

Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Proposed Residential Development on Land at
Nutbourne West. Comments on Matters Raised
by Parishioners, Jan 2014

January 2014

OWNER: M BAILEY | PREPARED BY STEPHEN JUPP MRTPI, 348 CHICHESTER ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS, PO21 5BX.
T:01243 822113; E:STEVE@PLANNING-SOLUTIONS.CO.UK

INTRODUCTION

This document has been produced in response by a request from the Parish Council to comment on / respond to the matters raised by local residents following the recent public events held by the Parish Council in respect of the Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

1.0 GENERAL COMMENTS

1.1 General Locations Within Southbourne

1.2 I made clear in my original promotional statement for this site that I considered that the level crossing and delays incurred there was a considerable constraint on development north of the village. I remain of this view. I do not consider it reasonable to expect traffic to go through Westborune or Woodmancote and indeed roads in those direction are not of a high quality.

1.4 I agree that land north of the A259 and south of the railway station is the most logical since it has the least constraints and ensures that the focus of the village remains at the A259 / Stein road junction. As to the caravan sites all being used, I think it may be worth considering whether there were to be a consequential adverse economic impact resulting from the loss of holiday makers and the income arising from their stays in the village.

1.5 I agree that land south fo the A259 should be an absolute last resort due to its location within the Chichester Harbour AONB. Moreover, generally, development is more focused north of the A259.

1.6 This may well be the case. I think the various constraints lead one to conclude that a number of sites should be provided to meet the provisional figure of 300 houses for the village itself rather than trying to fit them on one large site.

1.7 It is established ecological practice to relocate any reptiles or other protected species that may be detected on any chosen housing site. This is not a barrier to a site coming forward.

1.8 General Comments on Housing

1.9 The provision of affordable housing is very well secured through a legal agreement on any planning consent and this requires it to go to local people with a housing need. Current policy is for 40% to be affordable although to ensure conformity with the emerging local plan this is to be changed to 30% - see draft policy 34.

1.10 There are established figures for housing and garden sizes and there is no reason why the Parish Plan can't include such matters. It is also open for the Parish Plan to provide a general design code for new development. I don't think it should necessarily follow the

AONB design guide but there is merit to require any design code on a new housing site to draw upon established building patterns and forms within the more historic parts of the Parish, including specifically Prinsted.

- 1.11 I agree that quality design which achieves a 'sense of place' is essential to ensure high quality design is achieved.
- 1.12 I do not think you can prohibit 5 bed houses or flats. However it is essential that the mix satisfies the need for housing types that have been identified in the CDC SHMA. The affordable mix is 1 bed = 10-15%; 2-bed = 30-35%; 3-bed = 30-35%; and, 4+bed = 15-20%. The mix for market housing should be 35% 1 and 2-bed, 50% 3-bed and 15% 4 or more bed market homes.
- 1.13 Current policy requires 10% renewables to be achieved on all new housing sites and sustainable drainage is advocated.

1.14 General Comments on Transport

- 1.15 See comments to para 1.2 above
- 1.16 Both my client and I know the area very well. The owner is a local farmer who lives in the locality and will continue to do so. He wants a development that he, and the Parish, can be proud of.
- 1.17 Agreed. This is a constraint on development to north of village – see 1.2 above.
- 1.18 Agreed.
- 1.19 The Highway Agency have always been strongly against new junctions onto the A27(T). I am not convinced that the size of housing required for the Parish would be sufficient to pay for a new trunk road junction even if it were to be allowed by the HA. Such a junction may also encourage more traffic from the southern part of the village and from Nutbourne, Bosham, Hermitage and Emsworth to use Stein Road and the level crossing to gain access to the A27(T)..
- 1.20 A footway bridge could be possible but they have to meet disabled access requirements so occupy considerable amount of room – see the new one by Bishop Luffa school as an example. I cannot see a bridge being a feasible option.
- 1.21 Agreed.
- 1.22 Agreed. A recent Fad scheme at Fishbourne I have increased parking provision to meet Parish concerns. There is no reason why the Parish Plan cant contain its own parking standards for new housing. The question is whether a reduction should be allowed in more sustainable locations, such as close to railway stations and good bus routes.

- 1.23 Agreed
- 1.24 Noted. All new housing schemes have to provide secure cycle parking for householders.
- 1.25 It is important that new housing sites are within 1.2km of main village facilities in order to encourage walking [within 15 minutes] and cycling to facilities.
- 1.26 No comment

1.27 General Infrastructure Concerns

- 1.28 The provision of dog walking routes is to provide alternative to walking dogs along the harbour foreshore where nesting birds can be disturbed. They are indicative and this stage and would be fully justified at application stage as part of an ecological impact assessment.
- 1.29 I agree that it is important to retain function of village centre at A259 / Stein Road location. Can policies seek to enhance its role? Is there an option to provide additional village facilities in this area?
- 1.30 The capacity of Thornham WWTW is sufficient for the housing required.
- 1.31 It is vital to ensure that all sites deal with surface water disposal in a sustainable manner on site, do not exacerbate problems elsewhere and ideally assist in alleviating local problems, although the later point is difficult to require.
- 1.32 Is a new medical centre required? Should the NP seek to allocate land for one or safeguard land for its expansion?
- 1.33 WSCC can advice on this and if there is a requirement to expand primary or secondary schools then there is an established formula in order that new housing sites can make a financial contribution to new educational facilities.
- 1.34 WSCC have a formula for library provision as well.
- 1.35 The exact open space can be discussed at application stage or form part of the formal allocation. Allotments can be provided which meet established historic sizes such as 12 and 24 chains. CDC now have an up to date survey of open space needs and this should follow through into the NP.
- 1.36 No comment.

1.37 SPECIFIC SITES

I do not consider it appropriate for me to make specific comments on other developer sites. I have made general submissions as to what I consider to be the most appropriate locational criteria for new housing development in the Parish.

1.74 Land at Nutbourne West

I note that the only two comments relating to my site are in support of it coming forward for housing.

If it is allocated then I can confirm that the owner and myself would work closely with local residents and the Parish as a whole to ensure that a high quality scheme comes forward.

There is also room to provide a car park for the former Nutbourne Post Office and to provide parking for housing along the A259 which currently parks on the highway and obstruct the cycle lane.

Looking at the comments on all the sites as a whole I consider that the above response provides great merit in concluding that land at Nutbourne should come forward. I consider that it has considerable benefits and I commend its formal allocation to the Parish.

Stephen Jupp MRTPI
Chartered Town Planner
January 2014.