



Local Development  
Framework  
Shaping the future

## Informal Consultation Delivering Development Opportunities

This comment form will help us gather your comments on the Council's Delivering Development Opportunities Informal Consultation document.

**Please read the Informal Consultation Delivering Development Opportunities document before completing the form.**

Comments received will influence the next stage of Delivering Development Opportunities called Preferred Options. This will be out for consultation in the Autumn of 2007.

**All comments should be received by 4.30pm on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2007.**

### Your Contact Details - Please write clearly and in CAPITAL LETTERS

Contact Name	Mrs Louise Davies, Clerk
Organisation/Group*	Wisborough Green Parish Council
LDF number (if known)	
Full Postal Address	PO Box 255
	Wisborough Green
	BILLINGSHURST
	West Sussex
Post Code	RH14 0WT
Telephone Number	01403 701102
E-Mail Address	clerk@wisboroughgreenpc.org
If you are an agent acting on behalf of a client, please include the name of your client:	
*Is this the official view of the organisation/group named above?	Yes

If you wish to comment on more than one settlement, or on Gypsy and Traveller or Horticultural Development Area accommodation, please fill in a separate representation form for each.

**Please enter the name of the settlement that you are commenting on:**

WISBOROUGH GREEN

### Question 1

Do you agree with the site(s) identified as the **Favoured Option up to 2018**?

Yes - all       Yes – some/part of site       No

Please give reasons and please use the **site reference numbers** when referring to sites:

Site WG99

Winterfold is CDC favoured site because it has proximity to the conservation boundary with fewest constraints. It would require an extension of the settlement boundary to encompass the site. This boundary change would not, we assume necessarily include Winterfold House whose status would remain outside the boundary as at present.

Development of this site is likely to cause serious disruption to nearby residents but the major issue is the provision of access to the site which will require very careful study. It is likely that any improvements to access (or perhaps the offer of a village car park??) would need to use the Winterfold House plot.

The solution regarding the previous Garmans development whereby the contractor made a contribution towards improved pedestrian access would not be acceptable. In that case nothing was done (indeed the developers contribution was not even earmarked for any work at the site) until the Parish Council lobbied for improvements and a poor compromise solution was achieved long after the properties were occupied. To this day the majority of the money contributed by the Garmans' developer remains in a general 'improvement' fund with WSCC. This must not happen again.

The question of whether the owner would sell for affordable housing only is relevant, but we could assume this is true. It is known that the owner has advised CDC it is available, and he has advised that he would sell the house as well. It may also be advantageous for the community if the developer can be persuaded that there is space for a car park.

Bat flight paths are the stated reason for Winterfold as CDC's preferred location. Clearly this is a spurious argument with little consideration of the community's needs or views, and Ebernoe is distant enough to remove any differentiation between sites. The priorities CDC has used are subjective and questionable.

Continued on next sheet.

## **Question 1 continued**

### Infrastructure:

The site has not been assessed for infrastructure needs and impact. Traffic studies have not been done nor the question of pedestrian (and cycle) access needs. CDC should also take into consideration the development plans in Kirdford, which will create additional traffic travelling through Wisborough Green. The Parish Council is very concerned about parking adjacent to the crossroads in front of the Cricketers Public House and along Durbans Road as far as Winterfold. Visibility along this section is very poor and there is a history of accidents and near misses at the crossroads. If Winterfold is developed then we consider this would create a very dangerous section of road. The crossroads and parking concerns, near to the Winterfold site, are already the subject of a safety/visibility report currently being prepared by WSCC.

If Winterfold or land opposite Meadowbank were to be approved for development but allocated as being only affordable housing the CDC plan would not deliver any planned commercial development that addressed the identified need to balance the mix of housing. We can only see an expectation of small infill of existing plots – few are easily identifiable. In recent decades, CDC policies have allowed many properties to be enlarged without plans for new smaller homes. Whilst there is a clear need for some affordable housing, where is the provision for starter homes in the commercial sector? Kirdford has had bad experiences of over-provision of affordable housing in a short space of time, and our own survey identifies a need for progressive delivery. We consider that the chosen plot should be developed in stages to balance local need and provision. This applies to both rented affordable homes as well as those for purchase.

The community Housing Survey undertaken in summer 2006 indicated that residents did not desire to have one large site developed but smaller sites developed over a period of time.

CDC's earlier Core Strategy clearly identified infrastructure as a critical requirement before allowing any development. The WG Housing Survey endorsed this consideration. However this criterion seems absent in the sustainability reviews.

## Question 2

Do you think that the **Other Option to 2018** is a better option than the Favoured Option?

Yes - all       Yes – some/part of site       No

Please give reasons and please use the **site reference numbers** when referring to sites:

### Site WG98

Land south of Meadowbank across the A272 has environmental and conservation constraints. Furthermore the question of access and in particular pedestrian access to the village needs careful assessment. Further development here has in the past been rejected on the grounds of safety. Nothing has changed which might alter this. The present footpath is narrow and dangerous and although the road is within the 30mph limit, heavy lorries thunder down the hill. Placing more young families here would put them at risk unless there were improvements to pavements and road layout.

The survey indicated that the community did not desire to have one large site developed but smaller sites developed.

### Infrastructure:

The site has not been assessed for infrastructure needs and impact. Traffic studies have not been done nor the question of pedestrian (and cycle) access needs.

The comments regarding commercial housing in the previous section also apply to this site.

### Question 3

Do you agree with the sites identified for the **Proposed Greenfield Contingency up to 2026?**

None identified in my settlement  Yes - all

Yes – some/part of site  No

Please give reasons and please use the **site reference numbers** when referring to sites:

#### Site WG98

Land south of Meadowbank across the A272 has environmental and conservation constraints. Furthermore the question of access and in particular pedestrian access to the village needs careful assessment. Further development here has in the past has been rejected on the grounds of safety. Nothing has changed which might alter this. The present footpath is narrow and dangerous and although the road is within the 30mph limit, heavy lorries thunder down the hill. Placing more young families here would put them at risk unless there were improvements to pavements and road layout.

The survey indicated that the community did not desire to have one large site developed but smaller sites developed.

#### Infrastructure:

The site has not been assessed for infrastructure needs and impact. Traffic studies have not been done nor the question of pedestrian (and cycle) access needs.

#### Question 4

Do you agree that the **Discounted sites** should not be used?

Yes - all

Yes - some

No



Please give reasons and please use the **site reference numbers/address** when referring to sites:

Greenways Nursery site is popular with many but not favoured by CDC as it does not meet their sustainability criteria. They are also aware that extending the settlement boundary to encompass the site would leave all the land between it and the village at risk of future development. This would be something the village would need to bear in mind if they were to press for this site as their most favoured site. The potential amenity value for the parish (eg sports grounds) would depend very much on the type of development and the commercial opportunities available for a developer. In many ways it would be a far less disruptive development than Winterfold. Again there is unlikely to be any progress without the site including some market housing (as was originally put forward to the Parish Council). Greenways has infrastructure concerns such as pedestrian access.

The CDC approach has been to imply that allocated land should be joined up with the main settlement, on the expectation that land would be within or adjoining a village settlement. Following this logic, it has been implied that development in Newpound could only be done with the creation of a linking corridor from the village, even if this only included the road alone. Potentially this exposes the whole road and land abutting it to further development.

The Parish Council is concerned that it has been encouraged by CDC to undertake a public consultation exercise in full knowledge that Newpound locations were high on the priority for residents. Apparently CDC has not been prepared to think laterally and consider a satellite development on re-used land (ie not linked to the main village). We are being forced to use greenfield land in preference to rejuvenating previously developed locations. We risk retaining previously used sites that are clearly in need of redevelopment. The argument that creating satellites will automatically create developable corridors may have been made but nothing we have seen in writing supports this.

CDC has also ignored sites which have better road access and proximity to the centre of the village. These are the land between the allotments and Elms; and the Glebe field. As with any sites both would require the village envelope to be extended.

Compared to CDC's favoured site the discounted sites would be less likely to create disruption to the village during and when completed

### Question 5

If you think that **none** of the sites in the Informal Consultation Delivering Development Opportunities document are suitable, please provide details, including a map showing the site you prefer.

*We will not be able to include a site unless it relates to a settlement identified in the Delivering Development Opportunities. If you have previously provided details of your site, we do not need these again.*

Please refer to the Wisborough Green Parish Council Housing Survey of Summer 2006.

### Question 6

Do you have any comments regarding the following policies - Shopping Frontages/Horticultural Development Areas/Renewable Energy?

No

Yes (please provide details including paragraph numbers)

## Question 7

Do you have any comments regarding supporting and general text or comments regarding factual errors or conclusions made?

Yes (please provide details including paragraph numbers)

In summary, the Parish Council is concerned that:

- CDC appears to have dismissed the community view. The Parish Council has been encouraged to consult with the community in the form of a survey, to draw together views, comments and alternative options regarding the LDF. The survey's conclusions have not been taken up in terms of:
  - Location of sites preferred by the community.
  - Housing stock required to suit the community. The survey indicated that a good mix of houses were required, which also included smaller houses on the open market.
  - Smaller site development. The survey indicated that the community did not desire to have one large site developed but smaller sites developed.
  - Reducing impact by releasing new housing stock over time.
  - Infrastructure considerations in the criteria used to decide amongst options.
- Full sustainability assessments on the other sites identified in the survey are needed to balance the respective merits of these sites against Winterfold and Meadowbank where a consensus in the Parish perceive significant drawbacks. In particular, Greenways Nursery, Carters Field, The Glebe and Newpound. CDC must be pressed to provide these assessments.
- CDC has kept 'consulting' and ostensibly trying to involve the community, but the community does not feel that it is being listened to, and therefore true two-way consultation is not being achieved. Consequently the motivation of parishioners to respond to such consultation has reduced.
- CDC needs to consider the impact of development in Kirdford. Additional traffic would travel through Wisborough Green.
- The Parish Council feels that at this stage in long term planning, the potential disadvantages of extending Parish Settlement boundaries should not be decisive in ruling out proper consideration of other suggested sites for development.

**Thank-you for taking the time to complete this form.**

Comments received will influence the next stage of Delivering Development Opportunities called Preferred Options. This will be out for consultation in the Autumn of 2007.

Please return it to us using the FREEPOST address:

**FREEPOST CHICHESTER LDF**

Or e-mail to:

**ldf@chichester.gov.uk**

**All comments should be received by 4.30pm on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2007.**

**Further Information:**

Additional comment forms and more information on the progress of the Local Development Framework, can be downloaded from the Council's website: [www.chichester.gov.uk](http://www.chichester.gov.uk), by telephoning 01243 534571 or e-mailing [ldf@chichester.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@chichester.gov.uk).

**Data Protection:**

Please note that the information that you provide will be processed by Chichester District Council in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, to assist in the preparation of the Chichester District Council Local Development Framework.

Please note that a full copy of your comments will be made available for public inspection and on our website: [www.chichester.gov.uk](http://www.chichester.gov.uk).

This document is also available in large print or on tape.