

Appendix 4 Henfield

Consultee Ref	Consultee	Comment Number	How Consultee Responded	Nature of Response	Comment	Officer View and Recommendations	Officer Response	Keep updated
1	Elizabeth Taylor	1	Online Form	Observation	Although the consultation document appears well drawn up and sensible, it is impossible to be sure as none of the maps have road names, making it impossible to see the extent of the areas under consideration. I have lived in this village for over 30 years, but cannot navigate these proposals!!	Noted- no action	-	No
2	David Hayes	2	Online Form	Observation	It is an interesting and full study of the Henfield Conservation Area. I broadly agree with the changes proposed and have suggested an additional area to be added as originally proposed in the Henfield Parish Design Statement 2008, in which I had a major hand in its preparation. I have looked through the conservation area document in great detail and made a number of comments, corrections and suggestions which I hope will be helpful. As I am currently helping Henfield Parish Council in updating the Parish Design Statement, I have discussed with and passed all my comments through them which they will pass on in due course.	Noted- no action	-	Yes
3	Julia and Ian Dew	3	Online Form	Observation	We note that HDC commissioned this review, and our main comment is that we hope, at this time of austerity, that HDC feels it was value for money, because as ratepayers we are not convinced!	Noted- no action	The Council considers, as do many of the respondents, that the consultants have carried out a thorough conservation area appraisal of each of the five settlements.	Yes
3	Julia and Ian Dew	4	Online Form	Observation	Pages 8, 36 and 62 - The boundary review makes no differentiation between Chestnut Way and Chestnut End. Indeed Chestnut End is not mentioned specifically, except as an extension to Chestnut Way. The bungalows in Chestnut Way are discreet, built using bricks from the old Henfield Brickworks, which cannot be matched from current supplies. Yet the large detached houses in Chestnut End are bold and not at all discreet. In fact, it is questionable as to how these houses were approved by HDC, in this position overlooking the Tanyard Field. So while we can understand that Chestnut End should not be included within the conservation area, Chestnut Way itself still has the same relationship with Church Street and Martyns Lodge as it did at the time of the original designation. For this reason we cannot see any justification in removing Chestnut Way from the conservation area. As a direct comparison, we note that it is proposed the entrance to Martyns Close (including the first 2 bungalows) is still included in the Conservation area, and also Nep Close in Nep Town Road (see comments below - Page 62), remains included, which the review states detract from the Conservation area.	Noted- no action	All of the four exclusions in the Conservation Area involve the removal of suburban development - it is considered that all of these areas detract from the historic local character and their continued inclusion within the Conservation Area cannot be justified.	Yes
3	Julia and Ian Dew	5	Online Form	Observation	Page 28 - Grammar School? Does this refer to the Steyning Grammar School, or is it referring to the old Boys' School on the Common?	Noted - action proposed	Text will be altered to reflect that it is the Boys' School on the Common.	Yes
3	Julia and Ian Dew	6	Online Form	Observation	Page 29 - The author seems confused about the east/west relationship of properties around St. Peter's Church.	Noted - action proposed	Text will be corrected re: St Peter's Church.	Yes
3	Julia and Ian Dew	7	Online Form	Observation	Page 31 - Again, the author is confused, Pinchnose Green is not at the end of Cagefoot Lane, it is in Church Street.	Noted - action proposed	Text will be corrected re: Pinchnose Green	Yes
3	Julia and Ian Dew	8	Online Form	Observation	Page 33 - Nep Town Road, not Nep Road.	Noted - action proposed	Text will be corrected re: Nep Town Road	Yes
3	Julia and Ian Dew	9	Online Form	Observation	Page 38 - Refers to negative inappropriate fencing in the Tanyard. This statement needs some clarification as to which boundaries it refers to.	Noted - action proposed	Text will be corrected to clarify boundary.	Yes
3	Julia and Ian Dew	10	Online Form	Observation	Page 43 - Confusion again, there is no main car park off Tanyard Lane - indeed, there is no Tanyard Lane in Henfield! The Tanyard Lane Car Park is in Steyning.	Noted - action proposed	Text will be corrected.	Yes
3	Julia and Ian Dew	11	Online Form	Observation	Page 43 - The review suggests instigating a "traffic calming scheme that would treat Golden Square as a public space, where vehicles are less dominant and pedestrians might feel more comfortable". Traffic calming and less dominant vehicles at that point could mean more congestion to the north, i.e. the High Street. But, yes, it is a difficult area for many reasons. Perhaps this area should revert to the simple junction that it originally was, which may be more compatible with the historic buildings in the area.	Noted - no action	Point noted.	Yes
3	Julia and Ian Dew	12	Online Form	Observation	Page 62 - Regarding the review justifications, it refers to buildings on the north side of Nep Town Road as detracting from the conservation area, yet those buildings have not been removed from the boundary.	Noted - no action	Not every single building that has been identified as detracting from the Conservation Area is proposed for removal	Yes
4	Roger Smith	13	Online Form	Observation	P8 There are 4 bulleted paragraphs and 1 other paragraph describing boundary changes here. There are "6 proposals" listed on P62. Consistency is required.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	14	Online Form	Observation	P14 Billingshurst cited not Henfield	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	15	Online Form	Observation	P18 "Henfield Common is primarily rough grassland" whilst the photo shows the reed beds that are one of the elements that identify Henfield Common as a designated Site of Nature Conservation Interest. The reeds have no doubt, provided thatch in the past.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	16	Online Form	Observation	P28 "Grammar School" -presumably Steyning.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	17	Online Form	Observation	P28 "knapped lint"	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	18	Online Form	Observation	P29 "Church Terrace extends from an unmade cul-de-sac to the west of St. Peters." It is to the East.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes

Consultee Ref	Consultee	Comment Number	How Consultee Responded	Nature of Response	Comment	Officer View and Recommendations	Officer Response	Keep updated
4	Roger Smith	19	Online Form	Observation	P29 "The thatched and painted Cat House stands at its west end " Again to the East.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	20	Online Form	Observation	P31 "At Pinchnose Green in the centre is the ensemble of Potwell". Pinchnose Green is neither in the Tanyard character area nor adjacent to Potwell.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	21	Online Form	Observation	P32 "rough grassland" see comment at P18	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	22	Online Form	Observation	P32 "Gold Square"	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	23	Online Form	Observation	P36 "From Pinchnose Green there is a view taking in the pond looking north" See comment at P31	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	24	Online Form	Observation	P40 "A characteristic boundary of settlements in Horsham District is local stone laid in rubble courses." This is not evident in Henfield	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	25	Online Form	Observation	P43 ".the main car park off Tanyard Lane" Presumably Steyning.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	26	Online Form	Observation	P62 "Six proposals for extending the boundaries" Of the 6, 5 are exclusions and 1 an extension. Replace with altering?	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	27	Online Form	Observation	The major omission in the documents is the lack of any cross-referencing. For example, most of the evidence presented is in map form, all of the maps are numbered; yet no reference is made to map numbers anywhere in the text. Equally, the "rich and varied palette of materials" is detailed on P24. Yet no reference is made to this detail when the Management Plan (P42) states "Materials should be carefully chosen to complement the Conservation Area's existing palette of materials". This lack of cross-referencing is also covered by the following comments at P14 & P46.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	28	Online Form	Observation	P6 There are 109 listed properties in Henfield Civil Parish, about 4 times the national average. No explanation is given for only including 60 of these in the Conservation Area even though some others are either contiguous with or close to the designated area.	Noted - no action	-	Yes
4	Roger Smith	29	Online Form	Observation	The significant differences between Grades II and II* are not explained. Together they reduce the educational and informative values these documents are intended to achieve.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	30	Online Form	Observation	P6 "urban grain." The meaning of this specialist phrase is not included in Appendix 5, the Glossary of terms. This is surprising. The glossary is extensive with over 90% of the terms not included elsewhere in the document.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	31	Online Form	Observation	P7 Map1. The boundary of the adjacent designated South Park National Park is shown but without further reference made to it in the text. I presume the lines are contour lines. The intervals between them are not cited. Neither are any values given to enable the reader to determine where the land rises and falls. "Henfield" obscures the contours in the area of interest.	Noted - no action	The reference to the South Downs National Park is for information. Likewise, the lines are contour lines. They are also for information and do not require values.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	32	Online Form	Observation	P12 Map 3. No explanation is given for the irregular date intervals chosen. 1840 makes sense as the date of the map defining the mid 19th C on P13. However the 1915 -Present interval is not consistent with the "End of the 19th century" and the "Mid 20th century" dates on P13. A subdivision of the 1915-Present interval to highlight the buildings erected since the original designation of the conservation area in 1973 would provide the evidence used to define the proposed boundary alterations.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	33	Online Form	Observation	P13 The bottom 2/3rds of the "Mid 20th century" map are missing and so cannot support the written commentary.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	34	Online Form	Observation	P14 "Elmgrove" is an earlier name for the dwelling Seven Chimneys. In the same way "Deeryvore"(P8) is now 2 Park Villas and "the former premises of A. Baigent, builder" (P24) is the Barn, Golden Square. A map identifying all the named properties mentioned within the document and an alphabetical gazetteer would eliminate any synonymy and make the text capable of being followed without the need for additional research effort. The Horsham District Council 1:5000 Map of the Henfield Conservation area (08/09/11) could be enhanced to provide such a map.	Noted - no action	This additional map is not considered necessary.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	35	Online Form	Observation	P21 Map 6. Key view c is not mapped.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	36	Online Form	Observation	P24 "quoins" is not included in Appendix 5. See also earlier comment at P6.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	37	Online Form	Observation	P26 Map 7. Feature Trees are identified. However no further mention is made of these selected trees, their special features and their role in defining the character areas elsewhere in the text. The mapping of vegetation within the conservation area is incomplete.	Noted - no action	This level of information is too detailed for the Appraisal.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	38	Online Form	Observation	P27 Map 8. Although mapped, the significance of Archeological Notification Areas is not explained within the text, particularly for the character areas other than Church Street and High Street or the area, which lies outside the conservation area.	Noted - no action	Disagree, the name suggests what they are.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	39	Online Form	Observation	P41 "arises." Arrises are not included in Appendix 5 even when correctly spelled.	Noted - no action	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	40	Online Form	Observation	P44 An explanation of "pannage" would help all but the most dedicated foodies.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	41	Online Form	Observation	P46 Appendix 2: Gazetteer of listed buildings. The entry for each of the 60 buildings consists of a photograph and 6 other data types. Inspection shows the entries have not been sorted by any of these. In consequence neither the building name nor its NGR (Ordinance Survey Grid Reference) can be easily used to locate the listed building. Further inspection shows neither is there a hidden sorting of the data by Character Area. It does not function as a gazetteer. It is a random listing.	Noted - no action	This level of information is too detailed for the Appraisal.	Yes

Consultee Ref	Consultee	Comment Number	How Consultee Responded	Nature of Response	Comment	Officer View and Recommendations	Officer Response	Keep updated
4	Roger Smith	42	Online Form	Observation	The criteria evaluated in a Conservation Area appraisal are stated on P5. Traditionally, the evidence regarding each criterion would be presented separately, and analyzed. After all criteria had been considered, conclusions would then be drawn. This is not the case in this document.	Noted - no action	Noted.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	43	Online Form	Observation	On page 8, after only land use changes have been considered, the deletions to the conservation area boundary are proposed. These are then assumed to have been accepted throughout the rest of the document. No mention is made that the Tanyard field is now more secure in public ownership than was the case in 1973.	Noted - no action	Noted.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	44	Online Form	Observation	The Character areas are defined (Map9 P34) before the evidence regarding the Views criterion is presented on P36.	Noted - no action	Noted.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	45	Online Form	Observation	Objective evidence such as the location of those trees within the original conservation area with Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) placed upon them is not presented. A 2007 map of such trees, with all subsequent additions listed, is available from Henfield CP Council. It shows a great proportion of the trees within those areas where land use has moved to residential purposes since the original designation in 1973 are protected by TPOs. In consequence the amenity of these trees to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be lost if the proposed boundary deletions are accepted. It also makes clear where the removal of Conservation Area status would also remove the protection from trees. Within the Conservation Area some trees are doubly protected with TPOs. No analysis of this evidence is made in the text.	Noted - no action	This level of information is too detailed for the Appraisal.	Yes
4	Roger Smith	46	Online Form	Observation	The increasing risk of ash, oak & horse chestnut loss due to novel invasive pests and diseases (www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/visiting-woods/tree-diseases-and-pests/) and the changes in the Conservation Area character that would result from their loss is not considered. This lack of foresight is reflected in the Management Plan which may also last for 40+ years. Only the legal protection offered by Conservation Area Status against damage by humans is considered to be the appropriate action.	Noted - no action	The Council's Arboricultural Officer has visited the five settlements where Conservation Area Appraisals have been carried out and has a record of important trees.	Yes
5	Joan Francis, Horsham District Archaeology Group	47	Online Form	Observation	Where an application for alteration/demolition is proposed to a listed building this should follow the guidelines set out in the Standard and Guidance for the Archaeological Investigation and Recording of Standing Buildings ABIR published 2014. So that the knowledge of their original construction can be preserved before it is lost. This does not always happen in West Sussex even to this present day. Photos are a useful addition to the above.	Noted - no action	-	Yes
5	Joan Francis, Horsham District Archaeology Group	48	Online Form	Observation	Appendix 1: Historic development p44 Pre-history is up to AD 43 Roman/Romano-British AD43-AD410 Anglo-Saxon AD410-AD 1066	Noted - no action	-	Yes
6	Maggie Henderson, HB Archaeology & Conservation Ltd	49	Online Form	Observation	Map 3 has the buildings on the High Street/Cagefoot Lane junction as 1840-1915. Southdown House is ascribed a 17th C origin in the List description. The Henfield Club pre-dates 1845 and the building to the north of Eardley House is at least early 19th C in origin. I draw your attention to the Yeakell and Gardner map of 1778 - 83, the Ordnance Survey Surveyor's Draft of c.1800 and the Henfield Tithe map of 1845). I also draw your attention to the maps in Harris' EUS of Henfield from 2004 - map 8 onwards. The buildings bordering Cagefoot Lane are domestic in function but are included within the High Street character area as their 'architectural character is broadly consistent with the High Street' - the High Street character (not particularly well defined in the document) is surely a mixture of domestic and commercial, not to mention many earlier phases of development? Did the author of the document draw upon R. B. Harris' EUS for background? If so, shouldn't it be referenced?	Noted - no action	Noted.	Yes
7	Historic England	50	Email	Observation	Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above documents. We welcome and support the approach that Horsham Council is taking to revising and updating its conservation area appraisal and plans and the above documents, in our view, appropriately reflect the advice set out in our own guidance and more broadly in the National Planning Policy Guidance. While we have no specific comments to offer at this time on the individual conservation area documents, we would be pleased to offer advice on any specific matters arising from the preparation of the documents that fall within our remit, e.g. listed building repairs or parks and gardens enhancement.	Noted - no action	-	Yes
8	Natural England	51	Email	Observation	Natural England does not consider that these Draft Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.	Noted - no action	-	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	52	Email	Observation	1. Throughout the document references to Nep or Nep Road should be corrected to Nep Town or Nep Town Road	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	53	Email	Observation	2. P.9 Add group of large villas in Broomfield Road (per the Village Design Statement 2008) less the modern houses marked. - Add the witten leading from Broomfield Road (west side) to Batts Pond - Add Wantley Manor - Remove semi-detached houses from proposed addition in Furners Lane, (per Village Design Statement)	Noted - no action	-	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	54	Email	Observation	3. P.10 bullet 5 - remove "(5)". The sentence should start "A number of timber-framed houses built in the vicinity of the Church ... bullet 6 - 1840 should read 1844	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	55	Email	Observation	4. P.13 bullet 3 - This refers to houses that could be considered for inclusion in the Conservation Area (CA). Mid C20 reference appears to show the CA containing Spring Hills, which was developed later	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	56	Email	Observation	5. P.14 4th line refers to development on the eastern edge which should include the western edge as well. "Existing landscape character" refers to "Billingshurst" - should read "Henfield"	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	57	Email	Observation	6. P.15 The BUAB is out of date it should include developments at land east of Manor Close, West End Lane and Parsonage Farm Phase 3	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes

Consultee Ref	Consultee	Comment Number	How Consultee Responded	Nature of Response	Comment	Officer View and Recommendations	Officer Response	Keep updated
9	Henfield Parish Council	58	Email	Observation	7. P.21 Area C is not marked	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	59	Email	Observation	8. P.24 Second line – insert “the” before “eastern” Paragraph 2 – “exclusively” - remove “numerous” Paragraph 2 – “exclusively” is used twice in the same sentence Paragraph 4, penultimate line – add “west elevation of Potwell” before “is slate-hung”. Paragraph 4 – premises of A Baigent, builder, are now offices and at the south end of the High Street, not on Barrow Hill. Paragraph 4 – “generally casements ...” should change to a mixture + of casements, sash and sliding sash (Yorkshire lights) Paragraph 4 & 5– “Horsham slab” should be corrected to “Horsham stone” Paragraph 5 –	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	60	Email	Observation	9. P.25 Bottom left photograph delete “west towards” replace with “south along”	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	61	Email	Observation	10 P.28 Building Types and Styles Paragraph 1 - “the Stone House” Where is this? Paragraphs 2 and 3 - are repetitive with much of para 3 referring to Steyning. Paragraph 5 – add “horizontal sliding windows (Yorkshire casements) Paragraph 8 bullet 1 – “lint” should read “flint” bullet 3 – remove “slab” insert “St Peter’s Church” at end of sentence bullet 5 – add “mathematical tiles on right hand side of the White Hart” bullet 6 – remove “wonderful”	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	62	Email	Observation	11 P.29 Paragraph 2 – “west of St Peter’s” should read “east of St Peter’s” Paragraph 3 – replace “several” with “three”, add “two” before “disappearing”	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	63	Email	Observation	12 P.30 Paragraph 2 – remove “numerous” Paragraph 2 – penultimate line replace “Victorian” with “Late Edwardian”	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	64	Email	Observation	13 P.31 Paragraph 2- remove “Pinchnose Green” and start sentence “In the centre... “Paragraph 3 – after “Red Oaks, a large ...” add “Regency” and change final word “trees” to “hedgerows” Bottom left photograph shows view over the Tanyard from the footpath, not Blackgate Lane.	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	65	Email	Observation	14. P.32 Left hand photograph shows Golden Square (not Gold Square)	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	66	Email	Observation	15. P.33 Paragraph 2 – after “The density of construction is...” add “initially” Paragraph 2 – remove “most of” before “Kings James’ Lane” and change “streets” to “lanes”	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	67	Email	Observation	16 P.36 Paragraph 3 – correct “theone” to “the one” Paragraph 4 – replace “Fulking Hill” with “Truleigh Hill” Paragraph 5 – remove “From Pinchnose Green”. Sentence to read: “There is a view taking in the pond looking north where the High Weald can be seen in the distance” Paragraph 5 – remove “dense vegetation” replace with “hedges” Paragraph 5 - Remove “20th century housing” and replace with “scattered development” Paragraph 5 – remove “much of” after “surround” Paragraph 6 – “Hacketts” should be “Hacketts Cottage” Paragraph 6 – remove “and Duffies”	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	68	Email	Observation	17 P.38 Paragraph 5 – replace “almost all the” with “some” Paragraph 5 – remove “many” line 4 Paragraph 7 – remove “suburban” line 3	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	69	Email	Observation	18. P.40 Historic built environment Paragraph 1 – remove “and stone” line 2 Paragraph 3 – change first sentence to read: “Plot boundary treatment varies” Paragraph 3 – remove “boundary treatments” replace with “boundaries” Paragraph 3 – why the reference to Horsham District? Paragraph 3 – last line, add “picket fences” to list Paragraph 4 – remove “stone or” line 4	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	70	Email	Observation	19 P.41 Window Replacement, Paragraph 2 – insert “and horizontal” after “vertical” Dormer Windows... – replace “In most cases...” with “wherever possible...” last line Repointing... – replace “..the mortar in the joints is to...” with “...mortar is to hold the wall material together and...” line 2 Repointing – remove “is therefore sacrificial and...” line 4	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	71	Email	Observation	20. P.42 Paragraph 1 replace “criminal” with “civil” line 2	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes
9	Henfield Parish Council	72	Email	Observation	21 P.43 line 2 - Why sage green? Car parks – replace “ there are some visually poor car parking areas which...” with “the two public car parks...” Car parks – Replace “Tanyard Lane” with “High Street”	Noted - action proposed	Text to be corrected.	Yes