development.		considered		development on the	
				impact on the	which have an adverse impact on			available in the		site is not achievable.	
				character and	the landscape.			2016 SHLAA			
				appearance of the				but has not			
				landscape. The site				been			
				is also located				submitted for			
				entirely within flood				consideration			
				zone 2 and 3.				to 2022 Call for			
								Sites or since.			
		L		1	1						

Site Ref	Address		Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
		Itchen Abbas	Rejected	The site is not	The site has varied landscape			The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	House, south				•	consultation area for sharp sand		being actively		indicate why	
	of B3047			to yield 5 dwellings	(comprising the existing	and gravel. There is a TPO Point		promoted and		development on the	
				or more.	dwellinghouse and its residential	in the north-eastern corner, and		is considered		site is not achievable.	
					curtilage) has moderate	the southern boundary is		available.			
					landscape sensitivity, whilst the	adjacent to a TPO Area. The site					
					south of the site (comprising the	is on the valley sides of the River					
					existing grass/paddock land) has	Itchen SAC & SSSI and is in					
					high landscape sensitivity due to	proximity to the Avington					
					its open nature and more	Conservation Area and Avington					
					apparent topography as part of	Park (Grade II*) Registered Park					
					the valley sides of the River	& Garden. Given the above and					
					Itchen SAC & SSSI. The site is	the findings of the landscape					
					bound by the PRoW network on	assessment, the site is not					
					two sides which has contributed	considered to be suitable for 5					
					to its unusual triangular shape.	net dwellings or more.					
					The site is outside the defined						
					settlement boundary, and is part						
					of the linear, scattered, and low-						
					density settlement pattern						
					evident in the west of the village.						
					This area is characterised by large						
					dwellinghouses (within generous						
					sized plots) which are generally						
					"one plot deep" and accessed off						
					the B3047. A development of 5						
					net dwellings or more would be						
					contrary to the density and						
					pattern of existing built						
					development.						

	ı	1		T	<u> </u>			T	I	T	
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI097	Land north of	Itchen Abbas	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site is assessed as having a	The site is in a mineral	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	B3047 (Site A)			impact on the	medium/high landscape	consultation area and is		site was		indicate why	
				character and	sensitivity due to its scale,	adjacent to historic landfill. The		considered		development on the	
				appearance of the	openness, and elevation on the	site is in the setting of the listed		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				landscape, and on	valley side. The site is bound by,	Abbey House and is in proximity		2016 SHLAA			
				the setting of	and is readily visible from, the	to both the River Itchen SAC and		but has not			
				heritage assets.	PRoW network on its northern	SSSI, and the Avington Park		been			
					and western boundaries. The site	(Grade II*) Registered Park and		submitted for			
					is in an area where the	Garden. Given the above and		consideration			
					settlement pattern is becoming	the findings of the landscape		to 2022 Call for			
					more dispersed into the	assessment, the site is not		Sites or since.			
					surrounding rural landscape.	considered to be suitable for					
					Moreover, development would	residential development.					
					create an incongruous eastern						
					extension to the defined						
					settlement boundary.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection	·	•		Assessment		Assessment	
WI098	Land north of	Itchen Abbas		Potential adverse	The site is assessed as having a	The site is in a mineral	No	Unknown. The		There is no reason to	Yes
	Itchen Abbas			impact on the	medium-to-high landscape	consultation area and is		site was		indicate why	
	House			character and	sensitivity. The National Park	adjacent to historic landfill		considered		development on the	
				appearance of the	boundary and its northern	under the former railway line to		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				landscape, and on	boundary follow the former	the north. The site is		2016 SHLAA			
				the setting of	railway line, with everything	surrounded on three sides by		but has not			
				heritage assets.	south considered to be part of	the PRoW network and is bound		been			
					the distinctive Itchen Valley	by the defined settlement		submitted for			
					landscape. The site is elevated on	boundary to the south and		consideration			
					the valley sides of the River	west, and by a mature tree belt		to 2022 Call for			
					Itchen, and so can be seen in	to the north. The eastern		Sites or since.			
					distant views from the higher	boundary is open to views from					
					ground to the south on the other	the wider landscape, including					
					side of the river – this includes	intervisibility with the listed					
					the Avington Conservation Area	Abbey House, whilst the					
					and Avington (Grade II*)	northern area is visible in					
					Registered Park and Garden.	distant views over the river					
					Moreover, the site is surrounded	valley due to its topography and					
					by the PRoW network on three	elevated position. Given the					
					sides and is in an area where the	above and the findings of the					
					settlement is becoming more	landscape assessment, the site					
					dispersed into the surrounding	is not considered to be suitable					
					rural landscape.	for residential development.					
15011									.,	S	
		Kingston	Rejected			There is a public right of way to	No	e site is being	Yes	Potentially	Yes
	north			to the existing	to its location on the edge of the			actively		achievable, however	
	Kingston			settlement pattern	settlement next to a major public	l <sup>-</sup>		promoted and		access to the site is	
	Ridge			and potential	• '	boundary. The site is not		is considered		along narrow lanes	
				adverse impact on	' ' '	considered to be well related to		available.		which would be	
				the character and		the existing settlement pattern.				unlikely to be	
				appearance of the	proposed access in terms of					considered suitable	
				landscape	physical change in structure and					for higher volumes of	
					character together with the					traffic.	
					impact of vehicular movements						
					on users of the public right of						
					way network and in views from						
					land to the west, including the						
					scarp slope						

Sito Pof	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Kei	Address	Settlement			Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		•	7114114114	•	
LE019		Kingston	Recc' Rejected	rejection	High sensitivity due to the scale of the site, the openness of the landscape and poor relationship with the settlement pattern.	Adjacent to the Lewes Brooks SSSI on the eastern boundary which could give rise to unacceptable impacts. Popular PRoW crosses the site. Development of site of this size and in this location would also have unacceptable impact on the landscape.	No	Assessment Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Land on Church Lane, opposite tennis courts	Kingston	Rejected	Site would have an adverse impact on the landscape. No evidence to suggest site is available or achievable.	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		Development on the site is not currently considered to be achievable. Access is off bridleway.	No
	Lewes Garden Centre, Kingston Road	Kingston	·	Does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern and potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	to the existing use being incongruous to the landscape character.	Site does not relate to the settlement pattern and any sizeable development would extend the built-up area east of the C2, which is sensitive in terms of both landscape and biodiversity.		Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Sita Raf	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site itei	Address	Settlement			Landscape Assessment	Juitability Assessment		•		•	
LE096	Land adjacent to Abergavenny Arms Public House		Recc'	rejection	High sensitivity due to the scale of the site, the openness of the landscape and poor relationship with the settlement pattern.	Adjacent to the Lewes Brooks SSSI on the eastern boundary which could give rise to unacceptable impacts. Popular PRoW crosses the site. Development of site of this size and in this location would also have unacceptable impact on the landscape. The site is a small portion of SHLAA site LE019.	No	Assessment Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Swanborough Farm, Swanborough	Kingston	Rejected	Considered unsuitable due to a lack of access to local services.	sensitivity due to its previously built status. However the site is	Displacement of existing agricultural and equine uses. No local facilities in the settlement of Swanborough.	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Jakes Acres, Wellgreen Lane	Kingston	Rejected	Existing access is considered unsuitable for development. Widening of access would involve third party agreement and potential unacceptable landscape impact.	North of site has Moderate landscape sensitivity due to its topography and relative enclosure.  South East of site has High landscape sensitivity, as the land rises and is open to views including being on sensitive southern edge of the village visible from Swanborough Hill.	The site is adjacent to Kingston Conservation Area. Given the landscape sensitivity of part of the site, only the flat land to the north is considered suitable for development.	Yes	The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.		Existing access is not suitable and would involve third party land to widen.	No

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jake Kei	Addiess	Jettiement	Recc'	rejection	Lunuscape Assessment	Juitubility Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
AD007	Hoe Court	Lancing			Land rises to the north so the	The site's unmanaged condition	No	Landowner has	Yes	No obvious viability	Yes
			1	impacts at this	southern end of the site is more	may have resulted in significant		confirmed that		issues. There is no	
				important gateway	contained with the northern end	biodiversity assets. Access		the site is		reason to indicate	
				location,	more exposed to long views.	would be via the existing private		available.		why development on	
				·	Recent developments to the	road at its southern end onto				the site is not	
				and a lack of	south of the A27 and to the A27	the A27. Whilst this is left-turn				achievable.	
				sustainable	itself have reduced the sense of	only, a new roundabout is under					
				connectivity to	remoteness and tranquillity and	construction immediately to the					
				•	the site now has increased urban	l '					
					influences compared to its	bound journeys. Pedestrian and					
					previous assessment. However,	cycle access between the site					
					this also means the site forms	and Lancing is not currently					
					part of an important transition	achievable as there is no					
					from the urban development to	footway or cycleway on the					
					the National Park.	northern side of the A27. Public					
						transport access is also					
						constrained as passengers					
						would need to cross the A27 to					
						access westbound buses and					
						there is no crossing point near					
						the site. Overall, the site is not					
						considered suitable due to					
1						landscape impacts at this					
						important gateway location,					
						potential biodiversity impacts					
						and lack of sustainable					
ı <b>İ</b>						connectivity to Lancing.					
1											

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA179	Land at	Langrish	Rejected	The site is not	Moderate Sensitivity. The site sits	The site is not well related to	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Langrish			considered to be	within a wider landscape of early	the settlement of Langrish and		being actively		indicate why	
	House			suitable due to its	enclosure fields. The site is	is in proximity with farmstead		promoted and		development on the	
				relatively isolated	relatively enclosed with limited	and cottages that sit within and		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				location.	views. The house, driveway	are characteristic of the wider		available.			
					access, walls and landscaping are	countryside in this area. The site					
					PDL land and are distinctive	is adjacent to a SINC. The site is					
					features in this location.	not considered suitable for					
						significant residential					
						development due to the					
						relatively isolated location.					
						Conversion of the existing					
						buildings could potentially be					
						achieved in accordance with					
						existing planning policy.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
								-		· ·	
	Southerham	Lewes	Recc' Rejected	rejection  Disconnected site with potential high value ecology and restricted access. No current evidence that an acceptable scheme would be achievable.	Southerham Chalk Pit is a disused chalk quarry to the south of Lewes between the A27 and the Lewes-Eastbourne railway line. Some of the site has the character of previously developed land - including the internal site access road and concrete hard standings. However, much has naturally regenerated over time which has resulted in potentially sensitive habitats. The chalk cliff to the south is a geological SSSI in favourable condition. Whilst much of the site is hidden by topography, especially at the western end, towards the east it becomes much more open to long distance views across the Ouse valley and out towards Firle Beacon. This end of the site is also more tranquil with less road noise from the A27.	Challenging site due to location, which is disconnected from the town of Lewes, potential for Open Mosaic Habitats (high value and difficult to replace), and restricted access. Would require a very high-quality and innovative scheme to overcome these challenges. No current evidence that an acceptable scheme would be achievable.		Assessment The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable albeit there is likely to be viability challenges.	Yes
	Phoenix Car Park, Harveys Way	Lewes	Rejected	Site is not available for development.	Site is considered to have moderate landscape sensitivity given its location near to the river and sensitive views to nearby heritage assets.	Site is wholly within flood zone 3. The site is also within the conservation area and is close to a number of listed buildings, including a grade I listed chapel. Likely archaeological potential. The site is in active use as a car park serving Lewes town centre and redevelopment would have to be part of an overall parking/transport strategy for the town.	Yes	The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to suitable flood mitigation measures.	Yes

Recc' Rejected	rejection The site has multiple constraints and does not relate well to the settlement, being over 800m from	although very separated from the settlement. Poor vehicular	may not be compatible with	No	Availability Assessment Unknown. The site was considered	No	Achievability Assessment Development on the site is not currently	No
Rejected	multiple constraints and does not relate well to the settlement, being	framework, well screened although very separated from the settlement. Poor vehicular	relate well to the settlement and residential development may not be compatible with		site was		•	No
	and does not relate well to the settlement, being	although very separated from the settlement. Poor vehicular	and residential development may not be compatible with				site is not currently	
	well to the settlement, being	settlement. Poor vehicular	may not be compatible with		considered			
	settlement, being						considered to be	
		access. Development of height			available in the		achievable. Access is	
	over 800m from		neighbouring uses. The site is		2016 SHLAA		not considered	
		could be visible and intrusive in	within 250m of an Historic		but has not		suitable and there	
	town facilities and	views from surrounding high	Landfill Site. It is largely within		been		are potential	
	services.	ground. Medium Landscape	flood zone 2 and partly within		submitted for		significant	
		Sensitivity.	zone 3. The site is within a Site		consideration		contamination issues.	
			of Special Scientific Interest		to 2022 Call for			
			(SSSI) Impact Risk Zone (may		Sites or since.			
			require further advice from					
			Natural England). There is					
			moderate archaeological					
			potential on the site.					
Rejected	Potential adverse	High Sensitivity The site is visually	Due to the conclusions of the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	impact on the	prominent and is an old field	landscape assessment, the site		site was		indicate why	
	character and	pattern which provides time	is not considered suitable for		considered		development on the	
	appearance of the	depth in the landscape adjacent	development. The site is within		available in the		site is not achievable	
	landscape.	to recent modern development	250m of an Historic Landfill Site.		2016 SHLAA		although access is	
			Will require pre-application		but has not		expected to require	
			archaeological assessment and		been		significant highway	
			potential for high mitigation		submitted for		improvements.	
			costs. The site is within a Site of		consideration			
			Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)		to 2022 Call for			
			Impact Risk Zone (may require		Sites or since.			
			further advice from Natural					
			England).					
	Rejected	Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the	Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  High Sensitivity The site is visually prominent and is an old field pattern which provides time depth in the landscape adjacent to recent modern development	Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape adjacent to recent modern development  Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape adjacent to recent modern development  Rejected Potential adverse impact on the site.  High Sensitivity The site is visually prominent and is an old field pattern which provides time depth in the landscape adjacent to recent modern development. The site is within 250m of an Historic Landfill Site. Will require pre-application archaeological assessment and potential for high mitigation costs. The site is within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone (may require	Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape adjacent to recent modern development  Rejected Potential adverse impact on the conclusions of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable for development. The site is within 250m of an Historic Landfill Site. Will require pre-application archaeological assessment and potential for high mitigation costs. The site is within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone (may require further advice from Natural	Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Rejected Indicate Indi	Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  High Sensitivity The site is visually prominent and is an old field pattern which provides time depth in the landscape adjacent to recent modern development  Sensitivity.  Zone 3. The site is within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone (may require further advice from Natural England). There is moderate archaeological potential on the site.  Due to the conclusions of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable for development. The site is within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone (may require further advice from Natural  Only Unknown. The site was considered available in the 250m of an Historic Landfill Site. Will require pre-application archaeological assessment and potential for high mitigation costs. The site is within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone (may require further advice from Natural	Rejected Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  High Sensitivity The site is visually pattern which provides time depth in the landscape adjacent to recent modern development  Will require pre-application archaeological assessment and potential for high mitigation costs. The site is within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone (may require further advice from Natural England). There is moderate archaeological potential on the site.  No Unknown. The site was considered available in the site was considered available in the site is not considered available in the site is not achievable although access is expected to require further advice from Natural

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
15051	Landport Club	Lawas	Recc'	rejection  Development of the	Previously developed site on	Site is located within Flood Risk	No	Assessment Unknown. The	Unknown	Assessment Unknown as costs of	Unknown
	· •	Lewes	Rejected		' '						Unknown
	and Garages,			site would have an	river flood plain considered to	Zone 3a requiring flood		site was		necessary flood	
	Landport			unacceptable	have moderate landscape	mitigation works. The site is		considered		mitigation measures	
	Road			impact on flood	sensitivity.	within 250m of an Historic		available in the		may affect the	
				risk.		Landfill Site. The site is within a		2016 SHLAA		achievability of	
						Site of Special Scientific Interest		but has not		development.	
						(SSSI) Impact Risk Zone (will		been			
						require further advice from		submitted for			
						Natural England). The site is in		consideration			
						active use as a youth club which		to 2022 Call for			
						would need to be incorporated		Sites or since.			
						into any scheme or re-provided					
						in an appropriate location, as					
						part of development scheme.					
LE054	Land at	Lewes	Rejected	Impact on	Previously developed site on	The whole site is covered by a	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Buckwell			protected trees.	river flood plain considered to	Tree Preservation Order area.		site was		indicate why	
	Court				have moderate landscape	The majority of the site is in		considered		development on the	
					sensitivity.	flood zone 2. The site is in close		available in the		site is not achievable.	
						proximity to a Site of Special		2016 SHLAA			
						Scientific Interest and is within a		but has not			
						SSSI Impact Risk Zone.		been			
								submitted for			
								consideration			
								to 2022 Call for			
								Sites or since.			
								offices of silice.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
LE059	St Mary's Social Centre, Christie Road	Lewes		Site is not	Previously developed site with low landscape sensitivity	There are protected trees along the western boundary. The site is considered suitable for development subject to appropriate re-provision or replacement of the community facility. There is unknown archaeological potential.		Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. Further investigation into potential land contamination, surface water flooding and potential noise nuisance from A275 will be required.	Yes
LE102	Land off Hayward Road / Landport Road	Lewes	Rejected	Site is not available for development.	Medium Landscape Sensitivity. The site is on the Ouse Valley sides where the landscape is sensitive to visible development rising above the valley. The site is well contained (and it's layout relates well to surrounding development) by woodland to the north and existing residential development to the south and east, which also contains the site. Whilst it is visible from several viewpoints these are seen largely against the backdrop of, or in the foreground of existing development. The relationship of the site with the listed farmhouse is important - heritage advice needed.	is surrounded by development on south/ east sides. Significant wooded area along western boundary. Open to views across/ from countryside to north.	Yes	The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for development .	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	West of Winterbourn e Hollow, west of the Gallops	Lewes	Rejected	Potential unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and potential negative impacts on recreation and wildlife.	Site has High landscape sensitivity as undeveloped countryside on the edge of the town and downs, PRoWs cross and border site, intervisibility with Kingston downs.	Part of the site in within a Local Wildlife Site. Site is within the registered Lewes Battlefield and an Archaeological notification area. PRoW running through site and immediately to the north.	No	The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	Whilst access from Hawkenbury Way requires third party land and would impact PRoWs there is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Lewes Railway Station, Eastern Car Park, Station Road	Lewes	Rejected	Site is not considered deliverable due to availability for proposed use as redevelopment would be subject to re-providing car parking provision onsite or nearby.	Site is considered to have moderate landscape sensitivity due to its visibility and nearby heritage assets.	Within Flood zone 2 and susceptible to surface water flooding. Within the Conservation Area with nearby listed buildings. Site is currently the railway station car park, and any redevelopment would be subject to re-providing the railway station car parking provision onsite or nearby.	Yes	Unknown. The site was submitted by a third party. It has not been submitted by the landowner for consideration to the 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to improving access route to the site and confirmation of third-party access rights across the site.	Yes
	Phoenix Causeway Car Park, Harvey's Way	Lewes	Rejected	No evidence that site is available for development.	Site is considered to have moderate landscape sensitivity given its location near to the river and sensitive views to nearby heritage assets.	Site is wholly within flood zone 3. The site is also within the conservation area and is close to a number of listed buildings, including a grade I listed chapel. Likely archaeological potential. The site is in active use as a car park serving Lewes town centre and redevelopment would have to be part of an overall parking/transport strategy for the town.	l	Site submitted by a third party. Landowner has confirmed site not available.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to suitable flood mitigation measures.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
	,			rejection	·			Assessment		Assessment	
	36-38 Friars Walk		Rejected	No evidence that site is available for development.	Previously developed site within the conservation area, with prominent frontage on Friars Walk considered to have Moderate landscape sensitivity.	Site is within the conservation area, the historic core of Lewes and with nearby listed buildings. Likely archaeological potential. NE corner of site and Friars Walk (access) to the north is in flood zone 2		Unknown. The site was submitted by a third party. It has not been submitted by the landowner for consideration to the 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown		Yes
	Barclays and the Old Bank, High Street	Lewes		achievable for residential use due	Site is considered to have High landscape sensitivity due to the historic continuity and prominent position on the High Street.	conservation area and historic		Unknown. The site was submitted by a third party. It has not been submitted by the landowner for consideration to the 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown	Access appears only to be from High Street / Market St – unable to provide residential parking or associated refuse/ cycle storage.	No
	Lewes District Council, Southover House, Southover Road	Lewes	1 '	No evidence that site is available for development.	Site is considered to have moderate landscape sensitivity as a prominent building in the conservation area and nearby heritage assets.	Within the conservation area and historic core of Lewes, nearby listed building feature and potential archaeological interest. Although not a listed building, as a prominent and good quality building in the conservation area, suitability will be subject to appropriate conversion of the existing building.		Landowner has confirmed site is not available for development	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection		7.00000		Assessment		Assessment	
LE138	Sackville	Lewes		No evidence that	Previously developed site	Site is in Flood zone 2, with the	Yes	Unknown. The		There is no reason to	Yes
	House,			site is available for	considered to have Low	eastern part of the site in Flood		site was		indicate why	
	Brooks Close			development.	landscape sensitivity.	Zone 3. Site is within 250m of an		submitted by a		development on the	
						Historic Landfill Site.		third party. It		site is not achievable.	
								has not been			
								submitted by			
								the landowner			
								for			
								consideration			
								to the 2022			
								Call for Sites or			
								since.			
LE140	Lewes Prison,	Ι ΔινιΔς	Rejected	Potential adverse	Site has high landscape	Grade II listed Victorian prison.	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Voc
1	1 Brighton	Lewes	1 -		sensitivity due to its scale and	TPOs along boundaries on		site was		indicate why	
	Road			and appearance of	prominence on the valley slope	Brighton Road and Neville Road.		submitted by a		development on the	
	Nodu			the landscape and	prominence on the valley slope	Large scale site adjacent to the		third party. It		site is not achievable.	
				on heritage assets.		conservation area.		has not been		site is not demevable.	
				No evidence that		001.001.101.011.01		submitted by			
				the site is available				the landowner			
				for development.				for			
								consideration			
								to the 2022			
								Call for Sites or			
								since.			
								1- 3			

Cito Pof	Address	Cattlemast	Duovi	Dravi Daggan for	I and some Assessment	Suitability Assassment	Suitable	Availability	Available	A abias ability	Achievable
Site Ket	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	1 '		Achievability	Acilievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Friars Walk	Lewes	Rejected	No evidence that	Previously developed site with	,		Unknown. The		There is no reason to	Yes
	Car Park,			site is available for	Low landscape sensitivity.	2. Site is in the conservation		site was		indicate why	
	Court Road			development.		area and has likely		submitted by a		development on the	
						archaeological potential. The		third party. It		site is not achievable.	
						site is in active use as a car park		has not been			
						with public toilets and changing		submitted by			
						facilities serving Lewes town		the landowner			
						centre and redevelopment		for			
						would have to be part of an		consideration			
						overall parking/ transport		to the 2022			
						strategy for the town.		Call for Sites or			
								since.			
								Siriec.			
LE169	The Course	Lewes	Rejected	Development of the	Previously developed site with	Site is wholly within flood zone	No	The site is	Yes	Costs of necessary	Unknown
	Garage Site			site would have an	low landscape sensitivity	3 and historically flooded area.		being actively		flood mitigation	
				unacceptable	,	Site is within the conservation	l	promoted and		measures may affect	
				impact on flood		area.		is considered		the achievability of	
				risk.		urcu.		available.		development.	
				IIISK.				available.		development.	
15470				5					.,		.,
		Lewes	Rejected	_	High sensitivity	'	No	The site is	Yes		Yes
	the Pells			impact on		Malling Deanery Conservation	l	being actively		indicate why	
	(north of			Conservation Area		Area and woodland character.		promoted and		development on the	
	R.Ouse)			and woodland				is considered		site is not achievable.	
				character.				available.			

Cito Dof	A d d u o o o	Cattlamast	Duord	Duoyi Bosson for	Landsons Assessment	Cuitabilitu Assassment	Suitable	Availability	Available	A chi ava hilitu	Achievable
Site Ket	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Juitable	1		Achievability	Acilievable
EA214	Land south	Liphook	Recc'	rejection The site does not	The site has a very high	The site is within 5km of the	No	Assessment The landowner		Assessment The three proposed	No
	west of	Lipilook	Rejecteu	relate well to the	landscape sensitivity given its	Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA	INO	recently	l		INO
					l ' -			1 '		access points are all	
	Gunns Farm			_		and is surrounded by deciduous		indicated that		narrow and	
				pattern.	' ' '	woodland and lowland		the site is		unsuitable – both	
				1	_	heathland priority habitats to		available for		individually and in	
					from the west which are	the east, south, and west. The		development.		combination - to	
				considered to be	currently rural and largely	site is also surrounded by the				accommodate the	
				achievable and,	unaffected by views of Liphook.	PRoW network (incl. the				development	
				even if this could be	The site does not relate well to	Serpent Trail) and is located				quantum proposed.	
				overcome,	the existing settlement pattern,	between two registered parks					
				development on the	and development would	and gardens. The PRoW					
				site would have a	negatively impact on the rural	network crosses through the					
				potential adverse	character of the area.	site (east-west) and effectively					
				impact on the	Development would create a	divides the site into two distinct					
				character and	large-scale, incongruous, and	land parcels via a historic and					
				appearance of the	isolated extension to the south-	sunken byway which connects					
				landscape.	west of Liphook on the southern	Midhurst Road and B2070					
				·	side of the railway line.	Portsmouth Road. The site is					
					,	adjacent to, and readily visible					
						from, the railway line which is					
						also a source of noise					
						disturbance and contamination.					
						Given the above and the					
						findings of the landscape					
						assessment, the site is not					
						I					
						considered to be suitable for					
						development.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA040	Land north of	Liss	Rejected	The site does not	The site has a high landscape	The site is in the Wealden Heath	No	The site is in	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Hill Brow			relate well to the	sensitivity due to its large scale,	Phase II SPA 5km buffer. The site		single		indicate why	
	Road, west of			existing settlement	assart fieldscape context, and	is adjacent to (and in the setting		ownership and		development on the	
	Woodlands			pattern, and	surrounding historic and sunken	of) Clarks Farm and Pigs Lane.		the landowner		site is not achievable.	
	Lane, and			development on the	routes, which all contribute to	The former is Grade II listed		recently		However, there is	
	south of			site would have a	the secluded and rural character	whilst the latter is of special		indicated that		concern regarding	
	Huntsbottom			potential adverse	of the area. The site is above the	character worthy of		the site is		highway capacity,	
	Lane.			impact on the	75m contour, and the area is	preservation. The site is poorly		available for		and the potential	
				character and	seen as a valuable local gap	connected (both physically and		development.		impact on the	
				appearance of the	which helps to prevent the	visually) to Liss Village, and				historic and rural	
				landscape.	coalescence of Liss Village and	development would create an				character, of	
					Hill Brow. The site promoter has	incongruous eastern extension				surrounding roads.	
					proposed a 50/50 split whereby	to the nucleated village pattern.					
					built development could be sited	Given the above and the					
					on the lower northern area,	findings of the landscape					
					allowing the higher southern	assessment, the site is not					
					area to be used for POS / SANG.	considered to be suitable for					
					Despite the above, it is	built development.					
					considered that development of						
					any kind would extend the village						
					into open countryside, in an						
					isolated manner, creating an						
					incongruous eastern extension.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	,		Assessment		Assessment	
EA041	Land at	Liss	Rejected	The site does not	The site has a high landscape	The site is in the Wealden Heath	No	The site is in	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Hilliers			relate well to the	sensitivity. The site is in a	Phase II SPA 5km buffer. The site		single		indicate why	
	Nurseries,			existing settlement	prominent undeveloped area, is	is physically detached from the		ownership. The		development on the	
	west of			pattern and	(in some places) raised above the	settlement boundary and		landowner		site is not achievable.	
	Longhill			development on	road, is on the opposite side of	development would create an		previously		However, Highway	
	Cottage, Hill			site would have a	the road compared to the	incongruous southern extension		indicated that		Authority input	
	Brow Road			potential adverse	existing settlement, and is above	to the nucleated village pattern		the site would		would be required	
				impact on the	the 75m contour. The site is	of Liss. Given the above and the		be available for		given the proximity	
				character and	detached and has a poor	findings of the landscape		development.		of, and vehicular	
				appearance of the	relationship with the settlement	assessment, the site is not		However there		movements	
				landscape.	pattern and is highly visible in	considered to be suitable for		is currently no		associated with, Liss	
					distant views of Liss given that it	development.		evidence that		Primary School.	
					is part of an elevated, larger			the site is			
					fieldscape on a north-west facing			available or			
					slope. Moreover, access to the			being actively			
					site would create openings			promoted for			
					through which to view			development.			
					development and would be						
					detrimental to landscape						
					character.						

[at. a d		I	I	l- 1- 4	T	Ta	6 11-1-1			I	A -1-11-1
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA042	Hilliers	Liss	Rejected	The site does not	High landscape sensitivity. The	The site is in the Wealden Heath	No	There is no	No	The eastern area is	Yes
	Nurseries -			relate well to the	site is in a prominent	Phase II SPA 5km buffer. The site		evidence that		raised above, whilst	
	Land west of			existing settlement	undeveloped area, is (in some	is physically detached from the		the site was		the western area is of	
	Hangery &			pattern and	places) raised above the road, is	settlement boundary and is not		available or		a similar level to, Hill	
	Hill Brow			development on	on the opposite side of the road	considered to be well related to		being actively		Brow Road. A safe	
	Road			site would have a	compared to the existing	the settlement. Given the above		promoted for		access would need to	
				potential adverse	settlement, and is above the 75m	and the findings of the		development.		be created at the	
				impact on the	contour. The site is detached and	landscape assessment, the site				north-western end of	
				character and	has a poor relationship with	is not considered to be suitable				the site. There is no	
				appearance of the	settlement pattern and is highly	for development.				other reason to	
				landscape. There is	visible in distant views of Liss					indicate why	
				also no evidence	given that it is part of an					development on the	
				that the site is	elevated, larger fieldscape on a					site could not be	
				available or being	north-west facing slope.					achieved.	
				actively promoted.	Moreover, access to the site						
					would create openings through						
					which to view development and						
					would be detrimental to						
					landscape character.						
					·						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Availability		Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA142	Land at Hatch	Liss	Rejected	Development on	The site has a high landscape	The site is in the Wealden Heath	No	There is	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Lane			the site would have	sensitivity. The site is within a	Phase II SPA 5km buffer. The site		currently no		indicate why	
				an adverse impact	large tract of assart fieldscapes	is poorly connected (both		evidence that		development on the	
				on the character	and is bound by priority	physically and visually) to Liss		the site is		site is not achievable.	
				and appearance of	woodland habitat. The site is	Village and development would		available or			
				the landscape.	distinctive of its landscape	create an incongruous eastern		actively being			
					character area and forms an	extension to the nucleated		promoted at			
					important visual gap between	village pattern. Given the above		this time.			
					the edge of Liss, the wooded	and the findings of the					
					slopes of the Greensand Hill, and	landscape assessment, the site					
					the dispersed settlement of Hill	is not considered to be suitable					
					Brow. The site is visible from	for development.					
					Hatch Lane and contributes to						
					the rural character of the area.						
					Moreover, development would						
					extend the village into open						
					countryside, in an isolated						
					manner, creating an incongruous						
					eastern extension.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Kei	Address	Settlement	Recc'	rejection	Lanuscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Juitubic	Assessment	/ trailable	Assessment	/ tellic value
EA158	Land at Rake	Liss		Development on	Medium/high landscape	The site is in the Wealden Heath	No	The site is in	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Road		-,	site would have a	sensitivity. The site is part of a	Phase II SPA 5km buffer. The site		single		indicate why	
				potential adverse		is accessed via a rural, sunken		ownership.		development on the	
				impact on the	mature wooded field boundaries.	lane with banked and hedged		Unknown. The		site is not achievable.	
				character and	The site slopes down from the	edges. The site is adjacent to a		site was			
				appearance of the	road. The rear of the site	large dwelling to the south-west		considered			
				landscape.	comprises uncultivated land	and there are further larger		available in the			
					associated with a watercourse /	dwellings to the north-east. The		2016 SHLAA			
					spring and is also part of the	existing dwellings form a		however it has			
					Wyld Green Woodland SINC. The	dispersed pattern and a highly		not been			
					site is visible from the field	filtered settlement edge.		submitted for			
					entrance off Rake Road, but	Development would need to be		consideration			
					otherwise public views are	sited close to Rake Road.		to 2022 Call for			
					limited due to heights of existing	However, this is above the 75m		Sites or since.			
					banks and vegetation, and views	contour and development of		There is			
					from the Greensand Hills are	any depth would be inconsistent		currently no			
					largely shielded by woodland.	with the surrounding character		evidence to			
					Development would have a	and settlement pattern of large		indicate the			
					detrimental impact on the	dwellings on generous plot		site is available			
					increasingly rural character of the	sizes. Given the above and the		or being			
					wider landscape.	findings of the landscape		actively			
						assessment, the site is not		promoted for			
						considered to be suitable.		development.			
											1

Site veil	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA104	Holly Wood,	Liss Forest	Rejected	Development on	High landscape sensitivity. The	The site is in the Wealden	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Liss Forest			the site would have	site includes protected trees [refs	Heaths Phase II SPA 5km buffer.		site was		indicate why	
				a potential impact	(EH467)02, (EH548)03 and	The site comprises a large house		considered		development on the	
				on protected trees,	(EH574)04] and is in proximity to	and its garden land, to the west		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				and a potential	Longmore Inclosure SSSI which	of two residential properties off		2016 SHLAA			
				adverse impact on	forms part of the Wealden	Forest Road. The site is within		however the			
				the character and	Heaths Phase II SPA. The site is	an area of woodland that forms		site has not			
				appearance of the	within an area of woodland that	part of the former Longmoor		been			
				landscape.	forms part of the former	railway line which is now a		submitted for			
					Longmoor railway line which is	PRoW (Shipwrights' Way), LNR		consideration			
					now a PRoW (Shipwrights' Way),	and SINC. The entrance and		to 2022 Call for			
					LNR and SINC. Development of	frontage of the site is set within		Sites or since.			
					the whole site would be	a line of large trees and		There is			
					detrimental to the landscape	hedgerows, and there are		currently no			
					character of the adjacent PRoW,	mature trees visible from within		evidence that			
					LNR and SINC. The eastern part	the site. The site contains a		the site is			
					of the site relates more to Forest	number of protected trees,		available or			
					Road and is slightly less sensitive	including an Area TPO in the		being actively			
					due to surrounding residential	western third of the site. Given		promoted for			
					character.	the above and the findings of		development.			
						the landscape assessment, the					
i l						site is not considered to be					
i l						suitable.					
i l											

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	<u> </u>		Assessment		Assessment	
	Land east of Oak Cottage, Forest Road	Liss Forest		Development on the site would result in the loss of priority woodland habitat and would have an adverse impact on the	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity given that its relatively flat and contained by existing priority woodland habitat. The existing trees make a strong contribution to local landscape character, especially when viewed from Forest Road. Any loss of trees to facilitate development would impact on biodiversity, and on the appearance and character of the area.	consultation area and comprises priority woodland habitat. The site is in the Wealden Heath		The site is in multiple ownership. The majority landowner has recently indicated that the site is available for development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Land north and west of Lodsworth Recreation Ground	Lodsworth	Rejected		The site is of moderate landscape sensitivity. It is disconnected from Lodsworth village by the recreation ground and pavilion which form a clear edge to the settlement. Development of this site would extend the settlement significantly west and have a negative impact on the nucleated settlement pattern.	given the extensive scale of the site including in relation to the settlement, it disconnected nature and that there does not appear to be any logical means of sub-dividing the site for a smaller scale development to be		The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH214		Lodsworth	Rejected	Development on	The site is of moderate to high		No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	The Street,			the site would have	1	on a narrow track that is highly		being actively		indicate why	
	Lodsworth			a potential adverse	<u>'</u>	characteristic of Lodsworth and		promoted and		development on the	
				impact on the	site and its contribution to the	currently supports a small		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				character and	setting of Lodsworth village,	number of existing homes.		available.			
				appearance of the	particularly approaching from	Alternative access from the					
				landscape and	the south. Development of this	Street would be difficult to					
				settlement pattern.	site would extend the settlement	achieve sensitively and without					
					significantly south and have a	impact to landscape character					
					negative impact on the nucleated	due to topography. Not suitable					
					settlement pattern.	given the conclusions of the					
						landscape assessment and					
						impacts of access to the site.					
CH046	Land off Pook	Mid Lavant	Rejected	Development on	High Sensitivity. High Sensitivity	There are listed buildings	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Lane, Lower	and East		the site would have	due to size of site and location on	adjacent and in close proximity		being actively		indicate why	
	Road Lavant /	Lavant		a potential adverse	rising ground to south of village	to the site. Part of the site is		promoted and		development on the	
	Parkers			impact on the	which would compromise the	adjacent and partly within the		is considered		site is not achievable.	
	Stables.			character and	setting of the village and the	conservation area. There is a		to be available.			
				appearance of the	conservation area.	scheduled ancient monument					
				landscape.		adjacent to the site (to the					
				Development on		north). There is a Local Wildlife					
				the site would have		Site in close proximity (to the					
				a potential adverse		north). Access along Lower Road					
				impact on heritage		/ Pook Lane are narrow and of					
				assets.		rural character, improvements					
						to access to facilitate					
						development of the site would					
						not be suitable due to a likely					
						suburbanising effect.					

CIIO47   West Lavant   Mid Lavant   Rejected   Development on the size would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.   Provided in the service of the service	Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
High Sensitivity, High Sensitivity (High Sensitivity (High Sensitivity (High Sensitivity)									l -		-	
Field / Land at New 2   Lawarat	CH047	West Lavant	Mid Lavant			High Sensitivity, High Sensitivity	The site is adjacent to a	No		Unknown		Yes
west of centurion way and south of the primary school should be available.  West of centurion way and south of the primary school should be available.  West of character and speciarized to be available.  West of character and speciarized to be available.  West of character and speciarized to be available.  West of character and speciarized to be available.  West of character and speciarized to be available.  West of character and speciarized to be available.  West of character and speciarized to be available to the primary school would have significant negative landscape impacts. Access from the A286 would be more appropriate in landscape terms and in relationship to the village. This area is identified as Local Community Space in the Lavant NDP.  CH048 Land at Rejected Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  CH048 Land at lavant Book and East Lavant Book and East Lavant Book and Space and East Lavant Book and East Lavant Book and Space and East Lavant Book and East Lavant Book and Space and East Lavant Book and East Lavant Book and East Lavant Book and East Lavant Book and Space and East Lavant Book and East Lavant				'	<u> </u>	, , ,	-					
centurion way and south of the primary and south of the primary school  CHO48  Land at Fordwater Road Road  Lavant  CHO48  Land at Road  Fordwater Road  Road  CHO48  Land at Fordwater and appearance of the late the wite would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would be more appropriate in part of the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the protection of the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would be more appropriate in part of the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the protection of the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the protection of the site would have a potential adverse impact on the protection of the site would have a potential adverse impact on the protection of the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  CHO48  Land at Fordwater and appearance of the site is with the conservation area and there are would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site is a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the si					a potential adverse	impacting widely on village	_				=	
way and south of the primary school should have scaled and appearance of the primary school should have school should have significant negative however access from the A256 would be more apprairate in and East Lavant Road and East Lavant Service on the site would have appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the site would have appearance of the landscape.  We would have appearance of the site is within Skm of a Special Protection Area. The northeast area of the site is submitted to the site has not however access from the A256 would be more appriate in area is identified as local community Space in the Lavant had a made appearance of the site would have appearance of the landscape.  We would have a significant negative landscape impacts. Access from the A256 would be more appriate in area is identified as local access is required.  The site is within Skm of a Special Protection Area. The site is within Skm of a Special Protection Area. The site is within Skm of a Special Protection Area. The site is within Skm of a Special Protection Area. The site is within Skm of a Special Protection Area. The site is within Skm of a Special Protection Area. The site is within Skm of a Special Protection Area. The site is within Skm of a Special Protection Area. The site is the site is being actively promoted or is available for development.					•		1		be available for			
south of the primary school  s		way and			1	•			development		However alternative	
primary school  I and stage. The site is not considered to be available.  I and at Fordwater Road  Lavant  Mid Lavant  Fordwater  Road  A mid Lavant  The site is within 5km of a Special Protection Area. The northeast area of the site, east of the school may be suitable on the west of Lavant school would have significant negative landscape impacts. Access from the A286 would be more appropriate in landscape terms and in relationship to the village. This area is identified as Local Community Space in the Lavant  No. D.  CHO48 Land at Fordwater  Road  A mid Lavant  A mid L		· ·									suitable access is	
School   Second Protection Area. The northeast area of the site, east of the school may be suitable however access from the west of the school would have significant negative landscape impacts. Access from the A286 would be more appropriate in landscape terms and in relationship to the village. This area is identified as Local Community Space in the Lavant NDP.    CH048   Land at Fordwater   Road   Lavant Road   Rejected Development on the site would have impact and East a potential adverse impact on the scape impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.   Second Protection Area. The northeast area of the site, east of the school would have asset in the scape impact on the scape impact on the scape impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.   Second Protection Area. The northeast area of the site, site, site, site is within the conservation area and there are two gradel listed buildings and some protection area and there are two gradel listed buildings and some protection area and there are two gradel listed buildings and some protection area and the site was considered available in the site is not achievable.   Second Protection Area. The note were the site is not achievable.   Second Protection Area. The note were the site is not achievable and the protection area and there are two gradel listed buildings and some protection area and there are two gradel listed buildings and some protection area and there are two gradel listed buildings and some protection area and the protection area and there are two gradel listed buildings and some protection area and there are two gradel listed buildings and some protection area and there are two gradel listed buildings and some protection area and the protection area and there are two gradel listed buildings and some protection area and there ar		primary			landscape. The site	,			the 2016		required.	
of the school may be suitable however access from the west of Lavant school would have significant negative landscape impacts. Asserting the promoted or available for development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the stew would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse important to conserve and official site of the conservation area and there are two grade illisted buildings and grade listed church in close development of the site is not achievable. The site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation for to development or during construction may be required.  The site is within into corner and there are two grade illisted buildings and grade listed church in close considered appearance of the site is not achievable. The site is within into conserve and there are two grade illisted buildings and grade listed church in close considered available in the development or the site is not achievable. The site i	1				is not considered to				SHLAA,			
however access from the west of Lavant school would have significant negative landscape impacts. Access from the A286 would be me appropriate in landscape terms and in relationship to the village. This area is identified as Local Community Space in the Lavant NDP.  CHO48 Land at Fordwater Road at Lavant Rejected Development on the site would have appearance of the impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse a potential adverse a potential adverse impact on the site would have a potential adverse a potential adverse important to conserve and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse important to conserve and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse important to conserve and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse important to conserve and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse important to conserve and development on the site would have a potential adverse important to conserve and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse important to conserve and a potential adverse important to conserve and a potential adverse important to conserve and a potential adverse important to conserve and appearance of the landscape. Unknown There is no reason to Yes indicate why development on the site was considered available in the site is within flood zone 2 (south-with inclose of the conserve and the read of the conserve and the read of the conserve and the read of the conserve and the read of the conserve and the read of the conserve and the read of the conserve and the read of the conserve and the read of the conserve and the read of the conserve and the read of the site is being actively promoted or is available for development.					be available.		northeast area of the site, east		however the			
of Lavant school would have significant negative landscape impacts. Sees from the A286 would be more appropriate in landscape terms and in relationship to the village. This area is identified as Local Community Space in the Lavant NDP.  CH048 Land at Fordwater Road at Lavant Lavant Rejected Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the high and scape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on her landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on her landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on her landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on her landscape. The site is within the conservation area and there are due to its prominent location and papearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  OMII Lavant Rejected Development on the site would have important to the settlement and has an impact on the conservation area and there are due to its prominent location and read reduct to its prominent location and papearance of the landscape. Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development.  OMII Lavant Rejected Development on the site is within the conservation area and there are due to its prominent location and read reduct to its prominent location and papearance of the landscape. Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and the conservation area and there are to suburility. A small part of the site was considered advention and the site was considered advention and the site was considered advention and the site was considered advention and the site was considered advention and the site was considered advention and the site was considered advention and the site was considered advention. A state of the site was considered advention and the reductive that the site was considered advention							of the school may be suitable		site has not			
Significant negative landscape impacts. Access from the A286 would be more appropriate in landscape terms and in relationship to the village. This area is identified as Local Community Space in the Lavant NDP.  CH048 Land at Fordwater Road Lavant Road  ELavant Road  Mild Lavant And East Lavant Road  Elavant Road  Mild Lavant Road  Mil							however access from the west		been			
impacts. Access from the A286 would be more appropriate in landscape terms and in relationship to the village. This area is identified as Local Community Space in the Lavant NDP.  CH048 Land at Fordwater Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Lavant Road Road Lavant Road Road Lavant Road Road Lavant Road Road Road Road Road Road Road Road							of Lavant school would have		submitted to			
Would be more appropriate in landscape terms and in relationship to the village. This area is identified as Local Community Space in the Lavant NDP.  High Sensitivity, The site is frontwater Road  Lavant  Road  Lavant  Mid Lavant Road  Lavant  Mid Lavant Road  Lavant  Mid Lavant Road  Lavant  Mid Lavant Road  Lavant  Mid Lavant Road  Lavant  Mid Lavant And East Lavant  Mid Lavant And East Lavant  Mid Lavant And East Lavant  Mid Lavant And East Lavant  Mid Lavant And East Lavant  Mid Lavant And East Lavant  Mid Lavant And East And East Lavant  Mid Lavant And East And East Lavant  Mid Lavant And East And East And East Lavant  Mid Lavant And East							significant negative landscape		the 2022 Call			
CH048 Land at Fordwater Road Lavant Portect from suburban infill development on the site would have a potential adverse limpact on the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse limpact on the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse limpact on the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse limpact on the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse limpact on the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse limpact on the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse limpact on the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse limpact on the site would have a potential adverse limpact on heritage assets.  Indicate why development on the site within flood zone 2 (southwester considered available in the 2016 SHLAA, bits is within flood zone 2 (southwester) the site is within flood zone 2 (southwester) the site is within flood zone 2 (southwester) the site is within flood zone 2 (southwester) the site is within flood zone 2 (southwester) the site is within flood zone 2 (southwester) the site is within flood zone 2 (southwester) the site is within flood zone 2 (southwester) the site is within flood zone 2 (southwester) the site is within the conservation area and there are though a data buildings and distinctive features.  Views alloadenance the site is being actively promoted or available for development.							impacts. Access from the A286		for Sites or			
CH048 Land at Fordwater Road  Lavant  Mid Lavant Rejected and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  Rejected Abractace and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  Rejected Development on the settlement and East Lavant  High Sensitivity. The site is community Space in the Lavant NDP.  The site is within the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close proximity. A small part of the site was considered available in the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  Rejected Development on the settlement and has an impact on the fabric of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close proximity. A small part of the site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Sevidence the site is being actively promoted or available for development on the site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA, but has not been submitted to the 2022 Call for Sites. There is currently no evidence the site is being actively promoted or is available for development.							would be more appropriate in		since. There is			
CH048 Land at Fordwater Road  Lavant  Rejected Development on the site would have impact on the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the rist ge assets.  Rejected Development on the stite would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  Rejected Development on the stite would have a potential adverse impact on the simpact on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  Rejected Development on the site would have a potential adverse important to the settlement fabric of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed church in close proximity. A small part of the site is within flood zone 2 (south west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Site is being actively promoted or available for development on the site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA, but has not been submitted to the 2022 Call for Sites. There is currently no evidence the site is being actively promoted or is available for development.							landscape terms and in		currently no			
CH048 Land at Fordwater Road  Amount Fordwate							relationship to the village. This		evidence the			
CH048 Land at Fordwater Road Lavant Rejected Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  NDP.  The site is within the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close proximity. A small part of the site is within flood zone 2 (southwest considered available in the site is not achievable. 2016 SHLAA, but has not been submitted to the development or diversiting timestigation prior to development or dring construction may be required.  The site is within the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close proximity. A small part of the site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  The site is within the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and considered available in the site is not achievable. 2016 SHLAA, but has not been submitted to the 2022 Call for Sites. There is currently no evidence the site is being actively promoted or is available for development.							area is identified as Local		site is being			
CH048 Land at Fordwater Road Rejected Lavant Rejected a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  High Sensitivity. The site is important to the settlement on the stetlement on the fabric of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close diversity. A small part of the site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  High Sensitivity. The site is important to the settlement pattern and has an impact on the fabric of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close distinctive features.  Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.  Stein is within the conservation area and there are two grade II listed church in close doubt oldings and Grade I listed church in close doubt of the site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Stein is within the conservation area and there are two grade II listed church in close doubt oldings and Grade I listed church in close doubt oldings and Grade I listed church in close doubt of the site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.							Community Space in the Lavant		actively			
CH048 Land at Fordwater Road  Mid Lavant  Mid Lavant  Amod  Mid Lavant  Amod  Mid Lavant  Amod  Mid Lavant  Mid Lavant  Amod							NDP.		promoted or			
the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage and the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage and the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of south the stite is within flood zone 2 (south west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or the site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA, site is within flood zone 2 (south west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or the site is within flood zone 2 (south west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or the site is within flood zone 2 (south west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or the site is within flood zone 2 (south west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or the site is within flood zone 2 (south west c									available for			
the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage and the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage and the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of the conservation area and there are two grade II listed buildings and Grade I listed church in close of south the stite is within flood zone 2 (south west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or the site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA, site is within flood zone 2 (south west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or the site is within flood zone 2 (south west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or the site is within flood zone 2 (south west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or the site is within flood zone 2 (south west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or the site is within flood zone 2 (south west c	CH048	Land at	Mid Lavant	Rejected	Develonment on	High Sensitivity The site is	The site is within the	No	Unknown The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
Road  Lavant  a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  b pattern and has an impact on the fabric of the conservation area due to its prominent location and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  b pattern and has an impact on the fabric of the conservation area due to its prominent location and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  b wost corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  considered available in the 2016 SHLAA, but has not been submitted to development or during construction may be required.  considered available in the 2016 SHLAA, but has not been submitted to development or during construction may be required.  considered available in the 2016 SHLAA, but has not been submitted to development or during construction may be required.				Nejected		,				Onknown		
impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  Impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  Impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  Impact on the conservation area due to its prominent location and appearance of the landscape.  Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.  Impact on the character and appearance of the distinctive features. Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development.  Impact on the conservation area due to its prominent location and sistinctive features. Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.  Impact on the conservation area due to its prominent location and sistinctive features. Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.  Impact on the conservation in close proximity. A small part of the site is within flood zone 2 (south-west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Impact on the conservation and sistinctive factors in the conservation in the 2016 SHLAA, but has not been suburban in the 2016 SHLAA, but has not been conservation for the site is within flood zone 2 (south-west corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.						·					=	
character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  diversaling fordwater Road are important to conserve and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  diversaling fordwater Road are important to conserve and the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  diversaling for Sites. There is currently no evidence the site is being actively promoted or is available for development.					_ ·		_ =				=	
appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  distinctive features. Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development.  site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  site is within flood zone 2 (southwest corner). Archaeological investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.					l '							
landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development.  Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.  Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.  Views along Fordwater Road are important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.  See Important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.  See Important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.  See Important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.  See Important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.					appearance of the	•	1		1			
Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  Important to conserve and protect from suburban infill development or during construction may be required.  Investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.  Investigation prior to development or during construction may be required.						Views along Fordwater Road are	-					
the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on development or during construction may be required.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  The site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.					•	_	· =		submitted to			
a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.  development.  construction may be required.  for Sites. There is currently no evidence the site is being actively promoted or is available for development.					· ·	•			the 2022 Call			
impact on heritage assets.  is currently no evidence the site is being actively promoted or is available for development.						development.						
assets.  evidence the site is being actively promoted or is available for development.					1 '	·	, .		is currently no			
actively promoted or is available for development.												
promoted or is available for development.									site is being			
promoted or is available for development.									_			
development.									I			
									available for			
									development.			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						DI	b2					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH049	Land east of	Mid Lavant	Rejected	Development on	High Sensitivity. High Sensitivity	Parts of the site is within flood	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Churchmead	and East		the site would have	due to the expansion of built	zone 2 (north) and flood zone 3		site was		indicate why	
	Close	Lavant		a potential adverse	form into the river valley floor,	(eastern boundary). The site is		considered to		development on the	
				impact on the	this would be inconsistent with	adjacent to a conservation area.		be available for		site is not achievable.	
				character and	the existing development line of	There are three grade II listed		development			
				appearance of the	the Centurion Way	buildings adjacent to the site (to		at the time of			
				landscape.	which is a well chosen line.	the south).		the 2016			
								SHLAA,			
								however the			
								site has not			
								been			
								submitted to			
								the 2022 Call			
								for Sites or			
								since. There is			
								currently no			
								evidence the			
								site is being			
								actively			
								promoted or is			
								available for			
								development.			
CH054	Land north of		Rejected	1 '	High Sensitivity. High Sensitivity	The eastern third of the site is	No	The site is not	No	There is no reason to	Yes
		and East			due to exposed, flat settlement	within flood zone 2. The site is		being		indicate why	
	Road	Lavant		a potential adverse	edge location with no	within 5km of a Special		promoted for		development on the	
				impact on the	surrounding structure in which to	Protection Area.		development		site is not achievable.	
				character and	host development. Views from			and is not			
				appearance of the	the Trundle and surrounding			considered to			
				landscape. The site	public right of way would be			be available.			
				is not considered to	affected by the intrusion of this						
				be available.	site beyond the existing edge.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
	_	- 1	Recc'	rejection	•	,		Assessment		Assessment	
CH057	Land forming	Mid Lavant		Development on	High Sensitivity due to the	The site is wholly within flood	No			There is no reason to	Yes
	part of Staple			[ ·	expansion of built form into the	zone 2 and the northern half of		site was		indicate why	
	House Farm,	Lavant		a potential adverse	river valley floor which would be	the site is within flood zone 3.		considered to		development on the	
	Land east of			impact on the	inconsistent with the	There is a public right of way		be available for		site is not achievable.	
	Mid Lavant			character and	surrounding settlement pattern	along the eastern edge of the		development			
				appearance of the	and introduce	site.		at the time of			
				landscape. Flood	urbanising elements into an			the 2016			
				risk.	otherwise undeveloped			SHLAA, the site			
					landscape feature.			has not been			
								submitted to			
								the 2022 Call			
								for Sites or			
								since. There			
								currently no			
								evidence the			
								site is being			
								actively			
								promoted or is			
								available for			
								development.			
		Midhurst	Rejected	The availability of	Low/Medium Sensitivity. The site	There is a Tree Preservation	Yes	The site is not	Unknown	Appropriate access	Yes
	Petersfield			the site in full is	-	Order adjacent to the site		in single		directly onto the	
	Road			unconfirmed.	l ·	(west). The site is considered		ownership.		A272 or via Elmleigh	
					_	suitable subject to retention and		One of the		would be feasible but	
					important to local amenity on	protection of mature trees.		three		may require the	
					A272.			landowners		existing signalised	
								has signalled		pedestrian crossing	
								their part of		to be moved. A	
								the site is		transport statement	
								available.		would be required to	
								However, the		support this	
								availability		proposal. The access	
								from the other		arrangements should	
								two		be reviewed as part	
								landowners is		of a Stage One Road	
								not confirmed.		Safety Audit.	
					DI	04					
						· ·					

Site Pof	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jite Kei	Address	Settlement	_		Lanuscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	l .	-	'''	1	
CH067	Land South of Barlavington Valley	Midhurst	Rejected	the site would have	due to the size of the site and it's poor relationship with the settlement pattern. Development of this site would extend suburban influences into the wider countryside setting of Midhurst; the existing limit of	Preservation Order area. Much of the site is priority habitat	No	Assessment The site is considered to be available.	Yes	Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH134	Land	Midhurst	Rejected	May be suitable but	Low/Moderate Sensitivity	There is a Tree Preservation	Uncert	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	adjoining			currently unclear	Due to small size of site and	Area to the south. The site is	ain	being actively		indicate why	
	Holmbush			whether 5 or more	limited visibility, topography	within 250m of an Historic		promoted and		development on the	
	Way (The			units can be	could result in increased visual	Landfill Site. West part of the		is considered		site is not achievable.	
	Triangle Site)			accommodated	impact from development of the	site includes deciduous		available.			
				alongside these	site.	woodland priority habitat which					
				constraints.		connects to a wider area of					
						woodland and remnant ancient					
						woodland extending south of					
						Midhurst. West edge of the site					
						is within flood zones 2 and 3					
						and subject to surface water					
						flood risk. The site is adjacent to					
						a culverted watercourse. The					
						site is located on part of the					
						dismantled railway between					
						Chichester and Midhurst. Access					
						will need to be maintained for					
						Southern Water and Southern					
						Electric engineers to rear for					
						service mains maintenance. May					
						be suitable but currently unclear					
						whether 5 or more units can be					
						accommodated alongside these					
						constraints.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH137	Land South of June Meadows	Midhurst		Further information required on the principle of the loss of the informal open space / amenity space. Could be suitable with appropriate design to protect residential amenity and character of the area.	Low medium sensitivity The site does not have wider landscape impact and is within an area of existing housing. The existing layout of housing is distinctive, and additional development may impact on this.	informal open space / amenity space. Could be suitable with appropriate design to protect residential amenity and			Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH166	Land North of the A272, west of the Half Moon Pub, Petersfield Road	Midhurst	Rejected	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is High Sensitivity to development owing to its prominent position at the entrance to the settlement beyond the historic common edge development at the Half Moon PH.(GII Listed). The site provides a wooded and grassland PROW connection to the Woolbeding estate to the west. The woodland along the southern part of the site provides a setting and screening for post war development to the north.	flood risk on the northern boundary and through the centre if the site. The western	No	The site is being actively promoted and is considered to be available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site could not be achieved.	Yes

				1	T				1		
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH188	Midhurst	Midhurst	Rejected	The site is not	Low/Moderate Sensitivity. The	Site is sustainably located in	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	Vehicular access is	No
	Bowls Club			considered	site is located within the	Midhurst centre. Suitable		site was		possible from St	
				achievable unless	townscape of Midhurst. The site	subject to full constraints check.		considered		Margarets Way,	
				suitable access can	is flat and relatively enclosed but	The site is flat and raised above		available in the		however it is	
				be demonstrated.	is raised above June Lane. The	June Lane and therefore any		2016 SHLAA		understood that the	
				Availability is	site is within Midhurst	development would need to		but has not		owner of St	
				uncertain. Currently	Conservation Area and is	carefully consider the		been		Margarets Way is not	
				in active use by	adjacent to the relatively recent	relationship with June Lane. The		submitted for		currently willing to	
				Midhurst Bowls	development of St Margarets	site is currently used by		consideration		provide access. Site	
				Club.	Way area.	Midhurst Bowls Club and		to 2022 Call for		achievable provided	
						alternative facilities would be		Sites or since.		that access issue can	
						needed.		There is		be resolved.	
								currently no			
								evidence that			
								the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			
								Currently in			
								active use by			
								Midhurst			
								Bowls Club.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jake Kei	Addiess	Settiement		rejection	Lanascape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
CH219	Land north of	Midhurst		Development on	High Landscape Sensitivity. This is	Adjacent to settlement	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Voc
	June Lane	iviidiidi 3t	Nejected	the site would have		boundary. Ancient woodland	140	being actively		indicate why	163
	Julie Lalle			a potential adverse		within and adjacent to the site.		promoted and		development on the	
				impact on the	•	•		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				· •	variable and apparent	The apparent topography				site is not achievable.	
				character and	topography with some long-	combined with its nature as		to be available.			
				appearance of the	distance views. Historic	open fields which are					
				landscape.	Landscape Characterisation	characteristic to the rural					
					indicates a largely historic	setting of Midhurst makes it					
					medieval landscape. Woolbeding						
					Estate Historic Parkland adjacent						
					to the site and wider estate lands	and exposed to long distance					
					and New Lipchis Way wrap	views. Vehicular access from					
					around the site.	June Lane would not be suitable					
						for full development of the site.					
						Due to topography a logical					
						smaller portion of the site could					
						not be identified. Due to the					
						conclusions of the landscape					
						assessment, site is not suitable					
						for development.					
CHOO	Diam Area at	N Aliaba	Daiastad	The site is as settle.	Lavota madiona agraitivito. The	The site is according to the con-	NIa	Part of the site	Links access	Thous is no vector to	Vaa
		Midhurst	кејестеа	The site is mostly	Low to medium sensitivity. The					There is no reason to	res
	Holmbush			designated as Local	· ·	sites by deciduous woodland		has been put		indicate why	
	Way			Green Space and		priority habitat. The majority of		forward by the		development on the	
				provides	relatively newer development	the site is in active use as		landowner.		site is not achievable.	
				community and	-	recreation ground that is also		Availability of			
				recreation facilities		designated as Local Green		the other parts			
				for the community	Holmbush Way, historically on	Space. The remainder is in		are uncertain.			
				in this area, and	land adjacent to the former	active use a meeting hall					
				availability of the	railway line.	building and associated small					
				site is uncertain.		car park. The site provides					
						community and recreation uses					
						for the surrounding community					
						and it is currently unclear how					
						these could be reprovided on					
						site due to the size of the site,					
						or offsite.					
						or orisite.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	•		Assessment		Assessment	
CH264	West of	Midhurst	Rejected	Development on	High Landscape Sensitivity. The	Adjacent to settlement	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Pitsham Lane			the site would have	site as a whole is a large and	boundary. Relatively open and		being actively		indicate why	
				a potential adverse	mostly open site at the southern	local views from a public right of		promoted and		development on the	
				impact on the	edge of Midhurst. The site has	way bridleway along Pitsham		is available for		site is not achievable.	
				biodiversity and	gently sloping topography. The	Lane. The northern parcel is		development.		However access to	
				character and	west of Pitsham Lane has a rural	adjacent to New Pond Local				the site is unlikely to	
				appearance of the	character. The northern most	Wildlife Site and part of this				be suitable.	
				landscape. Part of	parcel has a more enclosed	parcel has surface water flood					
				the site is subject to	character, and the Historic	risk. Vehicular access is poor					
				flood risk and	Landscape Classification	along Pitsham Lane, and access					
				access is unlikely to	identifies this as a possible	along this bridleway should be					
				be suitable.	former recreation space and	avoided other than to non-					
					historic mapping (OS Six Inch	motorised users.					
					1888-1914) shows a cricket						
					ground and pavilion no longer						
					present on the site. Development						
					west of Pitsham Lane would						
					appear intrusive and poorly						
					connected.						

			Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Availability		Achievability	
olmbush			rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
ay / Mead ay Estate	Midhurst	Rejected	use and so further information would be required to confirm the site is	Midhurst Town and part of the 20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.	potential development of the site for additional affordable homes could be considered under existing Local Plan policies - SD25 supports the principle of development within settlement boundaries. It is noted that part of the site comprises a recreation ground designated as a Local Green Space and a commercial unit containing a small convenience store. These are important local facilities for the surrounding community which would need to be reprovided through any redevelopment of the site. All parcels are adjacent to	Yes	however the site is in active use and so further information would be required to confirm the site is		Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
orth of the oyal Oak	Midhurst		the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. The site is Registered Common Land and	High Sensitivity. High sensitivity due to the rural character of the site, high visibility and likely impact of development and	habitat. The east part of the Mead Way area is subject to surface water flood risk and is within flood zone 2. A very small area is also within flood zone 3.  The site is Registered Common Land. The site is within 250m of a Historic Landfill site. There is a grade II listed buildings adjacent		Registered Common Land and not		indicate why	Yes
orr	th of the	th of the Midhurst	th of the val Oak Rejected	use and so further information would be required to confirm the site is available.  The of the ral Oak  Midhurst  Rejected  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. The site is Registered	use and so further information would be required to confirm the site is available.  The of the val Oak  Rejected Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. The site is Registered Common Land and	use and so further information would be required to confirm the site is available.  Settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.  Settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.  Settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.  Settlement expansion in this site for additional affordable homes could be considered under existing Local Plan policies - SD25 supports the principle of development within settlement boundaries. It is noted that part of the site comprises a recreation ground designated as a Local Green Space and a commercial unit containing a small convenience store. These are important local facilities for the surrounding community which would need to be reprovided through any redevelopment of the site. All parcels are adjacent to deciduous woodland priority habitat. The east part of the Mead Way area is subject to surface water flood risk and is within flood zone 3.  The of the Midhurst appearance of the site, high visibility and likely impact of development and poor/nor relationship with the settlement pattern. Impact of tree removal likely to be significant change to landscape character to facilitate housing	use and so further information would be required to confirm the site is available.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this site for additional affordable homes could be considered under existing Local Plan policies - SD2S supports the principle of development within settlement boundaries. It is noted that part of the site comprises a recreation ground designated as a Local Green Space and a commercial unit containing a small convenience store. These are important local facilities for the surrounding community which would need to be reprovided through any redevelopment of the site. All parcels are adjacent to deciduous woodland priority habitat. The east part of the Mead Way area is subject to surface water flood risk and is within flood zone 2. A very small area is also within flood zone 3.  2nth of the Midhurst Rejected Development on the character and appearance of the landscape. The site impact of development and poor/no relationship with the settlement pattern. Impact of tree removal likely to be significant change to landscape character to facilitate housing	use and so further information would be required to confirm the site is available.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this available.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this available.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this home scould be considered under existing Local Plan policies - SD25 supports the principle of development within settlement boundaries. It is noted that part of the site comprises a recreation ground designated as a Local Green Space and a commercial unit containing a small convenience store. These are important local facilities for the surrounding community which would need to be reprovided through any redevelopment of the site is available.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this homes could be considered under existing Local Plan policies - SD25 supports the principle of development within settlement boundaries. It is noted that part of the site site is available.  20th and 21st Century settlement boundaries and in this is the formation would be a conditional and incommination and and male and proportional designated as a Local Green Space and a commercial unit containing a small convenience store. These are important local facilities for the surrounding community which would need to be reprovided through any redevelopment of the site is making to a small convenience store. These are adjacent to deciduous woodland priority habitat. The east part of the Mead Way area is subject to surface water flood risk and is within flood zone 2. A very small area is also within flood zone 3.  21th of the individual development of the site of the site is information would be a considered un	Use and so further information would be required to confirm the site is available.  When the site is available in the site is available.  When the site is available in the site is available.  When the site is available in the site is available in the site is available.  When the site is available in the site is available in the site is available.  When the site is available in the site is available in the site is available.  When the site is available in the site is available in the site is available.  When the site is available in the site is available in the site is available.  When the site is available in the site is available in the site is available.  When the site is available in the site is available in the site is available.  When the site is available in the site is available in the site is available.  When the site would have a potential adverse impact of the site allower a potential adverse impact of the landscape. The site is Registered Common Land and occurred to available in the site is registered Common Land and character to facilitate housing character of landscape is girificant change to landscape in landscape. The site is Registered Common Land and character of landscape is girificant change to landscape in landscape. The site is Registered Common Land and character of landscape is girificant change to landscape in landscape. The site is Registered Common Land and character of significant change to landscape in landscape. The site is Registered Common Land and character of significant change to landscape in landscape. The site is Registered Common Land and character of significant change to landscape in landscape. The site is Registered Common Land and character of significant change to landscape. The site is Registered Common Land character of significant change to landscape. The site is Registered Common Land and Common Land character of significant change to landscape. The site is Registered Common Land character of significant change to landscape. The site is Registered Common Land charac	use and so further information would be required to confirm the site is available.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land algacent to the former railway line.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground is set down at a lower level from Holmbush Way, historically on land adjacent to the former railway line.  20th and 21st Century settlement expansion in this area. The recreation ground designated as a Local Green Space and a commercial unit containing a small convenience store. These are important local facilities for the surrounding community which would need to be reprovided through any redevelopment of the site. All parcels are adjacent to deciduous woodland priority habitat. The east part of the Mead Way area is subject to surface water flood risk and is within flood zone 2. A very small area is also within flood zone 2. A very small area is also within flood zone 3. A very small area is also within flood zone 3. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also within flood zone 6. A very small area is also withi

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH131	Tennis Court	Midhurst	Rejected	Development on	Medium/High Sensitivity -	Part of the site is Registered	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Site, Land			the site would have	Medium/high sensitivity due to	Common Land located on a local		being actively		indicate why	
	south of			a potential adverse	potential for carrialative impacts	ridge line. The topography presents		promoted and		development on the	
	Goodwood			impact on the	from adjacent houses and	challenges iwithout a harmful		is considered		site is not achievable.	
	Close /			character and	proximity to A286. The site is	change to the immediate character		available.			
	Woodland			appearance of the	part of the undeveloped	and context of the area. There are					
	east of			landscape.	settlement context. The site has	several Tree Preservation Orders. A					
	Southlands				notable topography and an	Grade II listed pub is 50m to the					
	Park				elevated nature as a high point	east. The site is within 250m of an					
	laik				within the surrounding area.	Historic Landfill Site. Vegetation on site may provide some screening,					
					within the surrounding area.	however any non-native invasive					
						species such as Rhododendron					
						require removal and associated					
						management. There may be					
						opportunity to establish non-					
						motorised user connection across					
						the site linking Southlands Park to					
						Goodwood Close with access to					
						wider Midhurst. The site was					
						assessed in detail by the SDNPA in					
						determining planning applications					
						SDNP/16/02698/FUL (4 dwellings)					
						and SDNP/15/05631/FUL (5					
						dwellings) and was further					
						considered in the subsequently					
						dismissed appeals and it was					
						concluded for both schemes that					
						development would have an					
						unacceptable impact on the					
						landscape and would be					
						detrimental to the character of the					
						area.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
	71441.033		Recc'	rejection		January 7 133 233 III Cite		Assessment		Assessment	
	North of Wellington Road	Newhaven		Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	location of site in open downland	on the character and	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	North of Palmerston Avenue	Newhaven	Rejected	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	Very high sensitivity due to the distinctive and open nature of the site and proximity to public right of way network. Lack of potential mitigation.	Due to the conclusions of the landscape assessment the site is not considered suitable. Archaeological interest and wildlife value also impact suitability for development.	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		No existing access. Access could potentially be created although this would impact landscape character.	Yes
	Site 2, East Hill Road	Newhaven	Rejected	Development is not considered to be achievable (access arrangements & subsequent impact on PRoW network).	part of a valuable tract of open land which extends into Denton and includes an extensive public right of way network. Access is affected by the steep slopes of the valley side which also make the site visible from the rising land to the north of Denton. The	There is a footpath along the northern boundary of the site. There is unknown archaeological potential and the site will require a preapplication assessment. The site has several biodiversity constraints and will require further ecological investigation before allocation.		Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		Access unclear, appears to be via public right of way (ProW) which is narrow with the potential for gradient issues. Road would need upgrading to achieve required widths and visibility but this would have detrimental impact on PRoW.	No

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
LE092	Land on	Newhaven	Rejected	Development is not	Medium Sensitivity The site is	There is a footpath along the	Yes	Unknown. The	Unknown	Access unclear.	No
	south east			considered to be	part of a valuable tract of open	northern boundary of the site.		site was		Appears to be via	
	side of Hill			achievable (access	land which extends into Denton	There is unknown		considered		public right of way	
	Road			arrangements &	and includes an extensive public	archaeological potential and the		available in the		(PRoW) which is	
				subsequent impact	right of way network. Access is	site will require a pre-		2016 SHLAA		narrow with the	
				on PRoW network).	affected by the steep slopes of	application assessment. The site		but has not		potential for gradient	
					the valley side which also make	has several biodiversity		been		issues. Road would	
					the site visible from the rising	constraints and will require		submitted for		need upgrading to	
					land to the north of Denton. The	further ecological investigation.		consideration		achieve required	
					site is small in scale and in			to 2022 Call for		widths and visibility,	
					proportion with adjacent recent			Sites or since.		but this would have	
					development.					detrimental impact	
										on PRoW.	
	Land at	Newhaven	Rejected	Potential adverse	High sensitivity due size, scale	Due to the conclusions of the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Holmdale			impact on the	and location, high visibility,	landscape assessment the site is		site was		indicate why	
	Road			character and	proximity to public right of way	not considered suitable. There is		considered		development on the	
				appearance of the	network. Lack of potential for	unknown archaeological		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.	mitigation.	potential and the site will		2016 SHLAA			
						require a pre-application		but has not			
						assessment.		been			
								submitted for			
								consideration			
								to 2022 Call for			
								Sites or since.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jane Her	Addiess	Settiement	Recc'	rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
	Cut Hole, Denton	Newhaven	_	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	existing development on the edge of the settlement, the site is highly visible given its open and undulating topography –	A public right of way (PRoW) crosses the south of the site, although this does not appear to be well used. Development at the north of site would impact perceptual qualities and views from popular PRoW to the northeast. The site is cut off from the centre of Newhaven by several busy A roads. The south of the site is prone to surface water flooding.	No	The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	Unknown - there may be access issues to resolve, given current access is from the Strategic Road Network.	
LE120	Stud Farm	Newhaven	Rejected	Potential unacceptable landscape impact.	High Landscape Sensitivity - Edge of settlement expansion area, already detrimental to landscape character, edge of downland and open location makes site visually sensitive.	assessment, site is not considered suitable for development. Furthermore, site	No	The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	Unknown. It is unclear where access to site will be created from.	Unknown
CH224	Land at Valentines Lea	Northchapel	Rejected	The site plays a key role as central and amenity space for the existing development. It is also uncertain whether the site could suitably accommodate 5 or more dwellings.	the site's location well within an area of relatively recent development. However, the site is highly visible as a central focal	The site is a central point in the location of this development and is used as amenity open space. Due to the shape of the site, it is uncertain if it could suitably accommodate 5 or more dwellings.		The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH266			Recc'		The site is assessed as High Landscape Sensitivity due to the assart fieldscape definition of the site. The site is located in a prominent location at the southern entrance to the village.	There is Ancient Woodland within the site on the northern	No	•	Yes	1 -	Yes
	Land South of Northchapel	Northchapel	Rejected	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Impact on Ancient Woodland.		visually sensitive and plays a key role in the transition from built development to more open countryside. There is ancient woodland along the western and southern boundary of the site. A public right of way runs along the western boundary. A		There is no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH077	Land South of	Northchapel	Rejected	Development on	The site is assessed as having	The site is highly visible and	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Northchapel			the site would have	High Landscape Sensitivity due to	visually sensitive and plays a key		site was		indicate why	
	Primary			a potential adverse	the assart fieldscape definition of	role in the transition from built		considered		development on the	
	School			impact on the	the site and the high visibility of	development to more open		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				character and	the site in relation to the village	countryside. The site is adjacent		2016 SHLAA			
				appearance of the	as surrounding open countryside.	to the Northchapel		but has not			
				landscape.		Conservation Area and a listed		been			
						building. The western side of the		submitted for			
						site is located within areas of		consideration			
						flood zone 2 and 3 and is		to 2022 Call for			
						susceptible to surface water		Sites or since.			
						flooding.					
		Northchapel	Rejected	Development on	The site is assessed as having	The site has dominant	No	Unknown. The	l	There is no reason to	Yes
	Luffs			the site would have	High Landscape Sensitivity due to			site was		indicate why	
	Meadow			a potential adverse	the assart fieldscape definition of	1		considered		development on the	
				impact on the	,	role in the transition from built		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				character and	the site in relation to the village	development to more open		2016 SHLAA			
				appearance of the	as surrounding open countryside.	I		but has not			
				landscape.		Woodland surrounding the site		been			
						to the south and southeast.		submitted for			
						There is a group of protected		consideration			
						trees on the on the western		to 2022 Call for			
						boundary and a public right of		Sites or since.			
						way along the northern					
						boundary. The northwestern					
						area of the site is located within					
						flood zone 2 and is susceptible					
						to surface water flooding.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH225	Nyewood	Nyewood	Rejected	Development on	Moderate Landscape Sensitivity.	Residential development of the	No	The site is	Yes	Access is understood	No
	Timber Yard,			the site would have	The site is located between the	site would extend the		being actively		to be owned by third	
	Greenfields			a potential adverse	settlement of Nyewood and an	settlement boundary in a		promoted and		party and so is not	
				impact on	extensive area of woodland	manner which is inconsistent		is considered		considered	
				landscape	which provides a backdrop to	with the linear settlement		available.		achievable unless	
				character,	Nyewood. Development of the	pattern and be an incursion into				suitable permissions	
				settlement pattern	site would be visible and appear	the woodland. Areas of the				are resolved.	
				and biodiversity. In	as an incursion into the	woodland in close proximity to					
				addition, access	woodland and into the gap	the site are ancient woodland.					
				could be issue	between dwellings at this	Incursion into the woodland					
				regarding	location.	could have impacts on the					
				achievability.		habitat and species from					
						urbanisation, disturbance and					
						lighting, and erode the buffer					
						between the existing settlement					
						and the woodland at this					
						location.					
		Owslebury	Rejected	Potential	he site has high landscape		No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Underdown			incongruous	sensitivity due to its stepped (but			site was		indicate why	
	Farm & Feed			extension into the	overall dominant) topography	agricultural buildings in place of		considered		development on the	
	Mill			countryside and	and high visibility from the PRoW			available in the		site is not achievable.	
				adverse impact on		designed, residential		2016 SHLAA			
				the character and	countryside. Even if development	· ·		but has not			
				appearance of the	was limited to the western access			been			
				landscape.	-	However, this would create an		submitted for			
					_	incongruous extension to the		consideration			
					eastern extension to an	settlement boundary and may		to 2022 Call for			
					otherwise linear village which is	impact the future operation of		Sites or since.			
					orientated NE-SW.	the existing agricultural uses.					
						Given the above and the					
						findings of the landscape					
						assessment, the site is not					
						considered suitable for					
						residential development.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
LE126	Land to the	Peacehaven	Rejected	Potential adverse	Landscape sensitivity assessed as	The site is assessed as moderate	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	east of	/ Piddinghoe		impact on the	moderate although it is	for landscape sensitivity		being actively		indicate why	
	Telscombe			character and	considered this would be high in	although this is due to the lower		promoted and		development on the	
	Road /			appearance of the	the northern part of the site on	ground in the south-west which		is considered		site is not achievable.	
	Hoddern			landscape.	higher ground and exposed to	is removed from some longer		available.			
	Farm				longer distance views. There is a	distance views. There is also a					
					clear edge to the settlement to	very strong settlement edge					
					the west of the site.	along the west of the site. In					
						summary, the settlement edge					
						combined with the landscape					
						sensitivity make this site					
						unsuitable.					
EA046	Land south of	Petersfield	Rejected	Not considered to	The site has a moderate	The site is in a mineral	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	The site is accessed	No
	Larcombe		1	be achievable	landscape sensitivity and	consultation area for clay and is		site was		from its eastern	
	Road, and			(susceptible to	comprises floodplain grazing	adjacent to a Grade II listed		considered		boundary via culverts	
	west of The			flooding). Potential	marsh priority habitat. Although	building (No.211 The		available in the		over an existing	
	Causeway			isolated and	the site is seen in long distance	Causeway). The site is situated		2016 SHLAA		stream and public	
				incongruous	views, it is relatively flat and	between the A3/railway		but has not		right of way. The site	
				extension into the	screened by mature trees and	transport route (west) and a		been		accesses are in Flood	
				countryside and	hedgerows. Nevertheless, its	tributary stream of the River		submitted for		Zones 2 and 3 and	
				adverse impact on	boundaries are delineated by the	Rother (east). As such, the west		consideration		the existing culverts	
				the character and	A3/railway transport route	is susceptible to noise pollution,		to 2022 Call for		are unlikely to	
				appearance of the	(west), the PRoW network (south	whilst the east (incl. vehicular		Sites or since.		accommodate	
				landscape.	and east), and a tributary stream	access) is in Flood Zones 2 and 3				additional vehicular	
					of the River Rother (east). The	and is susceptible to surface				movements.	
					site is isolated and not well	water flooding. Given the above				Notwithstanding the	
					related to the existing settlement	and the findings of the				flood risks, access	
					pattern. Moreover, development	landscape assessment, the site				rights would need to	
					would create an incongruous	is not considered to be suitable				be obtained over the	
					extension to the distinctive,	for development.				adjacent eastern land	
					nucleated, and planned					parcels.	
					settlement pattern of Petersfield.						
1	ĺ	1	I		l						1

Site Ref	Address	Settlement		Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA073	Land rear of 219-249 The Causeway	Petersfield	Rejected	Susceptible to flooding. Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	its intervisibility with Butser Hill, its proximity to the A3 corridor, and its poor relationship with the existing settlement pattern.	The site is in a mineral consultation area for clay and is adjacent to a Grade II listed building (No.211 The Causeway). It includes an existing stream and pond, and so a vast proportion of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3. It is dissected by an existing PRoW which runs north-south across the site. Given the above and its landscape sensitivity, the site is not considered to be suitable for built development.	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
EA108	Lower Tilmore, Tilmore Road	Petersfield		The site is not considered to be available for development.	all sides and is only visible from its existing vehicular access off Tilmore Road. Development may have a significant impact on the	The site is accessed via Tilmore Road and is bound by large mature trees and hedgerows on all sides. The site is in Flood Zone 1 but is susceptible to groundwater flooding and is within a watercourse buffer. Given the above and the	1	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	•	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not	The site is assessed as having a	The site is allocated in the	Yes	The landowner	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	off Paddock			currently available	low landscape sensitivity given	Petersfield NDP, under Policy		has confirmed		indicate why	
	Way			for development.	that it is previously developed	H9, for 42 dwellings, subject to		that the site is		development on the	
					land (PDL), within the defined	the relocation of the existing		not available		site is not achievable.	
					settlement boundary, and that	depot use elsewhere in the		for			
					redevelopment would be	town. The NDP allocation has		redevelopment			
					consistent with surrounding	established the principle of					
					residential land. The site is	redevelopment.					
					allocated in the Petersfield NDP						
					and the NDP Examiner concluded						
					that the site was "clearly an						
					appropriate allocation, should						
					the site become available".						
FA11F	Como mo con ite.	Petersfield	Daiastad	The site is not	The site is assessed as herring a	The site is allocated in the	Vaa	The landowner	No	Thous is no vector to	V
	Community	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not	The site is assessed as having a		Yes		INO	There is no reason to	Yes
	Centre, Love			currently available		Petersfield NDP for 10 dwellings		has confirmed		indicate why	
	Lane			for development.	that it is previously developed	under Policy H10, subject to the		that the site is		development on the	
					land (PDL), within the defined	relocation of the existing		not available		site is not achievable.	
					settlement boundary, and that	community use elsewhere in the		for			
					redevelopment would be	town. The NDP alludes to a		redevelopment			
						possible relocation of the		•			
					residential development. The site	, ,					
						the Love Lane Recreation					
						Ground - see NDP Policy CP2.					
					concluded that the site is an	Notwithstanding the above, the					
					appropriate allocation should the						
					site become available.	the principle of development,					
						and so the site is considered to					
						be suitable subject to an					
						alternative community centre					
						location being identified.					
1				I			1		1	1	1

Site Ref	Address	Settlement		Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA191	Royal Mail	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not	The site is in the settlement	The site is allocated in	Yes	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Sorting Office			considered to be	boundary and is previously	Petersfield NDP, under Policies		site was		indicate why	
				available for	developed land (PDL). It	H6, RP1 and MU1, as a town		considered in		development on the	
				development.	comprises of a Royal Mail sorting	centre opportunity area for 5		the Petersfield		site is not achievable.	
					office (and associated car	dwellings and 360sqm of retail		Neighbourhoo			
					parking) and is located within	space. The NDP allocation has		d Plan process			
					Petersfield Town Centre and	established the principle of		but has not			
					Conservation Area. The site has	redevelopment for residential		been			
					low landscape sensitivity but is	and retail uses should the site		submitted for			
					likely to have high heritage	come forward for		consideration			
					sensitivity given its location	redevelopment in the future.		to the 2022			
					within the Conservation Area and			Call for Sites or			
					its proximity to nearby listed			since.			
					buildings.						
EA192	BT Exchange,	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not	The site is in the settlement	The site is allocated in	Yes	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Charles Street			considered to be	boundary and is previously	Petersfield NDP, under Policies		site was		indicate why	
	& Swan			available for	developed land (PDL). The site	H6, RP1 and MU2, as a town		considered in		development on the	
	Street			development.	comprises a three storey, L-	centre opportunity area for 11		the Petersfield		site is not achievable.	
					shaped, building used as a	dwellings and 1,000sqm of retail		Neighbourhoo			
					telephone exchange. The	space. The NDP allocation has		d Plan process			
					building is sited on the junction	established the principle of		but has not			
					of Charles Street and Swan Street	redevelopment for residential		been			
					(with access from the former) in	and retail uses should the site		submitted for			
					Petersfield Town Centre and is	come forward for		consideration			
					adjacent to (and surrounded by)	redevelopment in the future.		to the 2022			
					the Petersfield Conservation			Call for Sites or			
					Area. The site has low landscape			since.			
					sensitivity but is likely to have						
					high heritage sensitivity given its						
					relationship to the Conservation						
					Area and nearby listed buildings.						
					,						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA193	Petersfield	Petersfield	Rejected	The site is not	The site is previously developed	The site is allocated in	Yes	There is no	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	Infant School,			currently available	land (PDL), is in the settlement	Petersfield NDP, under Policies		indication that		indicate why	
	Hylton Road			for redevelopment.	boundary, and includes	H6-1, RP1 and R1, as a town		the site is		development on the	
					Petersfield Infant School. The site	centre opportunity area for 20		currently		site is not achievable.	
					is in Petersfield Town Centre and	dwellings and 400sqm of retail		available for			
					partially in Petersfield	space. The NDP allocation has		redevelopment			
					Conservation Area. Although the	established the principle of		. At the NDP			
					site has low landscape sensitivity,	redevelopment for residential		Examination,			
					it is likely to have high townscape	and retail uses should the site		the Education			
					sensitivity given its (partial)	come forward for		Authority and			
					location within, and relationship	redevelopment in the future.		other parties			
					to, the Conservation Area.			confirmed that			
								there is no			
								intention for			
								education use			
								to cease and			
								for the school			
								to be			
								relocated.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA226	Land east of	Petersfield	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site has high landscape		No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Heath Road			impact on the	sensitivity given its strategic scale			being actively		indicate why	
	East and			character and	and open nature. It has a strong	and flood zones. The site is in a		promoted and		development is not	
	Harrier Way			appearance of the	landscape distinctiveness forming	mineral consultation area for clay,		is considered		achievable. However,	
				landscape, the	a transitional area between two	Sort Saria, aria Sriarp Saria aria		available.		groundwater	
				setting of the Heath	landscape character areas. The	gravel, and less than half the site is in contaminated land buffers. The				vulnerability is an	
				and heritage assets,	site is bound by the Heath (west),	site includes the safeguarded				issue in this area, and	
				and the settlement		Petersfield-to-Midhurst route along				transport modelling	
				character and	(north), the River Rother (east);	its north-eastern boundary and				will be required due	
				pattern of	and is open to views from wider	includes an SGN regional gas				to the documented	
				Petersfield.	countryside and higher ground	pipeline which diverts across the				capacity and safety	
					(south). Large-scale development	site between the adjacent Harriers				concerns associated	
					would not conserve or enhance	Way and Petersfield WTW.				with the B2199	
					itile turai. Obeli cilaractei oi tilis	Development would create a				crossroads and A272	
					landscape, nor the role it plays in	strategic extension to the south-				junction further	
					providing a setting to the Heath,	east of Petersfield. This extension would create an imbalance				north.	
					numerous heritage assets, and	compared to the quantum of					
					the distinctive, planned, and	existing post-war development east					
					nucleated town of Petersfield.	of the B2199 Heath Road East. Even					
						if the developable area was reduced					
						to the western half, this would still					
						not positively contribute to the					
						settlement character and pattern of					
						the distinctive, planned, and					
						nucleated town of Petersfield, and					
						the setting and significance of the					
						Heath and numerous heritage					
						assets.					
1				1			I	l	I	l	

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
	710.01.000			rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA047	Land rear of	Petersfield		Potential adverse	The site has very low landscape	The site is in a mineral	No	The site is	Yes	The landowner has	Yes
	115 Sussex			impact on a defined	sensitivity given that it comprises	consultation area for clay, sharp		being actively		stated that vehicular	
	Road			area of special	enclosed residential garden land.	sand, and gravel. The site		promoted and		and pedestrian	
				housing character	Nevertheless, the proposed	includes TPOs on its north-		is considered		access would be	
				by virtue of its	demolition of, and access	eastern point and eastern		available.		achieved via the	
				proposed access.	through, No.115 Sussex Road	boundary. The existing				demolition of No.115	
					would negatively impact on an	dwellinghouse is in an "area of				Sussex Road.	
					"area of special housing	special housing character" (see				Although this would	
					character" (see Policy BEP5,	Policy BEP5, Petersfield NDP).				negatively impact on	
					Petersfield Neighbourhood	Given the above and the				an area of special	
					Development Plan). The NDP	findings of the landscape				housing character	
					Examiner previously stated that	assessment, the site is not				(see suitability	
					the formation of a new access to	considered to be suitable for				section above), there	
					Sussex Road would be damaging	development due to its				is no reason to	
					to the character of the area and	proposed access.				indicate why	
					would set an undesirable					development on the	
					precedent in respect of this					site is not technically	
					section of Sussex Road as a					achievable.	
					whole.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			_	rejection		,		Assessment		Assessment	
EA061	Land at Horse	Petersfield	Rejected	Potential	The site has high landscape	The site is in a mineral	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Chestnut			incongruous	sensitivity. It is highly distinctive	consultation area for clay, is in a		being actively		indicate why	
	Farm			extension into the	of its landscape character areas	contaminated land buffer, and		promoted and		development on the	
				countryside, and	and is visible from both the	includes a PRoW and TPOs on its		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				would have a	adjacent raised highway and	boundaries. The site is affected		available.		However, a previous	
				potential adverse	longer distance views from	by noise given that it's bound by				refusal on adjacent	
				impact on the	surrounding higher ground.	the A3 and railway line (west)				land (see ref.	
				character and	Development would elongate	and B2070 The Causeway (east).				34636/01/OUT)	
				appearance of the	and extend existing linear/ribbon	The site is dissected in half by a				highlighted potential	
				landscape.	development into the	tributary stream of the River				interference with the	
					countryside, creating an	Rother and so a large				safety and	
					incongruous southern extension.	proportion of the site is in Flood				convenience of users	
					This would not relate well to the	Zones 2 and 3. Given all the				of the adjoining	
					distinctive, nucleated, and	above and the findings of the				highway, incl. the A3	
					planned settlement pattern of	landscape assessment, the site				junction at Buriton.	
					Petersfield. The whole site	is not considered to be suitable.				As such, a transport	
					comprises floodplain grazing					assessment is	
					marsh priority habitat.					required to inform	
										any proposed	
										development use and	
										quantum.	

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA063	Land North	Petersfield	Rejected	Does not relate well	The site has high landscape	The site is in a mineral	No	The site is	Yes	Development on the	No
	West of			to the existing	sensitivity. It has an undulating	consultation area for soft and		being actively		site is not currently	
	Tilmore Road			settlement pattern -	topography and is very	silica sand, is surrounded by		promoted and		considered to be	
				potential adverse	characteristic of its landscape	deciduous woodland priority		is considered		achievable. Access	
				impact in the	character area. The western area	habitat, is in a contaminated		available.		via Bell Hill or the	
				character and	includes the Tilmore Brook and	land buffer area, and has				Steep House Nursing	
				appearance of the	the associated local green space	historic landfill in its north-				Home would require	
				landscape.	(LGS), whilst the eastern area	eastern area. Although raised				agreement with third	
					includes, and is in proximity to,	above the motorway, the site is				party landowners –	
					the Hangers Way PRoW and	still subjected to noise				the former would	
					Shipwrights Way respectively.	disturbance from the A3 which				also require access	
					Moreover, due to the site's	would negatively impact				over the Tilmore	
					location and scale, development	potential future residents. Given				Brook and LGS which	
					would be a dominating influence	the above and the findings of				is not considered to	
					which would negatively impact	the landscape assessment, the				be acceptable. As for	
					on the rural hinterland of	site is not considered to be				Tilmore Road, this	
					Petersfield and would create an	suitable.				would require the	
					unrelated, isolated, and					diversion of the	
					incongruous northern extension					Hangers Way PRoW.	
					to the nucleated and planned					In addition, hard	
					settlement pattern of Petersfield.					engineering works	
										and an intensified	
										use would have an	
										adverse negative	
										impact of the rural	
										character of the area.	

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection	•	•		Assessment		Assessment	
EA065	Land west of	Petersfield			The site is assessed as having	The site is in a mineral	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Upper			to the existing	high landscape sensitivity. It has	consultation area for soft and		site was		indicate why	
	Tilmore Road			settlement pattern -	an apparent topography and is	silica sand and includes historic		considered		development on the	
				potential adverse	very characteristic of its	landfill in its northern area.		available in the		site could not be	
				impact in the	landscape character area. The	Although raised above the		2016 SHLAA		achieved, subject to	
				character and	site is bound by, and includes,	motorway, the site is still		but has not		the delivery of a safe	
				appearance of the	the Hangers Way PRoW. The site	subjected to noise disturbance		been		and appropriate	
				landscape.	has a poor relationship with the	from the A3. This would		submitted for		access off Tilmore	
				-	settlement pattern and so	negatively impact potential		consideration		Road.	
					development would create an	future residents. Given the		to 2022 Call for			
					incongruous northern extension	above and the findings of the		Sites or since.			
					to the nucleated and planned	landscape assessment, the site					
					settlement pattern of Petersfield.	is not considered to be suitable					
						for development.					
						·					
EA072	Land South of	Petersfield	Rejected	Potential	The site has high landscape	The site is in a mineral	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	the Causeway			incongruous		consultation area for clay and		being actively		indicate why	
				settlement		includes TPOs on its boundaries		promoted and		development on the	
				extension and	and is visible from both the	and a PRoW running north-		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				adverse impact on	adjacent raised highway and	south. The site is in proximity to		available.		However, a previous	
				character and	longer distance views from	Flood Zones 2 and 3 – and is in a				refusal (see ref.	
				appearance of the	surrounding higher ground.	watercourse buffer – which is				34636/01/OUT)	
				landscape, and the	Development would elongate	associated with the existing				highlighted potential	
				setting of heritage	and extend existing linear/ribbon	stream in proximity to the west.				interference with the	
				assets.	development into the	Given the above and the				safety and	
					countryside, creating an	findings of the landscape				convenience of users	
					incongruous southern extension.	assessment, the site is not				of the adjoining	
					This would not relate well to the	considered to be suitable.				highway, incl. the A3	
					distinctive, nucleated, and					junction at Buriton.	
					planned settlement pattern of					As such, a transport	
					Petersfield. Moreover, the					assessment is	
					Petersfield Neighbourhood					required to inform	
					Development Plan Examiner					any proposed	
					previously rejected a proposed					development use and	
					allocation for a care home and					quantum.	
					care bungalows on the site due						
					to landscape impacts.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA145	Land at	Petersfield	1 -	Not considered to	The site has very high landscape	The site is in a mineral	No	The site is	Yes	•	No
	Tilmore West			be achievable.		consultation area for silica sand		being actively		site is not considered	
				Potential adverse	valley and setting of the Tilmore	and includes mature trees and		promoted and		to be achievable	
				impact on the	Brook. It has an undulating and	hedgerows along its internal		is considered		given the access	
				character and	dominant topography and is	subdivisions and external		available.		issues associated	
				appearance of the	readily open to views from the	boundaries. Given that the site				with Bell Hill Ridge	
				landscape.	adjacent PRoW, which also	is accessed via semi-rural roads,				and Coxes Meadow.	
					delineates the site's southern	has a dominant topography, and				It is also unclear	
					boundary. Moreover, Bell Hill	forms part of the Tilmore Brook				whether third party	
					Ridge is single-lane and	Valley, the site it is not				land is required to	
					development would impact on its	considered to be suitable for				connect the existing	
					semi-rural character.	built development.				access gate to the	
										adopted highway.	
EA183	Land at	Petersfield	Rejected	Site is allocated in	The site has high landscape	The site is in a mineral	No	The site is	Yes	The site is currently	No
	Buckmore			the Petersfield NDP	sensitivity due to its dominant	consultation area for soft and		being actively		accessed via an	
	Stables			(Policy C8) for a	topography and open views from	silica sands, is surrounded by		promoted and		unmade, single-lane,	
	(South)			new cemetery. Does	the PRoW network and Butser	deciduous woodland priority		is considered		narrow track which	
				not relate well to	Hill. It is adjacent to the A3 and	habitat, and is in a		available.		also forms part of the	
				the existing	so is subject to noise disturbance	contaminated land buffer.				PRoW network. The	
				settlement pattern/	which detracts from the	Although raised above the				above is appropriate	
				potential adverse	tranquillity of the area. The	motorway, the site is still				and sufficient for the	
				impact on the	proposed intensification of land	subjected to noise disturbance				existing, private	
				character and	use would negatively impact on	from the A3 which would				paddock use, but any	
				appearance of the	the use and rural character of the	negatively impact potential				intensification would	
				landscape.	PRoW network and the northern	future residents. Finally, the site				impact on the use	
					unmade, access track off Bell Hill.	is allocated in the Petersfield				and rural character of	
					Finally, development would be	NDP for a new cemetery (see				the PRoW network.	
					detached, secluded and	Policy C8). Given the above and				Moreover, the	
					incongruous to the existing built	the findings of the landscape				existing width is	
					settlement pattern and edge.	assessment, the site is not				unlikely to	
						considered to be suitable for				accommodate	
						built development.				intensification, and it	
										is not considered	
										possible to widen.	
1											

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	•		Assessment		Assessment	
EA184	Land east and	Petersfield		Potential	The site (including all previous	The site has TPOs on its	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	south of			incongruous	smaller submissions) has a high	northern boundary and is		being actively		indicate why	
	Russell Way			settlement	landscape sensitivity. The site	entirely within a mineral		promoted and		development on the	
				extension and	includes a listed building within	consultation area for clay, soft		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				adverse impact on	an assarted fieldscape on the	sand, silica sand, and sharp sand		available.			
				character and	· ·	and gravel. The site includes,					
				appearance of the	has a poor relationship with the	and comprises the setting of,					
				landscape, and the	existing settlement pattern and is						
				setting of heritage	open to views from Sussex Road	Mallards Mere / Wealth Lodge.					
				assets.	and the wider countryside.	Development in the north					
					,	would impact on the character,					
						setting and significance of the					
						listed building, whilst					
						development in the south would					
						create an incongruous south-					
						eastern extension to the					
						nucleated and planned market					
						town of Petersfield. Given the					
						above and the findings of the					
						landscape assessment, the site					
						is not considered to be suitable					
						for development.					
						ior development.					
EA186	Land adj	Petersfield	Rejected	Development would	The site has a high landscape	The site is in a mineral	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Causeway			split the curtilage of	sensitivity. The site is relatively	consultation area, is in a		being actively		indicate why	
	House			a listed building	flat and contained by recently	contaminated land buffer, and		promoted and		development on the	
				which would be	built development (north) and	has a TPO along its north-		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				harmful to the	well-established, mature	eastern boundary. Given the		available.			
				setting and	vegetation (south and east). The	potential harm to the setting					
				significance of the	site is in the curtilage of the	and significance of the Grade II					
				listed building.	Grade II listed Causeway House.	listed Causeway House, large-					
				_	In considering Sections 1(5) &	scale residential development is					
					66(1) of the Planning (Listed	not considered to be suitable.					
					Buildings & Conservation Areas)	Although the potential harm is					
					Act 1990, any proposal to split	likely to be "less than					
					the listed building's curtilage	substantial", it is considered					
					would be harmful to the setting	that such harm would not be					
					and significance of the listed	outweighed by any potential					
					building.	public benefits.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection		,		Assessment		Assessment	
EA189	Land at	Petersfield	_	Site is allocated in	The site has moderate landscape	The site is in a mineral	No	The site is	Yes		No
	Buckmore		'	the Petersfield NDP	sensitivity. Although it is visible	consultation for soft and silica		being actively		accessed via an	
	Stables				from the PRoW network and	sand, is in the setting of Bell Hill		promoted and		unmade, single-lane,	
	(North)				wider views from Butser Hill to	Cottage (Grade II listed) in the		is considered		narrow track which	
				not relate well to	the south, the site is relatively	north-east, is surrounded by		available.		also forms part of the	
				the existing	flat and is enclosed by deciduous	deciduous woodland priority				PRoW network. The	
				settlement pattern/	woodland and other vegetation	habitat, and is in a				above is appropriate	
				potential adverse	on its west, north and east	contaminated land buffer. The				and sufficient for the	
				impact on the	boundaries. The site is adjacent	site was previously rejected for				existing, private	
				character and	to the A3 and so is subject to	C3 residential development but				equestrian use, but	
				appearance of the	noise disturbance which detracts	has been resubmitted for a C2				any intensification	
				landscape.	from the tranquillity of the area.	care facility for older persons.				would impact on the	
					The proposed intensification of	Although raised above the				use and rural	
					land use would negatively impact	motorway, the site is still				character of the	
					on the use and rural character of	subject to noise disturbance				PRoW network.	
					the PRoW network and the	from the A3 which would				Moreover, the	
					southern unmade, access track	negatively impact potential				existing width is	
					off Bell Hill.	future residents. Finally, the site				unlikely to	
						is allocated in the Petersfield				accommodate	
						NDP for a new cemetery (see				intensification, and it	
						Policy C8). Given the above and				is not considered	
						the findings of the landscape				possible to widen.	
						assessment, the site is not					
						considered suitable for Class C2					
						or C3 development.					
CH088	Land east of	Petworth	Paiactad	Rejected for	Low Sensitivity	Site located to rear of small	No	Allocated for	No	Site to be developed	No
	Hampers	Comortin		housing as site is	The site is well contained within	industrial estate and currently	1	employment		for employment –	
	Common			allocated for		allocated as employment land.		land in the		access from existing	
	Industrial			employment in	appropriate screening through	Allocated for employment land		Petworth		employment site. Not	
	Estate			Petworth	supplementing the existing	in the Petworth Neighbourhood	1	Neighbourhoo		achievable for	
	Lotate			Neighbourhood		Development Plan. Policy WS4:	1	d Development		residential due to	
				_	0	Land east of Hampers Common		Plan. There is		allocation for	
						Industrial Estate. Location of site		no evidence		employment	
						to rear of employment not	1	that the site is		development.	
						suitable for residential.		available or		'	
							1	being actively			
								promoted for			
								residential use.			
L			<u> </u>	<u>I</u>	D I	B1		l		l	

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site itei	Address	Settiement		rejection	Lanuscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	l	Assessment		Assessment	
CH089	Land south of	Petworth			High sensitivity	The remaining section of the	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Herbert			that part of the	The site is on the south facing	field creates a buffer protecting		being actively		indicate why	
	Shiner School			large field (section	slopes of the upper Rother	the expanse of new residential		promoted and		development on the	
				to the west of this	Valley. Whilst part of the large	(allocated site) from impacting		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				proposal) is	field is allocated for development	on the rural character of this		available for			
				allocated for	in the Petworth Neighbourhood	part of Petworth which contains		development.			
				development within	Development Plan, it remains	a listed building at the entrance					
				the Petworth	that further development would	to the site on Grove Lane and a					
				Neighbourhood	intrude into the undeveloped	rural road leading up to the					
				Development Plan,	character of the landscape to the	historic part of the town. The					
				development on the	south of Petworth.	site is above the level of the					
				site would have a		road and development would be					
				potential adverse		overly dominant in this location					
				impact on the		as a result, plus there are some					
				character and		significant hedgerows bordering					
				appearance of the		the site and Grove Land.					
				landscape.		Together with the adopted					
						policy site – this would amount					
						to 200 houses. This is					
						considered an over					
						development for the site.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
СН097	Land north of Hampers Common Industrial Estate	Petworth	Rejected	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape	High Sensitivity The site is poorly related to the settlement pattern and relates more strongly to the surrounding countryside. The site is highly visible. In addition the site contains a number of significant trees including one on the front boundary with the road.	landscape assessment the site is not considered suitable for				There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
СН099	Land south of playing field	Petworth		Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets.	Very High Sensitivity The site is on the south facing slopes of the upper Rother valley and forms part of the setting of the registered parkscape, and the adjoining conservation area. Development would have an unacceptable level of impact on these features and impact on the wider views of the downs and the parkscape.	conservation area, and opposite the grade II listed Petworth Park Wall and Grade I listed Petworth		Unknown. The site was considered to be available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since. There is currently no evidence to indicate the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH101	Land at	Petworth	Rejected	Development on	High Sensitivity	The site is within the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	No suitable access	No
	junction of			the site would have	High sensitivity due to location	conservation area and is		site was		available.	
	Tillington			a potential adverse	within registered parkscape,	adjacent to a grade II listed Park		available in the		There does not	
	Road			impact on the	conservation area and poor	and Garden Walls and grade I		2016 SHLAA		appear to be a safe	
				character and	relationship with the town for	listed Petworth Park. There are		but has not		and existing access,	
				appearance of the	residential development. Likely	numerous other listed buildings		been		plus the site is on the	
				landscape.	lower sensitivity to estate	within the vicinity, including one		submitted for		corner with a	
				Development on	managed housing for estate	Grade II* listed.		consideration		roundabout and busy	
				the site would have	workers/connected personnel			to 2022 Call for		location. There are	
				a potential adverse	although visual impacts over the			Sites or since.		very high walls on the	
				impact on heritage	wall should be clarified. Historic			There is		site boundary with	
				assets.	environment advice essential.			currently no		the road – assume	
				Development on				evidence that		these would be	
				the site is not				the site is		affected through	
				currently				available or is		creating an access to	
				considered to be				being actively		the site.	
				achievable.				promoted for			
								development.			
CH102	Grove Road	Petworth	Rejected	Development on	High sensitivity - the site is in	The site is in active use as	No	The site is	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	allotments			the site would have	existing use as allotments and	allotments, and it is considered		currently in		indicate why	
				a potential adverse	provides green infrastructure in	that the current use is		use as		development on the	
				impact on the	terms of local food production,	important in terms of the		allotments and		site is not achievable	
				character and	health and wellbeing, climate	cultural landscape as perceived		therefore is		although access will	
				appearance of the	change. Likely high landscape	by the local community. It is		not considered		be to Grove Road.	
				landscape. The site	value/importance for the local	also highly sensitive to change		available.			
				is in active use as	community. Site is located within	due to its physical features, and		There is			
				allotments and not	the Petworth conservation area.	because it abuts an area of		currently no			
				available.		fieldscapes, and abuts also a		evidence that			
						well-used public right of way.		the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH103	Land at	Petworth	Rejected	There is insufficient	Medium/High Sensitivity	Development of the site would	No	The site is in	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	allotments			evidence that the	The site is vulnerable to views	result in the loss of allotments		active use as		indicate why	
	and Scout			site is available. In	from the conservation area and	and scout hut, both of which are		allotments and		development on the	
	Hut			addition	also could affect the setting of	in active use. The site is		scout hut and		site is not achievable.	
				•	the conservation area, access	physically adjacent to the		therefore not		However issues	
				site would have a	and levels likely to be an issue	conservation area which lies to		available.		regarding access due	
				potential adverse	(for Sheepdown Drive) and	the north and west and a grade		There is		to topography are	
				impact on the	existing hedgerows and trees to	II listed building. Considered		currently no		noted.	
				character and		impacts of development		evidence that			
				appearance of the	needed for allotments and scout	potentially mitigable, any new		the site is			
				landscape.	hut.	access would need to be very		available or			
						sensitively designed and the		being actively			
						impacts on the conservation		promoted for			
						area fully considered.		development.			
CH139		Petworth	1 -	Development on	Medium/High Sensitivity		No			There is no reason to	Yes
	of North				Medium/High sensitivity due to	conservation area and is		site was		indicate why	
	Street			a potential adverse	location at the rear of the	adjacent to a number of listed		available in the		development on the	
				impact on the	conservation area and	buildings. The conclusions of the		2016 SHLAA		site is not achievable	
				character and	orientation of the site alongside	landscape assessment		but has not		although issues	
				appearance of the	the rear of several listed	demonstrate that site is not		been		regarding any	
				landscape.	properties. Views from the east	suitable.		submitted for		suitable access are	
				Development on	and impacts on town fabric from			consideration		noted.	
					access issues.			to 2022 Call for			
				a potential adverse				Sites or since.			
				impact on heritage				There is			
				assets.				currently no			
								evidence that			
								the site is			
								available or is			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Joine Mei	Address	Settiement		rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
CH140	Quarry Farm,	Petworth		Development on	High Sensitivity	Due to the conclusions of the	No	Unknown. The		There is no reason to	Voc
	Grove Lane	Ceworen	Incjected	the site would have	,	landscape assessment the site is	140	site was		indicate why	103
	Grove Lane			a potential adverse	-	not considered suitable for		available in the		development on the	
				impact on the	the site and out to the	development.		2016 SHLAA		site is not achievable	
				character and	surrounding countryside which	development.		but has not		although it is noted	
				appearance of the	would be blocked by			been		that access would	
				'''	I			submitted for		need to be via	
				landscape.	development. The farmstead area would be Medium High						
					_			consideration		existing development to the north and a	
					Sensitivity due to its location in			to 2022 Call for			
					the wider countryside and the			Sites or since. There is		TPO is noted.	
					need to prevent urbanising						
					features being introduced.			currently no			
					The site is visible from a range of			evidence that			
					locations owing to the size,			the site is			
					topography and location. The			available or is			
					PROW to the north of the site			being actively			
					provides views over much of the			promoted for			
					sloped ground to the south east.			development.			
					The site is visible as pastureland						
					which connects with the wider						
					landscape beyond.						
CH228	Land at	Petworth	Rejected	Site is located with	Site is located within an area of	As the site is immediately	No	The site is	Yes	There is no direct	No
	Hampers			a landscape highly	high landscape sensitivity and	adjacent to the cemetery and		being actively		vehicular access, and	
	Green			sensitive location	development would intrude into	due to limited options for access		promoted and		the land is slightly	
				with no direct	the undeveloped open landscape	– the site is not suitable. It is		is considered		elevated above the	
				access to the site.	to the north and east of the site.	also not suitable as it is located		available.		adjoining highway.	
				The site is not	The site forms part of a	in an area of high sensitivity in				Access currently	
				considered to be	continuous tract of open	landscape terms.				would need to go	
				suitable or	countryside to the west of the					through the	
				achievable.	road where the only visible					cemetery, but that is	
					change to the landscape is the					not a viable option	
					existing cemetery, which is a					for residential	
					peaceful part of northern					development.	
					Petworth, set in open						
					countryside. This provides a						
					welcome break to the urban						
					residential development to the						
					west.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	•			Assessment		Assessment	
CH230	Bowling Green & Tennis Club	Petworth	Rejected	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity of moderate and is in active use for community and leisure uses for which the site is allocated in the Petworth Neighbourhood Development.		The site is allocated in the Petworth Neighbourhood Development Plan for community and leisure use and any development would require the existing uses to be relocated.	No	The site is allocated as community and leisure use in the Petworth Neighbourhoo d Development Plan. There is currently no evidence to indicate that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable	Yes
CH231	Midhurst Road Allotments	Petworth	Rejected	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on heritage assets. Site allocated in Petworth Neighbourhood Development Plan for allotments. Development may not be achievable.	High Sensitivity the site is on the south facing slopes of the upper rother valley and forms part of the setting of the registered parkscape, and the adjoining conservation area. Development would have an unacceptable level of impact on these features and impact on the wider views of the downs and the parkscape.	The site is in active use as allotments and it is considered that the current use is important in terms of the cultural landscape as perceived by the local community.	No	Site is currently used as allotments. It is also allocated in the Petworth Neighbourhoo d Development Plan for community and leisure facilities		Access unclear as site has frontage onto Midhurst Road – this may not be achievable. Unsure of land ownership and if there are barriers to development.	

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
						.,		•		•	
	Land at Poynings Road	Poynings	Recc' Rejected	rejection The site is considered to be previously developed land (PDL) and is adjacent to the SPB, with no exclusion criteria onsite.	edge of the settlement and is	The site is a recreation ground located to the north of the settlement and adjacent to a part of the settlement boundary. However, the site is not considered to relate well to the existing settlement pattern and development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. In addition, loss of recreation ground would only be permissible where an acceptable replacement is provided.	No	Assessment The site is currently in active use as a recreation area. Availability would be subject to alternative recreation space being available/provi ded.	No	Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site could not be achieved.	Yes
HO023	Brookgate Farm	Pulborough	Rejected	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	Highly sensitive landscape with open views across to Pulborough Brooks. Also forms part of an important gap between the urban area of Pulborough and the farmstead of Brookgate Farm.	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.		Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
HO040	Pulborough Garden Centre	Pulborough	Rejected	Unsuitable for residential use due to isolated location from the settlement of Pulborough.		Unsuitable for residential use due to location away from the settlement of Pulborough. Also proposed as an allocation for extended Garden Centre / complementary uses in the Regulation 14 Pulborough Neighbourhood Plan.		There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
MI010	Land north of	Pyecombe	Rejected	Potential significant	The site is visible from the	Whilst some development along	No	There is	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	School Lane			harmful landscape		the road frontage may be		currently no		indicate why	1
				impacts and over-	way (ProW) as a steeply sloped	acceptable it is likely capacity		evidence that		development on the	1
				dominate the	pasture field at the northern edge of	for this would be below the LAA		the site is		site is not achievable.	1
				existing village.	Pyecombe. Views over the site from	threshold. More in-depth		available or			
					the eastern valley side are open and	development would have		being actively			
					expansive over the site.	significantly harmful landscape		promoted for			
					Development of the whole site in	impacts and over-dominate the		development.			
					these views would be excessive and	existing village which is largely		development.			1
					,	at a lower level.					1
					Pyecombe. The South Downs Way	at a lower level.					1
					(SDW) runs along the eastern						
					southern boundaries and views into						1
					the site if developed would be						1
					incongruous in this location. The site						1
					has High Landscape Sensitivity owing						
					to its size and scale, and it's						1
					topography whereby development						1
					would appear overly dominant to the						1
					existing layout and scale of						1
					Pyecombe within the valley. the						1
					northern part of the site in particular						1
					extends for a significant length						
					beyond the existing settlement						
					envelope and extent of influence. A						
					smaller section of the site towards						
					the southern boundary to the east of						
					existing houses to the west is likely to						
					be less sensitive.						
ı İ											
1	1			1						1	1

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			1	rejection		,		Assessment		Assessment	
LE031	Land off Vicarage Way	Ringmer	Rejected	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and potential impact on the setting of a listed building	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	have a potential adverse impact	No	Unavailable as submitted as part of renewable energy proposal in C4S_73		Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE045	Land at Middleham	Ringmer		Potential harm to landscape and settlement character as it would be prominent on high ground over the brow of an existing rise from the existing settlement.	Medium/High Sensitivity The site is visible as an extension to the settlement over the brow of an existing rise which would be inconsistent with the extent of the existing settlement. There are protected trees on the southern boundary.	Due to the conclusions of the landscape assessment, the site is not considered suitable. The access to the site is within the conservation area. Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Along SW boundary are two group tree preservation order (TPO)s, one TPO sycamore, three TPO ash. Further TPOs lie between this area and the road.		Unavailable as submitted as part of renewable energy proposal in C4S_73		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Cito Bof	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Kei	Address	Settlement	1		Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		=		-	Acilievable
LE086	Land adjacent	Dodmoll	Recc'	rejection Potential	Medium Sensitivity – within the	The site is within the		Assessment Unknown. The		Assessment There is no reason to	Yes
	-	Roameii	Rejected		•				Unknown		res
	to Sunnyside			unacceptable	Conservation area, edge of	conservation area and is close to		site was		indicate why	
	and Ouseside			impact on the	sensitive settlement, tourist	listed buildings. The surrounding		considered		development on the	
	Cottages,			integrity of the	destination (Monks House),	area is characterised by low		available in the		site is not achievable.	
	Newhaven			village form and on	1	density development. Part of		2016 SHLAA		One shared access	
	Road			the Conservation	at entrance to village. Screening	the site is within the medieval		but has not		for the scheme is	
				Area.	difficult owing to this although	village core, and there is		been		preferable and is	
					existing trees provide structure	unknown archaeological		submitted for		considered	
					to western part. Existing	potential on the reminder of the		consideration		achievable with	
						site. Taking into account the		to 2022 Call for		relocation of bus	
					layout options.	Conservation Area Appraisal and		Sites or since.		shelter.	
						advice from the Conservation					
						Officer, it is considered that					
						development would have a					
						potentially unacceptable impact					
						on the integrity of the village					
						form and on the Conservation					
						Area.					
15005		D - due - II	Daiaskasl	Data atial advance	High Landson Consistent don to	The state to be seen all outside to the	NI -	Links The	Halasana	Th	V
LE095	Land adjacent	Roameii	Rejected	Potential adverse	High Landscape Sensitivity due to			Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	res
	to			impact on the	poor relationship with settlement	l l		site was		indicate why	
	Abergavenny			character and	pattern, entrance to village	public right of way to the west		considered		development on the	
	Arms Public			appearance of the	location, edge of settlement	of the site. Not suitable due to		available in the		site is not achievable.	
	House			landscape.	exposed to long distance views to	· ·		2016 SHLAA			
						assessment (high landscape		but has not			
					listed buildings and location	sensitivity).		been			
					within conservation area.			submitted for			
								consideration			
								to 2022 Call for			
								Sites or since.			
	l			l							

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land opposite Martens Field	Rodmell		rejection Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and Conservation Area.	undeveloped nature within the Rodmell Conservation Area and the visual sensitivity of the site at the edge of the settlement. Development of the site would	The site is open and exposed on the western edge. It sits outside of the settlement boundary on the western edge of the settlement. Highly visible to/from surrounding open countryside and higher ground to the south. Unsuitable due to conclusions of the landscape assessment (high sensitivity).	No	Assessment Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		Assessment Whilst vehicular access / land ownership for adjacent land unknown and there is no connection to mains gas/electricity/ water at present, there is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
CH105	West of Woodpeckers , A272	Rogate	Rejected	The site is not considered to be available for development.	boundaries. There is development to the south of the site and it would not be perceived in isolation. Views from public right of way to west important to consider.	The site is adjacent to the conservation (with a small part within the site) and is adjacent to a Grade II listed building. The site is within a Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) (may require further advice from Natural England). Trees exist on a number of boundaries to the site, and they contribute to the wooded character of the settlement. Their retention would therefore be sought. It is possible that a sensitive scheme, designed to complement the settlement form, could be provided on this site		As of 2024, there is no evidence to suggest that the site is being actively promoted or is still available for development.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

C: D (	I	la	la 1	la 10 (	I	lo	Cuitable	A 11 1 1111	Availabla	A 1 . 1 . 1 . 1 . 1 . 1 . 1 . 1 . 1 . 1	Achievable
Site Ref	Address			Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	1	Availability		Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land south of	Rogate	Rejected	1		Due to the conclusion of the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	Site has no clear	No
	Hugo Platt			the site would have	Sensitivity as an assart fieldscape	landscape assessment, the site		site was		access point from	
				a potential adverse	within a wide tract of fieldscapes.	is considered not		considered		road network.	
				impact on the	The site is poorly connected to	suitable.		available in the			
				character and	the settlement and would appear			2016 SHLAA			
				appearance of the	as an uncharacteristic intrusion			but has not			
				landscape.	into the wider landscape setting			been			
				Development on	of Rogate. Expansion of			resubmitted			
				the site is not	development in this area would			for			
				currently	perpetuate the uncharacteristic			consideration			
				considered to be	expansion of this nucleated			in the 2022 Call			
				achievable.	settlement.			for Sites. There			
								is currently no			
								evidence that			
								the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
							1	promoted for			
								development.			
								,			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jone Mer	71441 055			rejection		outabline, rissessiment		Assessment		Assessment	
CH107	Land south of	Rogate		Development on	Medium/High Sensitivity. The site	There is a nublic right of way	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Parsonage	Nogate	Trejected	the site would have		running through the site. The		site was		indicate why	
	Estate			a potential adverse		site is within a		considered		development on the	
	Listate			impact on the	,	Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI)		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				character and	· ·	Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) (may		2016 SHLAA		site is not demevable.	
				appearance of the	appear as an uncharacteristic	require further advice from		but has not			
				landscape.	intrusion into the wider	Natural England). Suitable		been			
				lanuscape.		access to the site would need to		resubmitted			
					' " "	be explored.		for			
					characteristics of the landscape	be explored.		consideration			
					as experienced from the public			in the 2022 Call			
					I			for Sites. There			
					right of way. Expansion of						
					development in this area would			is currently no			
					perpetuate the uncharacteristic			evidence that			
					expansion of this nucleated			the site is			
					settlement.			available or			
					To the east of the public right of			being actively			
					way the site is slightly more			promoted for			
					enclosed and relates to the			development.			
					school, and the adjacent						
					dwelling. This area is Medium						
					High Sensitivity, may have local						
					community value.						
CH109	Land east of	Rogate	Rejected	Development on	High Sensitivity. The site is High	Due to the landscape	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Sans Songe /			the site would have	Sensitivity due to the existing	conclusions, the site is not		being actively		indicate why	
	Land north of			a potential adverse	steep topography which makes	considered suitable		promoted and		development on the	
	Garbetts			impact on the	the site visually sensitive to wider	for development.		is considered		site is not achievable.	
	Lane, and			character and	views. Development would			to be available			
	south of A272			appearance of the	involve significant regrading			for			
				landscape.	which would be detrimental to			development.			
					local character. The site is						
					located on the edge of the						
					settlement and is poorly related						
					to existing						
					settlement pattern.						
					, i						
			<u> </u>		<u> </u>				l		

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jite Kei	Address	Settlement		rejection	Landscape Assessment	Juitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
CH235	Land	Rogate	_	Development on	Moderate to High landscape	The topography of this site and	No	Unknown.		There is no reason to	Voc
	surrounding	Rogate	1 -	the site would have		its immediate context are not	INO	There is		indicate why	163
	Rogate			a potential adverse	wider fields that are	considered to be suitable. It is		currently no		development on the	
	I -			l ·				•		•	
	Recreation			impact on the		near to the Conservation Area		evidence that		site is not achievable.	
	Ground			character and	fields, with hedgerow boundaries	I		the site is			
				appearance of the	and lack of woodland creating an			available or			
				landscape.	open character with long views.	register), as well as falling within		being actively			
						an archaeological notification		promoted for			
					boundary is an area of high	area. Potential landscape		development.			
					ground at the edge of the site,	impacts regarding access from					
					the land steeply slopes down to	the A272 at this location. For					
					the area of wider fields. Due to	these reasons and the					
					the topography the site is	conclusions of the landscape					
					prominent and marks the edge of	assessment, the site is not					
					the settlement in this part of	considered to be suitable.					
					Rogate. The site is poorly related						
					to the existing settlement						
					pattern.						
CUDDZ	D	D t -	Daile at a d	The site is a st	Mandausta Causitisitas Tha site site	The site is within Catalana at	V	The site is seen	NI-	Th	V
		Rogate	кејестеа	The site is not	Moderate Sensitivity. The site sits		Yes	The site is not	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	Housing Plots			available.	in prominent location in the	Policy Boundary for Rogate. It is		considered to		indicate why	
	to east				1 -	adjacent to the Conservation		be available.		development on the	
	entrance / 1-				properties provide a sense of	Area. There is a group of trees		The site is		site is not achievable.	
	4 Parsonage				l' ,	subject to a Tree Preservation		under more			
						Order in the far northeastern		than one			
					76 and 77. If considered for	corner of the site. There is a		ownership.			
					redevelopment, the opportunity	small area of surface water					
					could be taken to replicate this	flood risk in the southern area					
					characteristic, whilst also better	of the site. Access should be via					
					addressing the A272.	the Parsonage Estate rather					
						than a new access off the A272.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
	,		Recc'	rejection		•		Assessment		Assessment	
	Land north of A272 (Adjacent to Burial Ground)		Rejected	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	wider field with characteristic large open arable fields, hedgerow boundaries and lack of woodland creating an open character with long views. Steeply rising topography to the north/west. The site is in a prominent location at the eastern entrance to Rogate. The site is situated the other side of a strong hedgerow and tree	field and the boundary for the site does not reflect any existing boundary features. It is near to the Conservation Area and within the former parkland of Rogate Lodge (WSCC local register), as well as falling within an archaeological notification area. Potential landscape impacts regarding access from	No	There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	Unknown	Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Land south of Renault Garage	Rogate	1 -	Development on the site is not currently achievable due to lack of vehicular access.	Low to Moderate Sensitivity. The site is located in the context of other development and is largely enclosed in nature. However, the northern boundary of the site has previously been identified as a historic landscape feature.	and on the boundaries. Development should seek to	Yes	Unknown. There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		The site appears to be land-locked and road access would be a key issue.	No

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
BR001	Dean Court	Rottingdean	Rejected	Potential adverse	Assessed as high sensitivity for	Considered the high sensitivity	No	The site is	Yes	Subject to further	Yes
	Road			impact on the	landscape reflecting openness to	in landscape terms, including		being actively		investigation on	
				character and	local (across the valley to north-	the role of the site as a		promoted and		suitable access, there	
				appearance of the	west) and some longer distance	separation between urban and		is considered		is no reason to	
				landscape.	views, connection to adjacent	wider downs, makes the site		available.		indicate why	
					long-established public right of	unsuitable.				development on the	
					way (ProW) to the south-east					site is not achievable.	
					and woodland (Local Wildlife						
					Site) beyond. Considered						
					landscape includes role of site as						
					a separation between urban and						
					wider downs.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection	·	,		Assessment		Assessment	
EA224	Land north of	Rowlands		Development on	High Landscape Sensitivity. The	Designated woodlands define	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Rowlands	Castle		the site would have	site is within an area of open	the east and west boundaries of		being actively		indicate why the site	
	Castle			a potential adverse	arable land that runs through the	the site: Hanger woodland of		promoted and		is not achievable.	
				impact on the	centre of the character area	Cherry Row and Cherry Row		is considered			
				character and	where 18th and 19th century	grassland are designated as		available.			
				appearance of the	field patterns predominate,	SINCs. The site is located					
				landscape.	however a variety of	between two areas of woodland					
					archaeological features are noted	designated as ancient					
					in the landscape here.	woodland, accessible woodland,					
					Development at this scale would	and SINC – The Holt					
					be a significant extension to	(immediately adjacent west of					
					Rowlands Castle, extending the	the site) and Stansted Forest.					
					settlement beyond the	Development of the site would					
					farmsteads which provide the	impact a significant and well					
					natural edge and contribute to	used Public Right of Way that is					
					the transition from settlement to	gateway route into the National					
					countryside. Development into	Park – the Sussex Border Path					
					this character area would impact	which connects to the					
					the tranquil, rural character of	Shipwrights Way – which bisects					
					the landscape.	the east parcel. Woodhouse					
						Lane and the surrounding					
						network of roads north of					
						Rowlands Castle are relatively					
						rural in character; development					
						would impact on the setting of					
						this lane which is a gateway to					
						the National Park.					
BR004	Land at	Saltdean	Rejected	Potential adverse	Site is very open to longer	Considered unsuitable due to	No	The site is	Yes	The landowner has	Yes
	Longridge	Saituean	-	impact on the	distance views due to the change		NO	being actively	163	suggested access	res
	Ave			character and	in slope and appearing as on top	1		promoted and		could be achieved	
	Ave			appearance of the	of the hill. Assessed as moderate	· ·		is considered		through demolition	
				landscape.	for landscape sensitivity due to	'		available.		of 133 Longridge	
				ianuscape.	recent changes around the site.	on landscape character.		available.		Avenue, and	
					However, considered that due to					therefore the site is	
					the openness and prominence of					considered	
					the site, development would					achievable.	
					have an adverse impact on					acificvabic.	
					landscape character.						
					inanuscape character.						
					<u> </u>						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	76 Rookery Way	Seaford		Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	Medium/High Sensitivity. Edge of settlement expansion area, already detrimental to landscape character, edge of downland and wide-open location makes site visually sensitive.	running through the site. The site is in close proximity to a		Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Land off Normansal Avenue	Seaford	Rejected	Loss of public open space without provision of alternative open space of equal or better quantity, quality and accessibility.	Moderate landscape sensitivity with views of woodland, Seaford Head, the sea and the downs and connections to public right of way network to the north.	Alternative provision of equal or		The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Land off Coxwell Road	Seaford	Rejected	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	Medium Sensitivity The site is visually sensitive owing to its extent and elevation in the landscape. The existing downland character would be lost to development although existing development adjacent to the site and the sloping topography do mean that the site is less sensitive. There is no defensible boundary to the wider (and highly sensitive) open downland to the north.	at this point. This would be compounded by the lack of natural features in the landscape to provide a logical, defensible boundary to the site. The site is also more than 1500m from Seaford centre.		The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement		Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
LE107	Land north east of Coxwell Close	Seaford	·	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site is wholly contained within site C4S_192 and is considered to have the same Medium Sensitivity as a smaller portion of the larger site. The existing downland character would be lost to development although existing development adjacent to the site and the sloping topography do mean that the site is less sensitive. There is no defensible boundary to the wider (and highly sensitive) open downland to the north.	The site is visually sensitive and plays a key role in the transition from built development to open downland at this point. This would be compounded by the lack of natural features in the landscape to provide a logical, defensible boundary to the site. The site is also more 1500m from Seaford centre.		The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE108	Princess Drive	Seaford	·	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has High Landscape Sensitivity owing to its visual sensitivity in a vulnerable location on the edge of the settlement and the contribution that its undeveloped state makes to the overall character.	Due to the conclusions of the landscape assessment, this site is not considered suitable.	No	The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate development of the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Wayfields / Grand Avenue	Seaford		Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has High Landscape Sensitivity owing to its visual sensitivity in a vulnerable location on the edge of the settlement and the contribution that its undeveloped state makes to the overall character.	Two PRoW cross the site connecting the town to Bishopstone and downland, with long distance views to Seaford Head and the sea. Due to the conclusions of the landscape assessment, this site is not considered suitable.	No	The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
LE127	Land North of	Seaford	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site has a strong sense of	Large area of downland on	No	The site is	Yes	Unknown as subject	Unknown
	Seaford			impact on the	place, historic time-depth and	northern edge of Seaford. The		being actively		to access	
				character and	coherent landscape. Visual	site is visually sensitive and		promoted and		arrangements –	
				appearance of the	sensitivity increases as land rises	plays a key role in the transition		is considered		potentially this would	
				landscape and the	to the north. It is considered to	from built development to open		available.		be along narrow	
				local road network.	have moderate landscape	downland at this point. This				estate roads	
					sensitivity at its southern edge,	would be compounded by the				unsuitable for	
					increasing to very high sensitivity	lack of natural features in the				substantial additional	
					at the northern part of site.	landscape to provide a logical,				road traffic.	
					Given there is no defensible	defensible boundary to the site.					
					boundary to the more sensitive	A PRoW crosses the site and					
					land to the north, development is	along east its border with the					
					considered to have an	potential to improve the PRoW					
					unacceptable impact on	connection to downland. The					
					landscape character.	site is more than 1500m from					
						Seaford centre.					
		Seaford	Rejected	Potential adverse	Moderate landscape sensitivity	The site is poorly related to the	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Seaford Golf			impact on the	given the site location, transition	existing settlement boundary		being actively		indicate why	
	Club			character and	to open downland and visual	and would have a potentially		promoted and		development on the	
				appearance of the	sensitivity. Development would	adverse impact on the		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.	extend much further than the	landscape.		available.		Access would be	
					existing settlement edge and					gained via the	
					appear incongruous and					existing golf club	
					unconnected to the surrounding					access.	
					settlement pattern. New roof line						
					and built form would be visible in						
					wider views from nearby PRoW.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	1	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	~	Seaford	Rejected	Remote,	Site has High Landscape	Site is remote from any	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Car Park			unsustainable	Sensitivity owing to its visibility	settlement and is not suitable		site was		indicate	
				location with	on Alfriston Road.	for residential development.		considered in		development of the	
				potential adverse				the Seaford		site is not achievable.	
				impact on the				Neighbourhoo			
				character and				d Plan process			
				appearance of the				but has not			
				landscape.				been			
								submitted for			
								consideration			
								to the 2022			
								Call for Sites or			
								since. In active			
								car park use.			
LE172	Land on	Seaford	Rejected	Unacceptable	Site is considered to have High	Site is wholly within flood zone	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Ves
	Newhaven	Scarora	1 1		landscape sensitivity.	3 in a highly sensitive location.		site was		indicate	103
	Road, near		1	and potential	landscape sensitivity.	The site was rejected by the		considered in		development of the	
	junction of			adverse impact on		Seaford Neighbourhood Plan	I I	the Seaford		site is not achievable.	
	Bishopstone			the character and		process group.	I I	Neighbourhoo			
	Road			appearance of the		process group.		d Plan process			
	Noud			landscape.				but has not			
				lanascape.				been			
								submitted for			
								consideration			
							I I	to the 2022			
								Call for Sites or			
								since.			
								JIIICE.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement		Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability		Achievability	Achievable
LE173	Seaford Head Golf Course	Seaford		rejection  Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	Site considered to have high landscape sensitivity owing to visual sensitivity along existing settlement edge (Chyngton Road).	The site is part of the Heritage Coast. It was rejected by the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan process group.		Assessment Unknown. The site was considered in the Seaford Neighbourhoo d Plan process but has not been submitted for consideration to the 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown	Assessment There is no reason to indicate development of the site is not achievable.	Yes
LE174	Land at corner of Southdown Road and Chyngton Road	Seaford	Rejected	Unacceptable impact on flood risk and potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	Site considered to have high landscape sensitivity owing to visual sensitivity along existing settlement edge (Chyngton Road).	Part of site is within flood zone 3 and a PRoW crosses the site. The site is part of the Heritage Coast. It was rejected by the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan process group.		Unknown. The site was considered in the Seaford Neighbourhoo d Plan process but has not been submitted for consideration to the 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate development of the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection	·	,		Assessment		Assessment	
EA088	Land under	Selborne	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site is assessed as having a	The site is within 5km of the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	An appropriate and	No
	the Hill			impact on the	high landscape sensitivity. It is in	Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA		site was		safe access to the site	
				character and	the Selborne Conservation Area	and there may be potential for		considered		would need to be	
				appearance of the	and is in the setting of various	archaeology. A proposal for 10		available in the		achieved. The	
				landscape, and the	listed buildings. It is also in	dwellings (with associated car		2016 SHLAA		previously proposed	
				setting of heritage	proximity to, and partially visible	parking, open space, and		but has not		(and refused) access	
				assets.	from: the Wakes Registered Park	footpath) was refused in May		been		was from the B3006	
					and Garden; the East Hampshire	2014 and dismissed at appeal in		submitted for		via an adjacent field.	
					Hangers SAC; and the Selborne	March 2015. The appeal		consideration			
					Common SSSI. Although the site	Inspector concluded that		to 2022 Call for			
					is relatively flat, the surrounding	development would fail to:		Sites or since.			
					topography is apparent and so	conserve the landscape, scenic					
					the site is readily visible from the	beauty, and cultural heritage in					
					B3006 (when approaching from	the National Park; and preserve					
					the south) and the Hangers Way	and/or enhance the character					
					long distance walking route	and/or appearance of the					
					(which is on higher ground to the	Conservation Area. Given the					
					west). Moreover, the site forms	above and the findings of the					
					part of the rural setting of the	landscape assessment, the site					
					historic and predominantly linear	is not considered to be suitable					
					village of Selborne.	for residential development.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection		,		Assessment		Assessment	
EA111	Land at	Selborne	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site is assessed as having a	The site is within 5km of the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	A safe and	No
	Honey Lane			impact on the	high landscape sensitivity.	Wealden Heaths Phase II SPA		site was		appropriate access	
				character and	Although the site itself is	and there may be potential for		considered		point off Honey Lane	
				appearance of the	relatively flat, it is part of a larger	archaeology at its access off		available in the		would need to be	
				landscape, and the	field which is raised above its	Honey Lane. The site is not		2016 SHLAA		achieved. There are	
				setting of heritage	proposed access and the village,	considered to be suitable for		but has not		potential highway	
				assets.	on the opposite side to the East	development given: the findings		been		and landscape issues	
					Hampshire Hangers SAC. The site	of the landscape assessment		submitted for		associated with this	
					is partly within the Selborne	(above); the potential impact on		consideration		access point and the	
					Conservation Area and its access	heritage assets; and the		to 2022 Call for		junctions onto Honey	
					is in the setting of both	potential impact of creating a		Sites or since.		Lane and the B3006.	
					designated and non-designated	new vehicular access on rising					
					heritage assets. The site is visible	topography. If development was					
					in both glimpsed and whole	to be considered further, then it					
					views from the PRoW network	would need to be very small-					
					along its southern and western	scale.					
					boundaries.						
		L									

		I	1	I	T		la 1. · ·			I	1
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land to the	Selborne	Rejected	Not considered	The site has high landscape		No	The site is	Yes		Yes
	rear of the			suitable to	sensitivity and is adjacent to two			being actively		indicate why	
	Queens			accommodate 5 or	priority habitats. The site is in the	_		promoted and		development on the	
	Hotel, High				,	potential. The southern area is		is considered		site is not achievable.	
	Street				l e	in a contaminated land buffer		available.			
				impact on the	listed buildings, and is in	and so investigation and					
				character and	proximity to a registered park	potential remediation will be					
				appearance of the	and garden. The B3006 and	required. Development of the					
				landscape, and the	Huckers Lane are two of the five	whole site would be					
				setting of heritage	main areas of interest in the	inconsistent with the					
				assets.	conservation area - the site takes	predominantly linear form of					
					access from the latter. The	the village, and so would be					
					combination of a strong	incongruous to the existing					
					landscape setting between the	settlement pattern and					
					steeply rising wooded hangers,	development depths. Given the					
					many historic buildings, narrow	above and the findings of the					
					winding streets, the use of local	landscape assessment, the site					
					materials, and varied viewpoints	is not considered suitable to					
					and spaces, all combine	yield 5 or more dwellings. As for					
					successfully to create an	the proposed tourism use, it					
					attractive character, setting and	would be more appropriate to					
					sense of enclosure within the	consider this under current					
					Conservation Area and wider	Local Plan Policy SD23, as part					
					village. Furthermore, the village	of a planning application, to					
					is predominantly linear, and this	understand any potential					
					-	accumulative impacts associated					
					_	with the redevelopment of the					
					the road and has limited	adjacent Former Queens Hotel.					
					development at depth.						

			la	<u>.                                    </u>	la 15 ¢	I	a	C:a.a.b.la		Aa:labla		A abiaabia
Si	te Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
╙				Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH	1151	Selham	Selham	Rejected	Development on	The site has High Sensitivity due	Due to the conclusions of the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
		Sawmill			the site would have	to its size and location within the	landscape assessment, not		site was		indicate why	
					a potential adverse	River Rother corridor in an	suitable.		considered		development on the	
					impact on the	intimate and sensitive landscape.			available in the		site is not achievable.	
					character and	It does not relate to the			2016 SHLAA,			
					appearance of the	settlement pattern and although			but has not			
					landscape.	previously developed, the			been			
						existing agricultural character			submitted for			
						and use of the site is not			consideration			
						uncharacteristic in the landscape.			to 2022 Call for			
						Development for housing would			Sites or since.			
						be inconsistent with the			The site is also			
						settlement pattern and			in active use.			
						incongruous with the						
ı İ						_						
L												

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Kei	Address	Settlement	Recc'	rejection	Lanuscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitubic	Assessment	, realiable	Assessment	, temevable
EA053	Land at	Sheet	_		The site has a moderate	The site is rural in character and	No	The site is	Yes	Kingsfernsden Lane is	Yes
	Kingsfernsden			to existing	landscape sensitivity. Although	development would negatively		being actively		a narrow and rural	
	Lane			settlement pattern	relatively flat and enclosed by	impact on a narrow, rural, and		promoted and		sunken lane bound	
				and potential	mature trees and hedgerows, the	historic sunken lane		is considered		by trees and	
				adverse impact on	site is unrelated to Sheet Village	(Kingsfernsden Lane). The lane		available.		hedgerows. There is	
				the character and	and appears to be more closely	has no pavements, and the site				an existing gated	
				appearance of the	associated with the north-east	is bounded by protected trees.				access close to	
				landscape.	settlement edge of Petersfield.	Given the above and the				Fernsden Lodge, and	
					Moreover, development would	findings of the landscape				so development is	
					negatively impact on the rural	assessment, the site is not				technically	
					hinterland of Petersfield, would	considered to be suitable for				achievable. However,	
					create an incongruous north-	development.				development is likely	
					eastern extension to Petersfield,					to impact on the	
					and would coalesce the					narrow and rural	
					settlements of Petersfield and					character of the	
					Sheet.					sunken lane. Indeed,	
										hard engineering	
										solutions would	
										destroy the historic,	
										rural, and	
										countryside	
										character of the lane.	
										This raises questions	
										regarding the site's	
										suitability – see	
										above.	

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
FA407	1 l - <b>f</b> f	Sheet	Recc'	rejection	The size has some high lands on		No	Assessment	V	Assessment	V
1	Land off	Sneet	кејестеа	Potential adverse	, , ,	The site includes the Ashford	INO	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Farnham			impact on the	sensitivity as it forms a	Stream and its valley sides. The		being actively		indicate why	
	Lane, Church			character and	transitional area between the	northern half of the site is in		promoted and		development on the	
	Field			appearance of the	Ashford Stream (north) and the	Flood Zones 2 and 3 and is		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape, and the	Sheet historic village core	susceptible to ground and		available.			
				setting of heritage	(south). In terms of the former,	surface water flooding. The					
				assets.	the site includes the	southern half of the site slopes					
					watercourse, its valley sides,	up towards and contributes to					
					riparian vegetation, and space	the setting of the Sheet					
					for flood alleviation. As for the	Conservation Area and various					
					latter, the site is in, and positively	listed buildings – most notably					
					contributes to, the Sheet	the Church of St Mary					
					Conservation Area and its listed	Magdalene. Given the above					
					buildings.	and the findings of the					
					_	landscape assessment, the site					
						is not considered to be suitable					
						for development.					
EA201	Land at	Sheet	Rejected	Does not relate well	The site is assessed as having a	The site is surrounded by	No	The site is not	No	It is expected that	No
1	Broadlands			to the existing		mature tree belts and		available for		significant works	
	Meadow			settlement pattern	its intact field pattern, raised	hedgerows. The site does not		development.		would be required to	
	(North)			and potential	position, dominant topography,	relate well to the surrounding		development.		achieve access.	
	(1101 111)			adverse impact on	and sensitivity to settlement	settlement pattern and is				demere decess.	
				the character and	pattern.	prominent due to its raised					
				appearance of the	Patterni	position. Given the above and					
				landscape. Site also		the findings of the landscape					
				not available and		assessment, the site is not					
				not considered to		considered to be suitable for					
				be achievable.		development.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievabl
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
EA202	Land at	Sheet	Rejected	Does not relate well	The site is assessed as having a	The site is surrounded by	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	It is expected that	No
	Broadlands			to the existing	high landscape sensitivity due to	mature tree belts and		site was		significant works	
	Meadow			settlement pattern	its intact field pattern, raised	hedgerows. The site does not		considered		would be required to	
	(South)			and potential	position, dominant topography,	relate well to the surrounding		available in the		achieve access.	
				adverse impact on	and sensitivity to settlement	settlement pattern and is		2016 SHLAA			
				the character and	pattern.	prominent due to its raised		but has not			
				appearance of the		position. Given the above and		been			
				landscape. Site also		the findings of the landscape		submitted for			
				not available and		assessment, the site is not		consideration			
				not considered to		considered to be suitable for		to 2022 Call for			
				be achievable.		development.		Sites or since.			
EA203	Land south of	Shoot	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site has a high landscape	The site is bound by mature	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Voc
LAZUS	School Lane	Silect	Rejected	impact on the	sensitivity given its intact field	trees and hedges and is in		being actively		indicate why	1 63
	Serioor Earle			character and	' "	proximity to the Sheet		promoted and		development on the	
				appearance of the	undulating, apparent, and (in	Conservation Area. The site is		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.	some places) dominant	accessed off School Lane, which		available.	l	However, the site's	
				Тапазсарс.	topography onsite. It is readily	is a narrow lane used for on-		avanabic.		topography and the	
					visible from School Lane and	street parallel parking to				width of School Lane	
					residential development would	facilitate the primary school and				may limit the	
					•	existing ribbon residential				capacity for	
					to the nucleated pattern of	development on its northern				development.	
					Sheet.	side. Moreover, the site does				шетегере	
						not relate well to the existing					
						settlement pattern and is					
						prominent due to its raised					
						position. Given the above and					
						the findings of the landscape					
						assessment, the site is not					
						considered to be suitable for					
						development.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection		,		Assessment		Assessment	
CH113	Land south of	Singleton			High sensitivity - High sensitivity	The site is partly within the		Unknown. The		There is no reason to	Yes
	the Old	og.cco		site would have	I	conservation area. There is a		site was		indicate why	
	Rectory			potential adverse	within the conservation area and			considered		development of the	
	,			impact on the		the site and two grade II listed		available in the		site would not be	
				character and		buildings adjacent. A small part		2016 SHLAA		achievable.	
				appearance of the	sensitivity for the northern	of the site is within flood zone 2.		but has not			
				landscape.	1	Due to the conclusions of the		been			
				Development on	conservation area due to the	landscape assessment, the site		submitted for			
				the site would have	visual sensitivity to height and	is not considered to be suitable.		consideration			
				a potential adverse	density of development and			to 2022 Call for			
				impact on heritage	impacts on the conservation			Sites or since.			
				assets.	area.			There is			
								currently no			
								evidence that			
								the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			
								·			
	Land north of	Singleton	Rejected	· •	High Sensitivity. The site contains			Unknown. The		There is no reason to	Yes
	Charlton			site would have	a listed building and is within the			site was		indicate why	
	Road			potential adverse		grade II listed building located		considered		development of the	
				impact on the	listed buildings overlooking the	within the site. The northern		available in the		site would not be	
				character and	site. There is potential for	half of the site is within flood		2016 SHLAA		achievable.	
				appearance of the	<u> </u>	zone 2, and the north-west		but has not			
				landscape.		corner being flood zone 3. Due		been			
				Development on		to the conclusions of the		submitted for			
				the site would have	site. Historic buildings advice	landscape assessment, not		consideration			
				potential adverse	needed.	suitable.		to 2022 Call for			
				impact on heritage				Sites or since.			
				assets				There is			
								currently no			
								evidence that			
								the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jane Ne.	Address	Settiement	Recc'	rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
CH115	Manor Farm	Singleton		Whilst considered suitable for small scale, landscape-led and sensitively	the Conservation area with several listed buildings overlooking the site. Potential for significant detrimental impact to the settlement character due to the size and proportion of the site as a whole. This is a	within the conservation area. There is a grade II listed building within the site. The site is adjacent to a Registered Park		The site has been confirmed as unavailable.		Existing access is unsuitable to accommodate significant intensification of the site. There is no reason to indicate that the site is not achievable for small scale development.	Yes
	Land north of Singleton Primary School	Singleton	Rejected	Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Development on the site is not currently considered to be achievable.				Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since. There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.	Unknown	It is not clear where access to the site could be achieved.	No

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection		,	l	Assessment		Assessment	
CH242	Land south of	Singleton	Rejected	Development on	Moderate/High Landscape	Development of this site would	No	The site is	Yes	There is not reason	Yes
	Charlton			the site and access	Sensitivity. The is large in scale at	extend relatively recent		being actively		to indicate that the	
	Road			would have a	a prominent, location at the east	expansion of the settlement		promoted and		site is not achievable	
				potential adverse	entrance of Singleton village and	further along the south side of		is considered		albeit it is uncertain	
				impact on the	forms part of a wider field and	Charlton Road which is not		available.		whether there is a	
				character and	landscape with notable open	characteristic or consistent with				suitable access.	
				appearance of the	views to the south and part of	nucleated settlement pattern.					
				landscape and the	the separation and transition	The majority of the site is in					
				site is subject to	from Singleton village to Charlton	flood zone 2 and the north-east					
				flood risk.	village.	part of the site is in flood zone					
						3. River Lavant runs through					
						Singleton at this location. The					
						existing access from The Lays					
						development may not be					
						sufficient for the scale of					
						development of the site as a					
						whole, and access from Charlton					
						Road is likely to be urbanising					
						and unlikely to be suitable.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	,		Assessment		Assessment	
	Glebe land at Church Hill	Slindon		rejection  Development on the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Impact on Ancient Woodland and conservation area.	High Sensitivity. High sensitivity due to the size and proportions of the site extending into open countryside alongside Open Access Land and Ancient woodland. Impact on public right of way and conservation area.	The site is adjacent to ancient woodland along the eastern boundary, and the narrowness of the site means an adequate buffer zone would cover the eastern third, rendering an adequate layout for development hard to achieve. There is a public right of way running north to south through the middle of the site. Part of the site is within the conservation area.	No	Assessment Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since. There is currently no evidence to indicate the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Halewick Lane, Sompting	Sompting	Rejected	Not suitable for residential development due to poor relationship with settlement boundary	developed land (PDL) character,	Potential for built development but better for renewable energy / storage as quite disconnected from the settlement boundary.		Put forward by Adur Collective Community Land Trust but no contact with owner. Notice on gate says it is being developed by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) as an energy storage facility.	No	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH117	The Glebe,	South	Rejected	The site does not	High Sensitivity	Part of the site is within the	No	The site was	Unknown	Development of the	No
	Half House	Harting		relate well to the	High sensitivity due to views from	conservation area. There is a		considered		site is not currently	
	and Paddocks			existing settlement	the public right of way over the	grade II listed buildings within		available in the		considered to be	
				pattern and	site, from the wider landscape to	the site and there are a number		2016 SHLAA,		achievable. Further	
				development would	the west and those within the	of listed buildings adjacent.		however the		consideration of safe	
				have a potential	conservation area. The site is	There is a public right of way		site was not		and appropriate	
				adverse impact on	notable for its location within the	along the western edge. Due to		resubmitted to		access would need to	
				the character and	settlement which is part of South	the conclusions of the landscape		the most		be made.	
				appearance of the	Harting's local distinctiveness.	assessment, the site is not		recent Call for			
				landscape.		considered suitable.		Sites or since.			
				Development on				There is			
				the site is not				currently no			
				currently				evidence to			
				considered to be				indicate that			
				achievable.				the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
								=		_	
CH179	Land on	South Harting	Recc'	Prov' Reason for rejection  Development of the site would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and conservation area.	The site is Medium high sensitivity owing to its location at the southern edge of the village in an exposed location visible from surrounding PROW, roads and properties. Development in this location would appear elevated above listed properties to the west of the site within the Conservation Area.	The site is located in an elevated		Assessment Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA, however the site has not been resubmitted to the LPR Call for Sites or since. There is currently no		Achievability Assessment There is no reason to indicate the site is not achievable.	
								evidence to indicate the site is available or being actively promoted for development.			
	Land to north of Holmbush Close	Southwick	Rejected	The site is unsuitable as potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and biodiversity.	as Medium Sensitivity. The site is Medium Sensitivity due to the limited public viewpoints and low level of the site in relation to the surrounding topography. Views to/from the north and west would need to be investigated further. The east and north east	Historic Landfill Site. The site is downland pasture, holds nesting	No	Unknown. The site was considered available in the 2016 SHLAA but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
AD006	Land to north	Southwick	Rejected	Potential adverse	For the wider land ownership	The impact of development on	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	and east of			impact on the	that made up site reference	the historic farmstead in the		being actively		indicate why	
	Hill Farm Way			character and	AD006 - the same conclusions are	south-west corner would need		promoted and		development on the	
				appearance of the	drawn that the area is "high	further consideration. The		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape	landscape sensitivity due to the	Proposed developable area is		available.			
					size of the site dominating the	assessed as highly sensitive in					
					hillside in a prominent and highly	landscape terms and for this					
					visible location with exceptional	reason the site is considered					
					levels of public access and	unsuitable for development.					
					connectivity across the A27 to						
					the SDNP beyond." For the						
					submitted proposed developable						
					area (C4S_010) this site is						
					considered to be high sensitivity						
					in terms of landscape. The slope						
					upwards towards the north and						
					east does cover some longer						
					distance views. However,						
					development is considered to						
					have an adverse impact on						
					landscape character, where the						
					site is considered to still be open						
					from the public right of way						
					(ProW) (on the western						
					boundary and then to the north						
					of the site) and longer distance						
					views to the west, as well as						
					connection to the wider						
					landscape.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	•	,		Assessment		Assessment	
CH244	Land south of	Stedham	Rejected	Development on	Moderate Sensitivity.	The site is potentially within	No	There is	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	The Sorrels	with Iping		the site would have	The site is located within a wider	Notable View Area (v) identified		currently no		indicate why	
				a potential adverse	parcel of land used for	in SINDP7 (Landscape and		evidence the		development on the	
				impact on the	equestrian activity at the	Views). It can be seen from The		site is available		site is not achievable.	
				character and	entrance to the village. The site	Street as well as the footpath		or being			
				appearance of the	has no boundary definition other	along the western boundary.		actively			
				landscape and has a	than existing post and rail fencing	Access could be achieved from		promoted for			
				poor relationship to	and does not relate well to the	the Stedham Sawmills site.		development.			
				the settlement.	settlement pattern it is unclear	Access from The Street should					
					how providing a characteristic	be avoided. A small part of the					
					edge to the settlement would be	area is identified as susceptible					
					achieved.	to surface water flooding. The					
						land on the opposite side of					
						A272 is designated as SSSI and is					
						a Local Nature Reserve.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH245	Land west of	Stedham	Rejected	Development of the	High Sensitivity.	Development of the site would	No	There is	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	West Lodge	with Iping		site would have a	The site forms the southern part	be out of keeping with the low		currently no		indicate why	
				potential adverse	of the historic garden and setting	density sporadic rural edge of		evidence the		development on the	
				impact on the	to Rotherhill House. Rotherhill	the village. It is potentially		site is available		site is not achievable.	
				heritage, character	House is a substantial country	within Notable View Areas (iv		or being			
				and appearance of	house that most likely dates from	and v) identified in SINDP7		actively			
				the landscape. The	1799. While it is not listed it	(Landscape and Views). A small		promoted for			
				site as a poor	together with the parkland,	part of area identified as		development.			
				relationship to the	forms a locally distinctive,	susceptible to surface water					
				settlement and	coherent historic landscape and	flooding. Access to the site					
				there would be loss	an important, characteristic	would be unlikely to be					
				of woodland.	setting to Stedham village. This	achieved without loss of part of					
					parkscape is noted on the	the woodland belt to the south.					
					Historic Environment Record. The						
					trees within the site are						
					historically coherent and mark an						
					important historic boundary						
					which contributes to their value						
					and significance in landscape						
					character terms. Whilst the site is						
					currently used for equestrian						
					activities and is somewhat						
					bisected by post and rail fencing,						
					its fundamental parkland						
					character remains intact.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection		.,		Assessment		Assessment	
EA094	Land east of	Steep	_	Does not relate well	The site is assessed as having a	The site is in a mineral	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	The existing access	Unknown
	Hays Cottages			to the existing	high landscape sensitivity due to	consultation area and sits on		site was		points are via a	
				settlement pattern	its dominant and undulating	the head of a dry valley on land		considered		garage court off Hays	
				and potential	topography, and its exposure to	which slopes away from the		available in the		Cottages, and a	
				adverse impact on	local and distant views from the	settlement. The site is highly		2016 SHLAA		grassed narrow track	
				the character and	PRoW network and wider	visible from the PRoW network		but has not		on the dry valley side	
				appearance of the	landscape. It is also considered to	and wider landscape and is not		been		off Mill Lane. It	
				landscape.	be part of the historic field	well related to the existing		submitted for		would need to be	
					pattern and is poorly related to	settlement. Given the above and		consideration		demonstrated	
					the settlement pattern.	the finding of the landscape		to 2022 Call for		whether a safe	
						assessment, the site is not		Sites or since.		vehicular access	
						considered to be suitable for				point could be	
						built development.				created.	
		Steyning	1 '	Potential adverse		!	No	The site was	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Kingsmead			•	_	uncharacteristically extend the		available at		indicate why	
	Close			of settlement	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	nucleated settlement		time of		development on the	
				pattern, landscape,		southwards along Annington		application and		site is not achievable.	
				woodland habitat		Road; generate significant		appeal 2021-			
				and landscape.	Annington Road is a historic rural	•		2023			
					lane from which bostal tracks run	·		(reference for			
					· ·	of a valued and characteristic		application			
					-	woodland habitat. The proposal		SDNP/21/0289			
						would also negatively impact		2/OUT).			
						the landscape amenity value					
						and character of Annington					
					•	Road, which is a historic rural					
						road and gateway into the					
						National Park from Steyning,					
						and negatively impact longer					
						views from the South Downs					
						Way.					

	1	1		T	I					T	
Site Ref	Address	Settlement		Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
HO007		Steyning	Rejected	Potential adverse	High/Medium Sensitivity - The	,	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Horsham			impact on the	whole site is a large scale and has			being actively		indicate why	
	Road,			character and	High Sensitivity due to proximity	south and south east		promoted and		development on the	
	Steyning			appearance of the	to public right of way,	boundaries). There are nearby		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape and	conservation area, elevated	Listed Buildings to the south and		available.			
				heritage assets.	position above settlement and	south east of the site. The south					
					intervisibility with the close scarp	eastern part of the site is					
					slope and the downs. The south	relatively well contained, with					
					eastern corner of the site has	existing hedgerows along					
					slightly less Medium High	Horsham Road. However, the					
					sensitivity due to its relationship	site rises to the north and the					
					with the settlement pattern, but	whole site is higher than the					
					access and proximity to the	adjacent land to the south east					
					Conservation area and historic	(along Mouse Lane). There is					
					core of the settlement are	considered to be limited scope					
					significant constraints.	to mitigate impacts of any					
						smaller scale development in					
						the south east.					
HO032	Land at	Steyning	Rejected	Potential adverse	Site has very high landscape	Public right of way (ProW) along	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Sweetland,			impact on the		east border. Nearby listed		being actively		indicate	
	Newham			character and	sensitivity being open and in	building and tree preservation		promoted and		development of the	
	Lane			appearance of the	close proximity to the chalk	order (TPO) area. Site not		is considered		site is not achievable.	
	Laric			landscape.	scarp.	considered suitable for		available.		Site is not demevable.	
				lanascape.	, sea. p.	development given the		a valiable.			
						conclusion of the landscape					
						assessment.					
						المعادة الدالد					
	<u> </u>								<u> </u>		

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	-		Assessment		Assessment	
HO033	Land west of	Storrington	Rejected	Potential adverse	High landscape sensitivity owing	PRoW crosses site from west to	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Chantry Lane			impact on the	to the site's distinctiveness and	south. PRoW along northern		being actively		indicate that	
				character and	sense of place. The public right of	boundary with River Stor.		promoted and		development of the	
				appearance of the	way (ProW) crossing the western	Northern tip of site within flood		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.	part of the site provides an	zone 3. Due to the conclusions		available.			
					opportunity to appreciate the	of the landscape assessment,					
					scale and presence of the chalk	the site is not considered					
					escarpment. Prominent foot	suitable for development.					
					slope site when viewed from						
					Chantry Hill.						
EA103	Land adjacent	Stroud	Rejected	Potential impact to	The site is assessed as having	The site is not well related to	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	The access is not	No
	to Holmwood			settlement pattern	Moderate Landscape Sensitivity	the settlement pattern. Access		site was		currently suitable.	
	Lane			and the site is not	due to open views to the south	to the site appears to be the		considered		The access entrance	
				achievable due to	and part of land forming a	track adjacent north. The track		available in the		and early length is	
				access constraints.	transition from Stroud village to	is not currently wide enough to		2016 SHLAA		bounded by the	
					open countryside.	allow for suitable access.		but has not		primary school and	
								been		playground and there	
								submitted for		does not appear to	
								consideration		be scope to widen.	
								to 2022 Call for			
								Sites or since.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	•	-		Assessment		Assessment	
	Land east of Langrish Primary School	Stroud		Potential adverse impact to settlement pattern and the site is not achievable due to access constraints.	The site has low-moderate landscape sensitivity. The site is part of a wider landscape of early enclosure. It shares some historic landscape character features such as the wooded field margins. The site has low visibility.	I	No	The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.		The access is not currently suitable. The access entrance and early length is bounded by the primary school and playground and there does not appear to be scope to widen.	No
	Land south of Winchester Road, east of Seven Stars PH	Stroud	Rejected	Potential adverse impact to settlement pattern and character.	sensitivity. The site is part of a wider landscape of early enclosure. It shares some historic	The site is not well related to the settlement pattern, separated from the built form core of the settlement by the Seven Stars pub, car park and landscaping. The southern part of the site is adjacent a watercourse and is subject to surface water flood risk. Access to the site is indicated from the A272 but via a 'drive' skirting round other land.	No	Unknown. The site was submitted to the SDNPA between 2016 and 2022 Call for Sites, but has not been submitted for consideration to 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Former Army Training Camp, Barns Farm Lane	Sullington		Remote from any settlement which would have an urbanising effect on the countryside.		Unsuitable location for residential development away from any settlement.		There is currently no evidence that the site is available or being actively promoted for development.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Jane Nei	Address	Settlement	Recc'	rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Assessment		Assessment	
	Land adj to Swanmore	Swanmore		Potential adverse impact on the	The site is assessed as having a medium/high landscape	which is well contained,	No	Unknown. The site was	Unknown	The existing access is narrow, heavily	No
	Primary			character and	sensitivity. The site is relatively	screened, and enclosed by		considered		wooded, and	
	School and			appearance of the	secluded and enclosed by	mature trees and hedges,		available in the		topographically lower	
	Church Car			landscape. Unclear	existing woodland and boundary	although glimpsed views from		2016 SHLAA		than the main	
	Park			whether a	vegetation. The above –	the PRoW network are possible.		but has not		developable area.	
				safe/appropriate	alongside the topographical	The existing		been		There is concern that	
				access can be	changes and the condition /	woodland/vegetation,		submitted for		an appropriate and	
				achieved.	location of the existing access -	topography, and access limit the		consideration		safe vehicular access	
					limit the developable area.	developable area. Given the		to 2022 Call for		from Hampton Hill	
						above and the findings of the		Sites or since.		cannot be achieved	
						landscape assessment, the site				to accommodate	
						is not considered to be suitable				built development.	
						for development.					
WI031	Land at	Swanmore	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site has high landscape	The site is of significant size and	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Dodds Lane			impact on the	, , ,	scale in relation to the		being actively		indicate why	
				character and	1	surrounding settlement pattern.		promoted and		development on the	
				appearance of the	settlement pattern. The site is	The central and eastern parts		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.	open and visible from wider	are highly sensitive given their		available.			
					views to the east. Development	open nature. Although the					
					would create an isolated	slightly more enclosed western					
					development and an incongruous	part is less sensitive,					
					extension to the predominantly	development would still involve					
					contained and nucleated pattern	substantial tree loss and scrub					
					of Swanmore.	clearing which would increase					
						its visibility. Even if reduced,					
						development would still be					
						unacceptable in landscape					
						terms as it would be					
						inconsistent with surrounding					
						(and transitional) settlement					
						character. Given the above and					
						the findings of the landscape					
						assessment, the site is not					
						considered to be suitable for					
						development.					
				l	<u> </u>	L .					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection		.,		Assessment		Assessment	
WI036	Little	Swanmore	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site is assessed as having a	The site is large and located on	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Vicarage			impact on the	high landscape sensitivity. The	the edge of the settlement		site was		indicate why	
	Farm			character and	site is prominent within the	within a rural / low density		considered		development on the	
				appearance of the	wider landscape due to its large	character associated with the		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.	scale and apparent topography.	surrounding countryside. There		2016 SHLAA			
					The site has poor relationship	are two PRoW which cross the		but has not			
					with the existing settlement	site. Although the site is		been			
					pattern, and development would	physically adjacent to the		submitted for			
					impact on surrounding views and	settlement boundary at its		consideration			
					the PRoW network.	south-east corner, it is not		to 2022 Call for			
						considered to be well related to		Sites or since.			
						the settlement nor its					
						development pattern. Given the					
						above and the findings of the					
						landscape assessment, the site					
						is not considered to be suitable					
						for residential development.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	-		Assessment		Assessment	
WI103	Land at	Swanmore	Rejected	Potential	The site has moderate landscape	The site is in a mineral	No	The site is	Yes	The proposed access	Yes
	Vicarage Lane			incongruous	sensitivity given its small-scale	consultation area and is		being actively		would be via Fullegar	
				extension into the	and predominantly flat	adjacent to historic landfill		promoted for		Cottages outside the	
				countryside and	topography. Nevertheless,	under the former railway line to		affordable		National Park. There	
				adverse impact on	development would further	the north. The site is		housing and is		is no reason to	
				the character and	extend existing ribbon	surrounded on three sides by		considered		indicate why	
				appearance of the	development into the	the PRoW network and is bound		available.		development on the	
				landscape.	surrounding countryside. This	by the defined settlement				site is not achievable,	
					would create an isolated	boundary to the south and				but this is subject to	
					development and an incongruous	west, and by a mature tree belt				a site assessment of	
					extension to the predominantly	to the north. The eastern				the adjacent land	
					contained and nucleated village	boundary is open to views from				parcel and access by	
					of Swanmore.	the wider landscape, including				Winchester City	
						intervisibility with the listed				Council authority.	
						Abbey House, whilst the					
						northern area is visible in					
						distant views over the river					
						valley due to its topography and					
						elevated position. Given the					
						above and the findings of the					
						landscape assessment, the site					
						is not considered to be suitable					
						for residential development.					
	Land at Kirby	Telscombe	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site is considered high in	·		The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Farm			impact on the	terms of landscape sensitivity.	ground, may be potential in this		being actively		indicate why	
				character and		area for development excluding		promoted and		development on the	
				appearance of the		an area north/south around the		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.		lowest point which is		available.			
						susceptible to surface water					
						flooding. However, on balance,					
						landscape sensitivity would					
						make this eastern part					
						unsuitable.					

C		la	<u>.</u>		I		Cuitabla		Aa.ilalala		A alai a a la la
Site Ref	Address		Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI006	Land end of	Twyford	Rejected	Not considered	The site slopes gently to the	The SHLAA (2016) stated that	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Bourne Fields			suitable to yield 5	north and comprises part	the site had planning permission		site was		indicate why	
				dwellings or more.	driveway and part woodland at	for 10 dwellings and that these		considered		development on the	
					the rear of Bourne Fields. The	were being built out. No record		available in the		site is not achievable.	
					existing trees make a strong	of the planning permission can		2016 SHLAA			
					contribution to local landscape	be found, and the officer site		but has not			
					character and help to separate	visit in June 2023 confirmed that		been			
					the existing employment and	no dwellings have been		submitted for			
					residential areas to the north and	constructed. The SHLAA (2016)		consideration			
					south respectively. Any loss of	recommendation is, therefore,		to 2022 Call for			
					trees to facilitate development	considered to be an error. In		Sites or since.			
					would impact on biodiversity,	terms of the suitability, the site					
					and the appearance and	is not considered suitable to					
					character of the area. Finally,	yield 5 dwellings or more given					
					given the density of surrounding	the surrounding residential					
					residential development, the site	density, and the need to retain					
					is not considered suitable to yield	the existing driveway and					
					5 dwellings or more.	woodland.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	-		Assessment		Assessment	
WI046	Land at Down	Twyford	Rejected	Not considered	The site has very low landscape	The site comprises residential	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	End, Bourne			suitable to yield 5	sensitivity. It is enclosed, used as	garden land enclosed by well-		site was		indicate why	
	Lane			dwellings or more.	residential garden land, and is	established trees, hedgerows,		considered		development on the	
					sandwiched between built	and other vegetation. Although		available in the		site is not achievable.	
					development to the north and	the site has very low landscape		2016 SHLAA		However, there are	
					south. The site is more sensitive	sensitivity, the site is not		but has not		some concerns over	
					to the north and east due to the	considered suitable to yield 5		been		the impact of	
					existing PRoW, priority woodland	(net) dwellings or more given		submitted for		development on the	
					habitat, and its narrowing,	the surrounding residential		consideration		historic and sunken	
					triangular shape. Development	density, and the need to retain		to 2022 Call for		nature of Bourne	
					would need to be focused to the	existing trees and woodland.		Sites or since.		Lane.	
					west. However, any loss of trees						
					and impact on the historic and						
					sunken nature of Bourne Lane (to						
					facilitate development) would						
					have an impact on the						
					appearance, biodiversity, and						
					character of the area. Given the						
					above and the density of						
					surrounding development, the						
					site is not considered suitable to						
					yield 5 (net) dwellings or more.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	-		Assessment		Assessment	
WI104	Land at	Twyford	Rejected	Not considered to	Orchard Close is set within	The site is allocated in the	Yes	The site is not	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	Orchard Close			be available for	substantial grounds, to the east	Twyford NDP (Policy HN5) for		available for		indicate why	
				redevelopment.	of Twyford Village, off the	the change of use (CoU) or		redevelopment		development on the	
					historic and sunken Bourne Lane.	redevelopment of the site. The				site is not achievable.	
					The site is owned by Twyford	NDP policy limits					
					School and is in use as a boarding	redevelopment to the footprint					
					house having formerly been a	of the existing buildings and					
					purpose-built residential home	immediate surroundings so to					
					(including assisted living for older	minimise the impact on the					
					persons). The site includes built	historic garden. The policy does					
					development and car parking in	not provide one specific end use					
					the north, and a historic	or redevelopment quantum, but					
					Edwardian Garden (as described	instead sets out a criteria-based					
					by the Hampshire Gardens Trust)	policy to help guide anticipated					
					in the south. The site gently rises	changes following purchase by					
					to the north and is enclosed by	Twyford School. The site was					
					established vegetation including	entered onto the South Downs					
					some protected trees. The upper	Brownfield Register in					
					floors of the existing buildings	December 2020. The entry					
					can be seen in glimpsed views	highlights an opportunity for the					
					from the wider landscape.	delivery of, at least, 5 dwellings					
						within a 0.14ha area. Moreover,					
						the NDP allocation has					
						established the principle for					
						CoU and/or redevelopment, and					
						so the site is considered					
						suitable.					
HO025	College Road	Upper	Rejected	Potential adverse	Open downland at a higher level	Unsuitable due to landscape	No	There is	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
		Beeding		impact on the	than College Road. No	impact and breaching defensible		currently no		indicate why	
				character and	development on this side of the	boundary of College Road.		evidence that		development on the	
				appearance of the	road at present.			the site is		site is not achievable.	
				landscape.				available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
HO046		Upper Beeding		Unacceptable impact on flood risk and potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	Edge of settlement but falling away to south with no enclosure	Most of the site in flood zones 2 and 3. Small area outside probably below capacity threshold for LAA. Landscape impact likely to be high.	No	Unknown. The site was considered in the Upper Beeding Neighbourhoo d Plan process but has not been submitted for consideration to the 2022 Call for Sites or since.	Unknown	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
HO047	Beeding Court Farm	Upper Beeding	Rejected	Potential to be out of character with the farmstead settlement pattern and poorly related to the village.	Adur floodplain.	Unsuitable as higher density housing on this site would be out of character with the farmstead settlement pattern and poorly related to the village. SDNP/16/06133/OUT for five dwellings was refused and dismissed on appeal. The Inspector considered that "replacing one house with five houses would be disrespectful of the farmstead character that has been maintained following the business park's establishment. That is because a more intense residential enclave would be introduced".		Unknown. The site was considered in the Upper Beeding Neighbourhoo d Plan process but has not been submitted for consideration to the 2022 Call for Sites or since.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI028	Warnford	Warnford		The site is in active	The site is assessed as having a	The site comprises a stepped	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Farm, Lippen			employment use.	medium/high landscape	hardstanding to accommodate		being actively		indicate why	
	Lane				sensitivity due to its prominence	two, long, former agricultural		promoted and		development on the	
					on the valley side of the River	buildings and car parking. The		is considered		site is not achievable.	
					Meon. A PRoW passes through	first building is single storey,		available.			
					the site along its access and	whilst the second is larger in					
					south-western boundary and	mass, scale, and height. The two					
					continues up the valley side to	former agricultural buildings					
					capture views of the site and	have been converted for					
					settlement. Although existing	employment uses and these					
					mature trees help to partly	uses are active as confirmed by					
					screen the site in views from the	the officer site visit in May 2023.					
					north-west and west, the site is	Although a sensitive (i.e.,					
					open to views from the south	farmstead or courtyard style)					
					and east. The existing built units	redevelopment could help					
					can be seen from Lippen Lane in	improve the appearance and					
					between existing residential	character of the site and wider					
					development. The rising	landscape, a residential-led					
					topography means that	scheme would introduce a more					
					development has potential to	suburban character into the					
					impact on landscape and visual	predominantly agricultural					
					character.	landscape and would result in					
						the loss of employment space.					
HO024	Land north of	Washington	Rejected	Potentially suitable	Previously developed site	Site is within the conservation	Yes	The site is	Yes	Subject to acceptable	Yes
	The Street			for small scale	considered to have moderate	area with listed buildings in		available for		access and impact on	
				development but	landscape sensitivity owing to its	close proximity. Subject to		development.		neighbouring	
				unclear if 5	historic continuity and visual	acceptable relationship with				properties (including	
				dwellings can be	sensitivity from the Street.	neighbouring properties site is				a listed building),	
				accommodated.		considered potentially suitable				there is no reason to	
						for small scale development.				indicate	
						However, unclear if 5 dwellings				development of the	
						can be accommodated.				site is not achievable.	

		T		1			1		1	T	
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
HO013	Land North of	Watersfield	Rejected	Development on	High Sensitivity. There are	Development on the site would	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	River Lane			the site would have	extensive views along the river	have a potential adverse impact		being actively		indicate why	
				a potential adverse	valley towards the chalk ridge	on the character and		promoted and		development of the	
				impact on the	from the public footpath. The	appearance of the landscape. It		is considered		site is not achievable	
				character and	site is considered to be an	would also have a detrimental		available.		although it is not that	
				appearance of the	important gap between	impact on the protection area				the site would need	
				landscape. It would	Coldwaltham and Watersfield.	around the Water Meadows.				to be accessed from	
				also impact on the	The Conservation Area abuts the	There are limited priority				A29 and this may not	
				setting of the	site. Historic buildings are visible	habitats on the site although				be suitable.	
				conservation area	and is Watersfield hamlet. The	bats have been recorded. But					
				and the water	site is High Sensitivity due to the	the main issue is landscape					
				meadows to the	relationship between the historic	sensitivity and impact on					
				south.	core of Watersfield and its	historic character.					
					surrounding historic fieldscapes,						
					the site being a part of that. The						
					site is highly visible along the A29						
					and from the Footpath and does						
					not relate well to the settlement						
					pattern. There are some						
					significant trees on the boundary						
					with the A29.						

a		la	I	la 15 6	I	In 1. 1.111.	Ctaak!		l Assailabi		Achievable
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land west of	Watersfield	Rejected	The site is not	Moderate sensitivity. The site is	The site is close proximity to	1	As of 2024,	No		No
	Besley			considered to be	Moderate Sensitivity due to its	Conservation Area and adjacent	l	there is no		achievable although	
	Farmhouse			available for	size, relationship with adjacent	to a Grade II listed building. A		evidence to		gaining suitable site	
				development.	development and potential for	Tree Preservation Order (TPO)		suggest that		access will require	
					screening. It is adjacent a listed	covers two trees in the north-		the site is		assessment and	
					building and further advice and	western area of the site. The		being actively		confirmation. There	
					details are needed to assess the	site is within a Site of Special		promoted or is		appears to have been	
					impact.	Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact		still available		a previous access	
						Risk Zone (and will require		for		from site to A29,	
						further advice from Natural		development.		perhaps for	
						England). The site is within 5km				agricultural use. This	
						of a Special Protection Area.				would likely lead to	
										the loss of a	
										substantial amount	
										of mature hedgerow	
										to gain necessary	
										widths and visibility.	
										Access might be	
										achievable from	
										Chapel Close, but this	
										is an unadopted	
										access road servicing	
										garages at present	
										and could impact an	
										electricity substation	
										and (TPO) trees.	
										, ,	
			1								

City Def	Address	C - 111 1	D1	D I D	1	Code-Liller Accessor	Cuitable	A !! - I . !!!A	Available	A - L ! L !!!»	Achievable
Site Ket	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Acilievable
110000		\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	Recc'	rejection		<u> </u>		Assessment	.,	Assessment	<b>.</b>
		Watersfield	Rejected	The site is High	High Sensitivity The site is High	•	No	The site is	Yes		No
	River Lane,			· ·	Sensitivity due to the relationship			being actively		River lane it is	
	Watersfield				between the historic core of	on the character and		promoted and		considered the site	
					_	appearance of the landscape		is considered		development is not	
				historic core of	-	and the setting of the historic		available.		achievable as River	
				Watersfield and its	part of a larger field structure	core. Whilst not directly				lane is narrow and	
				surrounding historic	and is located within an open	abutting the conservation area,				rural in character.	
				fieldscapes.	part of Watersfield and accessed	it is close to it. The site is not					
				Development of the	via a rural and narrow lane. It is	directly connected to the					
				site would have a	visible from the rear gardens of	settlement boundary – it does					
				potential adverse	properties along A29.	not abut it and is some distance					
				impact on the		away.					
				character and							
				appearance of the							
				landscape and the							
				setting of the							
				historic core. Whilst							
				not directly							
				abutting the							
				conservation area,							
				it is close to it.							
AR025	Land north of	Wepham	Rejected	Out of character	Wepham is a small cluster of	A development of 5+ dwellings	No	There is	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Lample House			with settlement	· ·	on this site would be out of		currently no		indicate why	
	· .				the intersection of routeways	character with this settlement		evidence that		development on the	
				the landscape	above the river valley of the	pattern and harmful to the		the site is		site is not achievable.	
				character,	Arun. The settlement pattern is	landscape character. The hamlet		available or			
				unsustainable	loose and diverse with some	also lacks any facilities and is		being actively			
				location.		not a sustainable location for	1	promoted for			
					"	development.	1	development.			
					others set back in sinali groups.	acvelopment.		development.			

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
				rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
CH184	Manor Farm,	West Dean	Rejected	Development on	High Sensitivity owing to its	Due to the conclusions of the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	No
	A286			the site would have	location within the conservation	landscape assessment the site is		site was		indicate that the site	
				a potential adverse	area, inclusion within the historic	not considered to be suitable.		considered		is not achievable.	
				impact on the	village core, highly visible	The potential displacement of		available in the			
				character and	location within the village	existing agricultural and equine		2016 SHLAA.			
				appearance of the	fronting the River Lavant	use to alternative sites is also		The site has			
				landscape.	opposite the village green, and	noted.		not been			
					likely existing heritage assets			resubmitted to			
					within the site.			the Local Plan			
								Review Call for			
								Sites. The site			
								is in active use.			
								There is			
								currently no			
								evidence to			
								indicate that			
								the site is			
								available or			
								being actively			
								promoted for			
								development.			

		la	I	l	T	La	0.31.1.1		L A 11 - 1. 1		A -1-11-1
Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment		Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
	Land south of	West Liss	Rejected	Development on	The site has a low landscape			The site has	Unknown	·	No
	Riverside			the site is not	sensitivity. The site is below the	consultation area for sharp sand		been identified		the railway and the	
	Close			currently	75m contour and is not	and gravel, silica sand, and soft		through the		rear gardens of	
				achievable.	characteristic of its landscape	sand. The site has high		Liss		properties along	
				Development would	owing to the existing golf course	recreational value given its		Neighbourhoo		Riverside Close. At	
				have a potential	use. Although the site can be	current use as part of a 9-hole		d Development		present, there is no	
				adverse impact on	seen in distant views from	golf course, and it is unclear if		Plan (NDP)		option for a vehicular	
				recreation, and a	Farnham Road, it remains	the site is required for the		[Adopted		or pedestrian access	
				potential adverse	relatively enclosed on its	continued operation of the golf		2017] which		and so development	
				impact on the	northern and eastern boundaries	course. The site is in the		previously		is not considered to	
				character and	by existing rear gardens and the	Wealden Heath Phase II SPA		considered the		be achievable.	
				appearance of the	railway line respectively.	5km buffer, and the southern		site. As of			
				landscape.	Notwithstanding the above,	and eastern boundaries are in		2023, it is			
					development would create an	Flood Zone 2 and a		uncertain			
					incongruous extension to the	contaminated land buffer		whether the			
					existing settlement pattern.	respectively. If a vehicular		site is still			
						access could be created, then		available for			
						development would create an		development.			
						incongruous extension to the					
						existing settlement pattern.					
						Given the above and the					
						findings of the landscape					
						assessment, the site is not					
						considered to be suitable for					
						built development.					
1											
											L

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	,	1	Assessment		Assessment	
EA222	Liss Business	West Liss	Rejected	The site is in active	The site comprises two existing	The site is previously developed	No	The landowner	No	There is no reason to	Yes
	Centre			employment use.	commercial units, hardstanding,	land (PDL) within the existing		recently		indicate why	
				The site is	car parking, and courtyard within	settlement policy boundary		indicated that		development on the	
				considered	the existing settlement	(SPB). There is potential for		it is taking		site is not achievable.	
				unavailable given	boundary. The site has a low	contamination due to existing		action to			
				the current	landscape sensitivity given that it	and previous commercial uses		dispose of the			
				landowner is taking	is previously developed land	and redevelopment may require		site. Should			
				action to dispose of	(PDL), predominantly flat, and is	the relocation of infrastructure		any new site			
				the site and the	bound by recent twentieth	– i.e., sub-station, overhead and		owners wish to			
				intention of any	century development on three	underground cables etc. The site		develop the			
				new owner is	sides.	is subject to an Article 4		site for			
				unknown.		Direction which removes		alternative use			
						permitted development rights		such as			
						for a change of use of office or		residential, the			
						light industrial units to		SDNPA would			
						residential use. A full planning		need to be			
						application is, therefore,		satisfied that			
						required for any such change of		the loss of			
						use. The Liss NDP explains that		employment			
						there is no land available for		land is			
						new businesses and that many		acceptable.			
						small businesses in Liss want					
						flexible spaces. The site is in					
						active employment use as					
						documented during the officer					
						site visit in April 2024 and					
						confirmed by the landowner					
						June 2024.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
	710.01.000		Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI009	Land at	West Meon		Not considered to	The site comprises the front	The site comprises a large part	Yes	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Meadow			be available for	residential garden land of	of the residential garden land at		site was		indicate why	
	House			development.	Meadow House which is a large,	Meadow House. The south of		considered		development on the	
					detached, modern, 2.5 storey	the site is in Flood Zones 2 and		available in the		site is not achievable.	
					dwellinghouse of brick and tile	3, and so development would		2016 SHLAA			
					construction. The site is assessed	need to be restricted to the		but has not			
					as having a medium landscape	central and northern areas of		been			
					sensitivity. It is relatively flat and	the site. Development would		submitted for			
					comprises open mown lawn and	also need to be carefully		consideration			
					boundary shrubs which is	designed to consider any		to 2022 Call for			
					uncharacteristic of its landscape.	potential impact on the setting		Sites or since.			
					The site is highly visible from the	of the adjacent conservation					
					road and PRoW network, and is	area and the need to retain					
					bounded by key landscape	important mature trees within,					
					features, i.e., disused railway to	and adjacent to, the site.					
					east, River Meon to south, and						
					Conservation Area to west.						
					Although heavily constrained and						
					visible, the recent changes on,						
					and adjacent to, the site suggest						
					that there is an opportunity for						
					small scale, sensitive, and						
					sympathetically designed,						
					residential development which						
					respects the built form,						
					character, and density of the						
					area.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI010	Land at	West Meon	Rejected	No evidence that	The site is assessed as having a	The site is located within the	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Meonwara			the site is available	low/medium landscape	defined settlement boundary of		site was		indicate why	
	Crescent			or being actively	sensitivity given its peri-urban	West Meon and is bounded by		considered		development on the	
				promoted. Potential	character, its location within the	residential development on		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				adverse impact on	defined settlement boundary,	three sides. Although not		2016 SHLAA			
				amenity, informal	and that it is bounded by existing	representative of the local		but has not			
				community use, and	residential development on three	landscape character, the site		been			
				heritage assets.	sides. The site is not	comprises existing public open		submitted for			
					representative of the local	space (POS) and so		consideration			
					landscape character. However,	development would not be		to 2022 Call for			
					the site is readily visible from	suitable, nor appropriate, unless		Sites or since.			
					adjacent properties and has high	alternative provision of an equal					
					community value given that it is	or better quality was sought.					
					used as public open space (POS).	Even if alternative POS provision					
					The officer site visit in April 2023	was secured, development					
					confirmed the presence of	would create an overall density					
					children's play equipment and	which would be uncharacteristic					
					temporary goal posts.	to the area, notwithstanding the					
						likely impacts on existing					
						residential amenities and non-					
						designated heritage assets to					
						the south. Given the above and					
						the findings of the landscape					
						assessment and 2023 officer site					
						visit, the site is not considered					
						to be suitable for development.					
<i>i</i>											

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
	7144.055			rejection		outcomity resessing in		Assessment		Assessment	
	Land at Long Priors (Extension)	West Meon		Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	and other established footpaths.	development and comprises an		The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	Yes
	Land north of West Meon Road	West Meon		Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	arable, and relatively flat, "gap" between the existing defined settlement boundaries of West Meon. However, development within this gap would coalesce two distinct areas of settlement: the historic village centred around the A32, and the cluster of dwellings centred around Westbury Manor. This would conflict with the historic settlement pattern of West Meon such that the separate areas of historic settlement would no longer be legible in the landscape.	and forms a "gap" between the existing defined settlement boundaries. The access is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 due to the proximity of the River Meon. Development within this gap would coalesce two distinct areas of settlement: the historic village centred around the A32, and the cluster of dwellings centred around Westbury Manor. This would conflict with the historic settlement pattern of West Meon such that the separate areas of historic	No	The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable subject to a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	,		Assessment		Assessment	
WI110	Land north of	West Meon		Potential adverse	The site has a moderate	The site is adjacent to the West	No	The site is	Yes	The existing access is	No
	Doctors Lane			impact on the	landscape sensitivity. The site is	Meon Conservation Area and		being actively		via a single-track	
				appearance,	flat, is characteristic of the wider	the Grade II listed Cedars		promoted and		road which is gated,	
				character, setting	landscape, and is enclosed by	Cottage. The existing access is		is considered		is in the conservation	
				and significance of	existing trees, hedgerows,	via a narrow single-track which		available.		area and setting of a	
				adjacent heritage	allotments and built	is used by walkers, is rural in				Grade II listed	
				assets.	development. Given its relative	character, and is within the				building, and is	
					enclosure, it is mostly hidden	conservation area and setting of				currently only used	
					from public view and	a Grade II listed building. The				by walkers to gain	
					development would create a	engineering works required to				access to the	
					neutral extension to the	achieve vehicular access would				allotments and PRoW	
					settlement.	have a likely significant impact				network. Although	
						on both the appearance and				development is	
						character of the conservation				technically	
						area and the setting of the listed				achievable, it is likely	
						building. As such, it is				to impact on the	
						considered that the site is not				rural character of this	
						currently suitable for				track and harm the	
						development given the				setting of heritage	
						potential impact from the site's				assets.	
						proposed access on adjacent					
						heritage assets.					
WI014	Land west of	West Meon	Rejected	Poorly related to	The site has very high landscape	The site does not relate well to	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	Floud Lane			the settlement	sensitivity due to its open and	the defined settlement		being actively		indicate why	
				boundary. Potential	rural character, topography,	boundary of West Meon.		promoted and		development on the	
				adverse impact on	lowland meadow priority habitat,	Development would create an		is considered		site is not achievable.	
				the character and	high visibility from the PRoW	incongruous western extension		available.			
				appearance of the	network, and its contribution to	which would significantly impact					
				landscape, and on	the setting of (and views to and	on the setting and views to, and					
				the setting of	from) the West Meon	from, the conservation area and					
				nearby heritage	Conservation Area and the Grade	listed historic church. Given the					
				assets.	II listed Church of St John, the	above and the findings of the					
					Evangelist. The landscape	landscape assessment, the site					
					framework means that the site	is not considered to be suitable					
					has low capacity (if any) to	for development.					
					absorb development.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI055	Land East of	West Meon	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site is assessed as having a	The site is adjacent to, and	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	Floud Lane			impact on the	high landscape sensitivity. The	within the setting of, the West		site was		indicate why	
	and South of			character and	site is in proximity to, and	Meon Conservation Area and		considered		development on the	
	Church Lane			appearance of the	contributes to the setting and	Grade II Listed Church of St		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				landscape, and on	views of, the West Meon	John, the Evangelist. The site is		2016 SHLAA			
				the setting of	Conservation Area and the Grade	prominent in views from the		but has not			
				adjacent heritage	II Listed Church of St John, the	wider landscape, road, and		been			
				assets.	Evangelist. The site is on rising	PRoW networks. Given the		submitted for			
					topography and is prominent in	above and the findings of the		consideration			
					views from the PRoW and road	landscape assessment, the site		to 2022 Call for			
					networks. Moreover,	is not considered to be suitable		Sites or since.			
					development would impact on	for development.					
					the perception of the village and						
					the setting of heritage assets.						

Cito Dof	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landsons Assessment	Cuitability Assassment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Site Ker	Address	Settlement	Recc'		Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Juitable	·		•	Acilievable
CH360	Land east of	Mosthourne		rejection	Moderate to High Landscape	The site is adjacent to	No	Assessment The site is	Yes	Assessment There is no reason to	Voc
	River Street	Westbourne	Rejecteu	Isite would have a	Sensitivity. The site is located	Westbourne Conservation Area.		being actively	163	indicate why	163
	River Street				•		l	,		·	
				potential advise	1	Much of the site is within the		promoted and		development on the	
				impact on the	Conservation Area at a	watercourse buffer of the River		is considered		site is not achievable.	
					•	Ems. River Ems and Meadows		available.			
				appearance of the	east entry to the village with	Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and					
				landscape and	· ·	associated priority habitat is					
				would not be	east, albeit separate from the	adjacent south. The entrance					
				consistent with the	historic core of the village.	and west part of the site is					
				settlement pattern		within Flood Zone 2, EA Flood					
				of Westbourne. The		Alert and Flood Warning areas,					
				entrance to the site		and within 1-100 and 1-1000					
				is also subject to		surface water flood risk. Pylons					
				flood risk.		bisect a small part of the north-					
						east corner of the site. The River					
						Ems and River Street form a					
						clear edge to the settlement at					
						this location. Development of					
						the site would not be consistent					
						with the settlement pattern on					
						Westbourne. This area forms					
						the transition from the village to					
						countryside. Access to the site					
						would likely have an urbanising					
						impact on the lane and result in					
						loss of hedgerow.					
						iloss of fieugerow.					

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
		1	1			,		Assessment		Assessment	
	Land at Bramley Farm	Willingdon	Rejected		The site is assessed as moderate sensitivity in landscape terms. This is partly due to the historic layout of the fields and boundaries, otherwise the site would be considered a lower sensitivity. The site is enclosed and has low visibility in some longer distance views for	Impact on the wider landscape by departing from the current form of the western side of Willingdon, in addition to the severance effect of Wannock Road, is significantly adverse. Therefore, for wider landscape reasons this site is considered unsuitable.	No	Assessment The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.		Assessment There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	
					example from the top of Combe Hill to the south. However, development of the site is a departure from the current form of Willingdon on the western side, where Wannock Road is the boundary and extent of the settlement. Wannock Road creates a severance from the site to the existing settlement. Development would be an encroachment at a sensitive edge of the National Park.						
	Land at Bramley Farm	Willingdon			The site is very open in long distance views to the west and south even though there are established hedgerow and tree boundaries. The land is also higher than the existing residential to the south further increasing the visibility of the site. The assessment considered the site to be high sensitivity in particular because of the openness in views, for example from Combe Hill to the south.	The landscape assessment considered the site to be high sensitivity. It is considered development would have a significant adverse impact on landscape character. This is due to the openness of the site and the likely prominence of development in views. Due to the landscape assessment the site is considered unsuitable.		The site is being actively promoted and is considered available.		There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable.	

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
		Willingdon	Rejected	Significant adverse	Development of the site would	As a result of the landscape	No	The site is	Yes	There is no reason to	Yes
	north west of			impact on the wider	expand the settlement to the	assessment the site is		being actively		indicate why	
	Jevington			landscape character	west out of keeping with the	considered to be unsuitable. In		promoted and		development on the	
	Road			of the area.	current pattern, intruding into	addition, it is considered the		is considered		site is not achievable	
					the downland and having a	necessary expansion of the		available.		subject to the access	
					significant adverse impact on	access from the road to				being suitably	
					landscape character. The site is	facilitate development is likely				improved to enable	
					considered to be high sensitivity	to have an adverse impact on				residential	
					in landscape terms. As the land	the area of adjacent ancient				development.	
					slopes upwards further to the	woodland.					
					north-west a large area of the						
					site is of higher sensitivity						
					especially in longer distance						
					views, for example from public						
					right of way (ProW)s on						
					downland to the south-east.						
	Land adjacent	Winchester	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site is assessed as having a	The site is in a mineral	No	Unknown. The		There is no reason to	Yes
	to Five			impact on the		consultation area and adjacent		site was		indicate why	
	Bridges Road			character and	•	to existing ribbon residential		considered		development on the	
				appearance of the	used location. The site slopes	development along St Cross		available in the		site is not achievable.	
				landscape and	down to, is in proximity to, and is	I		2016 SHLAA			
				settlement pattern.	part of the valley side of, the	create an incongruous extension		but has not			
					River Itchen SAC & SSSI. The site	to the existing ribbon / linear		been			
					is readily visible from both its	form of development. Given the		submitted for			
					northern and eastern boundaries	above and the findings of the		consideration			
					which are adjacent to the	landscape assessment, the site		to 2022 Call for			
					Winchester Conservation Area	is not considered to be suitable		Sites or since.			
					and PRoW network respectively.	for development.					
					The site is adjacent to existing						
					ribbon development, off St Cross						
					Road, to the west.						

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection				Assessment		Assessment	
WI034	Dykes Farm,	Winchester	Rejected	Potential adverse	The site has high landscape		Uncert	The site is	Yes	The site would be	Unknown
	Easton Lane			impact on the	periorately arra is on the mationar			being actively		accessed via the	
				adjacent river,	i ark boundary. The site has an	potential for archaeology associated		promoted and		planning authority	
				reserve, and	elongated shape due to the	with the nearby water meadow.		is considered		area of Winchester	
				surrounding	Itchen Valley PRoW and Old	The site is near historic landfill, employment uses, and transport		available.		City Council. All three	
				landscape and	Railway Line (now built	infrastructure. Development would				access options will	
				uncertain whether	development) to the west and	need to remediate any potential				need to be appraised	
				development is	east respectively. The site is on	land contamination and be designed				to ascertain the	
				achievable (access).	the valley side of the River Itchen	with noise in mind. The site is in a				safest and most	
					SAC & SSSI and is part of a	highly sensitive area in terms of				appropriate vehicular	
					transitional area between the	landscape and ecology. Delivery of				access(es) onto the	
					river and surrounding landscape.	circa 40 affordable dwellings could				site. The appraisal	
					The site is in proximity to Flood	be explored in the southern area				will also need to	
					Zones 2 and 3. The south area is	(approx. 1.4ha) around existing				consider flooding,	
					on a raised plateau and the north	agricultural buildings. This would				ecology, and	
					area is on the same level as the	leave the remainder of the site for				landscape	
					river. The north area includes	enhancements to green				constraints.	
					priority habitat associated with	infrastructure, biodiversity, PRoW, and water quality and management.					
					the nature reserve. The south	That said, further work and					
					area has glimpsed views of the	investigation is required to					
					Cathedral and Guildhall.	understand if the site is truly					
					Cathearar and Cananani	suitable for development. The					
						delivery of 100% affordable housing					
						could be considered under existing					
						planning policy.					
1											
			1	1							

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason for	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
			Recc'	rejection	·	,		Assessment		Assessment	
WI111	Land north	Winchester	Rejected	Not considered	The site has moderate landscape	The site is in a mineral	No	The site is	Yes	The site is accessed	Unknown
	west of			suitable for	sensitivity but is considered to	consultation area, is in proximity		being actively		from the Itchen Way	
	Easton Lane			residential	have a high ecological sensitivity	to historic landfill, and is		promoted and		PRoW (off Easton	
				development given	given its location in the	adjacent to existing		is considered		Lane) which provides	
				its sensitive location	floodplain of, and proximity to,	employment uses. There is		available.		access to existing	
				and condition of the	the River Itchen SAC & SSSI. The	potential for contamination				residential properties	
				site and uncertain	site is adjacent to priority habitat	given the past and current uses				and to an angling	
				whether	associated with the River Itchen	of the site. Moreover, given the				club. The PRoW is a	
				development is	and the Winnall Moor Nature	location and condition of the				single access track	
				achievable due to		site, and the findings of the				with limited scope for	
				access.	straddles Flood Zones 2 and 3,	landscape assessment, the site				widening to	
					and flood risk is likely to increase					accommodate new	
						for residential development.				development. It is	
					Given its small-scale, it is unlikely					unclear whether	
					that effective, meaningful, and					access could be	
					characteristic mitigation and					achieved from the	
					landscape buffers could be					adjacent trading	
					appropriately achieved.					park.	
BR002	Land to the	Woodingdea	Reiected	Potential adverse	The site was previously assessed	Development on the site would	No	Unknown. The	Unknown	There is no reason to	Yes
	west of	n	1	impact on the	as high landscape sensitivity	have a potential adverse impact		site was		indicate why	
	Falmer Road			character and	owing to its location and size	on the character and		considered		development on the	
	between and			appearance of the	within a narrow land bridge	appearance of the landscape.		available in the		site is not achievable.	
	including			landscape.	which joins two sections of the			2016 SHLAA			
	Woodside			·	SDNP and forms a gap between			but has not			
	and the Old				Ovingdean and Woodingdean			been			
	Cottage				(both settlements are outside the			submitted for			
					SDNP). Development of the site			consideration			
					would be highly visible from			to 2022 Call for			
					surrounding (higher) land to the			Sites or since.			
					west and east, together with						
					views from surrounding roads to						
					the north and south. The wooded						
					nature of the site contributes to						
					local character providing a						
					backdrop to views and screening						
					in some cases.						
					D I	<del>97</del>		l .	l		

<del>D 197</del>

## Appendix D (ii) Sites assessed for potential Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

Site	Address	Settlement	Prov'	Prov' Reason	Landscape	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability	Available	Achievability	Achievable
Ref			Recc'	for rejection	Assessment	-		Assessment		Assessment	
WI038	Land North of Rareridge Lane	Bishops Waltham	Rejected	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a high landscape sensitivity due to its large, open, and elevated nature. The site is adjacent to priority habitats, ancient woodland, and local environmental designations.	The site is a substantial and visually prominent site on the edge of an existing town. The site is in close proximity to a conservation area, has some archaeological potential, and is crossed at various points and locations by the PROW and permissive path networks.	No	The site is in single ownership and the landowner recently indicated that the site is available for 50 gypsy & traveller pitches.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable. However, the existing access off Butts Farm Lane is single track with limited scope for widening. This will influence development type and capacity.	Yes
AR060	Land Between Downview Road and Stable Lane	Findon	Rejected	Potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	Site considered to have moderate landscape sensitivity owing to its proximity to PRoWs and location in the transition area to open downland. Existing hedgerows provide some enclosure	PRoW along northern boundary and views from PRoW to the East. Site is not considered suitable as development would further extend the settlement edge into open downland having an unacceptable impact on landscape character	No	Site is available for residential development.	Yes	There is no reason to indicate development of the site would not be achievable.	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov' Recc'	Prov' Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment although	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability Assessment	Achievable
					further planting would not be characteristic of open downland.						
WI103	Land at Vicarage Lane	Swanmore	Rejected	Potential incongruous extension into the countryside and adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.	The site has a moderate landscape sensitivity given its small-scale and predominantly flat topography. Nevertheless, development would further extend existing ribbon development into the surrounding countryside.	Vicarage Lane is a very narrow rural lane, access would need to be in southern corner of the site to minimise use of this lane, but access may still not be possible without affecting its character. Site very open to Vicarage Lane so any development would impact on the setting of this lane which is a gateway to the National Park.	No	The site is in single ownership and the landowner recently indicated that the site is available for residential development but has not suggested gypsy and traveller development.	Uncertain	The proposed access would be via Fullegar Cottages outside the National Park. There is no reason to indicate why development on the site is not achievable, but this is subject to a site assessment of the adjacent land parcel and access by Winchester City Council (WCC).	Yes
CH251	Windy Hill Ark, Bulchins Copse,	Wisborough Green	Rejected	The site is considered unsuitable for any development,	The site is in the P2 : Northchapel Basin landscape	The site is approximately 1.3 miles south-west of Wisborough Green and 4.3 miles north-east of	No	Site owner has submitted the land for this use so it	Yes	Whilst the current access may have visibility issues there	Yes

Site Ref	Address	Settlement	Prov' Recc'	Prov' Reason for rejection	Landscape Assessment	Suitability Assessment	Suitable	Availability Assessment	Available	Achievability Assessment	Achievable
	Strood Green			including gypsy and traveller pitches, due to its unsustainable and car dependent location, the dispersed settlement pattern and the ecological sensitivities.	character area, and key characteristics include the large wooded commons at The Mens supporting important ecological assemblages including ancient seminatural woodland. The site lies outside of any settlement boundary in a area of dispersed development along the A272 between Wisborough Green and Petworth.	Petworth. The A272 at this point is national speed limit and has no footways along it between the site and these settlements.  WSCC raised concerns on a previous application (SDNP/22/00761/FUL) about the visibility splays and speed of traffic and the nearest fire hydrant being 350m away. An enforcement notice has been served in respect of the access, field shelters, caravan and fencing.  The Mens SAC and SSSI wraps around the site, including Bulchins Copse and the whole site is within the SSSI impact zone.  The site is considered unsuitable for any development, including gypsy and traveller pitches, due to its unsustainable and car dependent location, the dispersed settlement pattern and the ecological sensitivities.		is assumed to be available.		appears sufficient road frontage to achieve a safe access elsewhere.	