

Liz Pulley

From: Michael Gadd <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 11 June 2015 16:32
To: Neighbourhood Planning
Subject: Wisborough_Green_response_form (1).doc
Attachments: Wisborough_Green_response_form (1).doc

Please see attached comments concerning the Wisborough Green NP Stage 16 consultation. Please acknowledge receipt. Many thanks, Michael Gadd

LEGAL DISCLAIMER

Communications on or through Chichester District Councils computer systems may be monitored or recorded to secure effective system operation and for other lawful purposes.

● 2020-2021



Representation Form

Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations
2012 - Regulation 16

Wisborough Green Parish Council has prepared a Neighbourhood Plan. The plan sets out a vision for the future of the parish and planning policies which will be used to determine planning applications locally.

Copies of the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents are available to view on the District Council's website: <http://www.chichester.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplan>.

All comments must be received by 5:00pm on 11th June 2015.

There are a number of ways to make your comments:

- Complete this form on your computer and email it to: neighbourhoodplanning@chichester.gov.uk
- Print this form and post it to us at: **Neighbourhood Planning, East Pallant House, 1 East Pallant, Chichester PO19 1TY**

All comments will be publicly available, and identifiable by name and organisation (where applicable). Please note that any other personal information provided will be processed by Chichester District Council in line with the Data Protection Act 1998.

How to use this form

Please complete Part A in full, in order for your representation to be taken into account at the Neighbourhood Plan examination.

Please complete Part B overleaf, identifying which paragraph your comment relates to by completing the appropriate box.

PART A	Your Details
Full Name	Michael Gadd
Address	Farnagates House Billingshurst Road Wisborough Green
Postcode	RH14 0DZ
Telephone	[REDACTED]
Email	[REDACTED]
Organisation (if applicable)	
Position (if applicable)	
Date	11/06/2015

PART B

To which part of the document does your representation relate?

Paragraph Number		Policy Reference:	Various
------------------	--	-------------------	---------

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)

Support Support with modifications Oppose Have Comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:

Policies OA1 & OA2

The principle is acceptable, but the selected location of local gaps is inconsistent. The selected location on Durban's Road positions the gap at the North end of the green space to either side of the road. One would have thought that even allowing for development at Winterfold the gap should encompass the whole green space or at least start at the southern end of it. Surely this will allow for further development of this highly visible green space.

The local gap on Kirdford Road encompasses built up land on the southern side which is at odds with this being a gap and seems contrived. I would suggest this gap needs to be further along Kirdford Rd at Wisborough Villas especially in light of the inspector's decision to allow development at Greenways. The planning inspector's comments on the allowed appeal WR/13/00744/FUL state that development in that location would not lead to new isolated homes in the countryside.

EN2

The view across Brooklands Barn is not consistent with the view specified in the Conservation Area plan. I question the quality of the view which is spoilt by a large row of very tall non indigenous conifers and several electricity pylons. It has few natural landscape merits and should not be included.

SS2

Redevelopment of this as residential use is a sensible option, although one wonders whether a mixed use scheme incorporating some B1 use would be a benefit to the economy of the village. I recognise that the existing employment can be retained elsewhere but this will be outside of the parish. There are also a number of local small businesses that rent office accommodation in neighbouring centres so I believe there would be strong demand and which would add to the overall sustainability of the village.

Despite its suitability on many grounds and I agree it should be redeveloped, I question whether it's deliverable. Its access suffers from poor visibility to the east along the A272 and is only just inside the 30mph. As I live opposite to the east, I can testify that traffic speeds are very rarely 30mph at this point and more generally in the band of 40-50mph. Visibility splays in excess of 120m will no doubt be required and these cannot be achieved unless the existing trees, hedgerows and raised ground (>600mm) are removed. Much of the land is of unknown ownership which would prevent this. More importantly, loss of this vegetation would have significant urbanising effect at the entrance to the village and be contrary to other policy. One option could be to move the 30mph sign further east and introduce low impact (in terms of noise) traffic calming. But there is obviously a high cost attached to this which could make any scheme financial unviable and there is no guarantee that either can be delivered.

The site does have footpath connectivity to the village but this is <1m wide for almost its entire length. It is also well outside of the 5 minute walk criteria and I'd suggest it would be closer to 8-10 minutes from the

top of the access road into the proposed site. The distance to the centre of the Green (the point specified in the NP) from the top of the indicative access road is some 700m and from the same point to the village shop it is 670m. It is also beyond the local gap which is intended to constrain the village expansion.

SS4

I strongly object to this policy. For the following reasons:

- It is Greenfield adjacent the conservation area, outside of and not bordering the SPA and within close proximity to two listed building. Furthermore, new houses will sit in front of the Grade I listed church on the approach along Durbans Road.
- From examination of the minutes for the parish council meeting dated June it is evident that the landowner, who has submitted a pre-app for 50% more houses than stated in the NP, is looking to ignore the number of houses allocated in the NP and the phasing of them being delivered. It seems from the minutes that the parish council and CDC is accepting some level of defeat with regards to the quantum of houses and I assume this is because once the SPA is adjusted to include this site a higher density will be hard to resist. If this is the case then it undermines any basis on which the site has been assessed to date and a further consultation exercise should be convened that provides this significant new information to the community so the site can be fairly assessed.
- The site was included in the draft plan but was not included in the consultations on which the draft plan was based. It was included in the housing survey of 2006 which recorded the largest public response and in that survey it performed very poorly and came 10th out of 11 sites considered. The consultation process is undermined by this and the site appears to have leapfrogged more popular sites based on a subjective assessment of its performance which is inaccurate and not transparent.
- Having examined the traffic light assessment for this site and compared it to others it appears to have received a far more positive commentary for some reason. There is no transparency as to how the objectivity of this assessment was assured and it seems entirely subjective.
- The NP and draft NP state that it would have minimal visual impact. This cannot be the case viewed on the approach to the village from either Durbans Road or Newpound Lane where the site and up to 30 new houses will be highly visible. This further undermines the consultation process as that is part of the basis on which it was assessed at stage 14.
- It has been included over other greenfield and brownfield sites which were preferred by the community in 2006 which was the only time it was put forward against alternative options (this wasn't the case at Stage 14 as no alternatives were offered). Throughout the consultation the community expressed a preference for the sites along Kirdford Road and Newpound. The inspector's decision on the Greenways nursery on Kirdford Road established that these sites were sustainable so this cannot be used as an argument to dismiss them from selection. Indeed, the Carters Field site is only 40m further from the shop than this site and offered a footpath connection which would have provided for all sites existing and proposed along Kirdford Road. It would have also have enhanced the sustainability of these sites
- Durbans Road suffers from high speed traffic at this point and narrow unsafe pavements. In the assessment of the site this was understated and yet elsewhere in the NP traffic calming is suggested. The plan should include a requirement for the developer to provide this.
- The footpath from the site along Durbans Road is no more than 1m wide and there is no way to widen it without taking land from private gardens which cannot be delivered putting the deliverability of this site in question.
- Once the SPA is adjusted to include this site there will be little to prevent an application for 10-15 houses on the garden of Winterfold being permitted as it will fall within the SPA. This will include knocking down the existing house at Winterfold the principle of which has now be accepted by the appeal decision on WR/13/01722. Given the land owners demonstrated intent on the site allocated in the NP there is a strong argument to suggest that such an application will be brought.

General Objections

The NP does not take adequate account of housing for the older people. The NP acknowledges that the village has a high proportion of retired people and the consultation processes all the way back to 2006 indicated between 30-39% support for retirement housing. When asked, 20% and above specifically refer to sheltered housing. AgeUK use the terms retirement and sheltered housing inter-changeably. Despite this none has been provided for within the NP and the document doesn't mention either. It suggests that mixed demographic developments with a proportion of lifetime homes provides what's needed. It's unfortunate that for some reason this assessment has been made and I can see no argument within the consultation assessments to explain the reasoning. Indeed, to the contrary, the evidence review specifically (page 10) the specialist housing would be required. There is a serious issue of transparency as to why this has been ignored. If there was uncertainty about what respondents understood retirement housing to be in the consultations then this should have been further clarified in later consultations but this was not done. A significant number of residents have asked for this and it's established within the NP consultations that many are looking to leave the village to find this type of accommodation which clearly undermines the intent of the plan to be for local people. Further consultation should be undertaken to establish whether the community feels the expressed needs of retirees has been met. This will then satisfy the requirement for transparency.

There is a questions of transparency as I believe that a number of my comments made at Stage 14 are not included in the consultation report or the data associated with it and yet some are.

There is a question over transparency as to why the sites preferred by the community have not been included and have received adverse assessments. This is of particular concern when some selected sites have been promoted to the community through the draft NP and the submitted NP with false information. I have stated some of these above and a further one relates to Clarks Yard "It fits all the key criteria the community put forward and the visualisations show a small development of mostly smaller units." As you'll see in my comments above it fails on several counts. I forgot to note down the reference but this inaccuracy runs back in to the site assessment where it was noted to be within the walking criteria. I realise the NP is not required to be as accurate as a LP but when preferred sites are being rejected there needs to be some level of accuracy.

While road safety and new footpaths are mentioned in the NP there is no clear policy or execution plan that will deliver them. These have been expressed as key local concerns throughout the consultation process but have not been delivered in the plan. It's not sufficient to say they will be secured through 106 payments as the cost can be significantly above the amount requested they should be tied to specific developments in the area impacted by the development.

(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

Improvements are included in my text above

(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)

If you have additional representations feel free to include additional pages. Please make sure any additional pages are clearly labelled/ addressed or attached.

