

## **Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan Comments and Questions forms – collated and edited – Jan 2014**

*NB This is an edited and collated version of all the responses received from local residents following the three consultation events (15<sup>th</sup> Oct, 9<sup>th</sup> Nov, 23<sup>rd</sup> Nov) held by the Southbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan Team.*

*Please note that while the comments/questions have been listed under “general” and “site specific” as set out on the response forms, it is necessary to read the whole of this list to achieve a proper understanding of the responses received by the Parish Council.*

*The reference numbers in brackets should enable individual responses to be traced should this be required (eg “9/11/8” is number 8 response received on 9<sup>th</sup> Nov form : “L” refers to letter: “e” refers to e mail).*

### **1 GENERAL COMMENTS**

#### **1.1 GENERAL LOCATIONS WITHIN SOUTHBOURNE**

1.2 Southbourne already overdeveloped and any new development between Woodfield Park Road and Nutbourne should be resisted to protect Strategic Gaps (9/11/8). Area north of the railway line is land-locked by A27 and level crossing and therefore saturated and not appropriate for more development without significant improvement to access (23/11/1). Concerned about any proposals to build north of the railway line due to access problems arising from the 2 existing level crossings, a problem which would be prohibitively expensive to resolve (9/11/2). The four sites at the northern end (Cooks Lane, East of Kelsey Avenue, and both Church Commissioners sites) would all lead to traffic problems (15/10/1).

1.3 Second choice (after near A259) would be at north of village allowing direct access to Stein Road (9/11/7).

1.4 Land between railway and A259 should be developed all the way to Fishbourne (23/11/1). Due to traffic problems scattered sites south of railway line preferred (23/11/15). Prefer multiple sites with bulk south of the railway, caravan sites are best placed to take brunt as associated issues are small by comparison (9/11/20). Sites south of railway would avoid causing more congestion at level crossing, and are nearer schools, doctors, chemist, shops (9/11/3) (L/6/12/13). Preferred location is where direct access to A259 available as would give less rise to traffic problems (15/10/9) (9/11/7). Developments need to be linked directly to A259 (15/10/22).

1.5 South of the A259 has very limited potential due to flood risk and natural beauty (23/11/1). Building south of the railway would be the cheaper sewage disposal option, building to the north of the railway would require significant up-grades (9/11/2).

1.6 Would prefer smaller developments spread around village (9/11/1) (9/11/4) (9/11/3) (9/11/7) (23/11/8) (15/10/30) (L/15/10/31).

1.7 Wildlife needs somewhere to live/re-locate due to pressure from all the proposed development (L/2/12/13). Planting trees etc. to secure

carbon capture is required (15/10/6). Local workforce should be used to boost local employment and local resources to reduce carbon footprint (15/10/6).

## **1.8 GENERAL COMMENTS ON HOUSING**

1.9 Questions ability to let social housing as Housing Associations do not now want tenants on benefits. (23/11/12) How can you be sure that new housing goes to local people? (9/11/7). What is meant by “affordable” and what % would be affordable housing? (15/10/7)

1.10 Houses generally look clinical and too small for families, local costs high? (23/11/12). Houses need gardens for children to play and privacy, and adequate parking space (9/11/7). Are all developers prepared to commit to adhere to design guidance for Chichester Harbour AONB as published by CDC, even where sites are outside the AONB? (15/10/10).

1.11 Quality housing needed with a mixture of interesting heights and designs and with adequate parking for two cars each so that properties are attractive and viable in the long term helping to “grow” new developments at a reasonable pace, not just a quick build-out. Family housing is needed. North/south facing roofs best to enable solar panels to be installed effectively (15/10/22). Warden assisted housing needed (L/15/10/31).

1.12 Most proposals seem acceptable but there should not be any flats or 5 bedrooed executive houses because these would not fit in with the area. More 2 and 3 bedroom affordable homes are needed and a few bungalows (23/11/25).

1.13 There is no explanation about how “green responsibilities”, which are becoming more affordable, would be accommodated or sourced within any of the proposed developments eg photovoltaic cells (PV), wind turbines, and anaerobic digestion to produce own power and meet UK and EU targets. Sustainable drainage systems required (15/10/6).

## **1.14 GENERAL COMMENTS ON TRANSPORT**

1.15 Concerned about increased traffic and its impact on A259 (15/10/8) (15/10/5) (9/11/6) (23/11/3) (23/11/10) (23/11/11) (L/6/12/13) (e/18/10/24) and generally (15/10/5) (15/10/4), and in Stein Road and Penny Lane (15/10/16) (23/11/12). A259 is blocked when A27 obstructed (15/10/4). Heavy lorries generated by Clovelly Road and Tesco deliveries are making Stein Road hazardous, pot holes and poor repairs following work by Gas, Water and Electricity services are creating a poor surface (23/11/25). Concerned about inadequate roads to serve new developments north of the railway line (15/10/1)(9/11/6) (L/6/12/13).

1.16 How well do the developers really know the area (9/11/7).

1.17 Roads through Westbourne and Woodmancote are only country lanes and not suitable for traffic heading north out of the village (15/10/3) (9/11/1) (15/10/9). Highway implications of more traffic using junction at northern end of Stein Road which has poor visibility, no lighting and no footways have not been assessed (e/18/10/26).

1.18 Concerned about pressure and delays at Southbourne Level Crossing being made worse (9/11/1) (9/11/6) (23/11/3) (23/11/27) (L/6/12/13) (15/10/32). Cars parked near level crossing cause congestion (23/11/21).

1.19 Need to improve transport links including serious consideration of new junction from Southbourne directly onto A27, probably from Stein Road (15/10/1) (15/10/5) (15/10/20) (23/11/7) (23/11/11). There needs to be a new access onto the A27 from Stein Road or Broad Road (Hambrook) (15/10/20).

1.20 A footbridge over the railway crossing needed (23/11/9) (23/11/11). An alternative means of crossing the railway line is needed (9/11/9). A road bridge over the railway is required (15/10/1) (15/10/5) (15/10/21).

1.21 Parking on footpaths should be dealt with as it puts those in wheelchairs at risk (23/11/9).

1.22 Adequate parking must be provided within new developments (23/11/12). Will there be enough parking provided per family house plus visitors? (23/11/26). How much parking space is required for each property? (9/11/7).

1.23 Parking is already a problem at the Co-op, Tesco (L/6/12/13), and the Bourne College without any more cars (9/11/1). Roadside parking is already a problem in Cooks Lane, New Road and Mosdell Road, including people leaving cars to use the train (15/10/4) (9/11/7). Parking and traffic congestion associated with the Junior and infant Schools needs resolving (15/10/4). A proper drop-off point for the station required (e/18/10/24).

1.24 Cycle Route of Scandinavian standard needed along full length of A259 (23/11/11). Bike parking needed within new developments (23/11/11). Parking in cycle lanes should be prevented (23/11/9).

1.25 New development should have reasonable access on foot to village facilities (9/11/9).

1.26 No.11 Bus service Westbourne/Southbourne/Chichester very well run by Emsworth and District, the local bus company, but has been recently withdrawn. Can it be re-instated? (9/11/7) (15/10/19).

## 1.27 GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE CONCERNS

1.28 Concerned that no overarching vision for 21<sup>st</sup> century apparent, schemes seem to be fragmented and integration required for all this to make sense (23/11/11). Proper consideration needs to be given to what is needed and where before random proposals for "dog walking paths" proposed eg at Nutbourne west (e/22/10/27).

1.29 Local Centre - Development to north and east of Southbourne would help create a local centre but need for infrastructure investment to achieve this (23/11/7). Most individual proposals seem acceptable but concerned about infrastructure (23/11/11). Do not favour development of "second village centre", retain centre at A259/Stein Road junction (23/11/27).

**1.30 Sewage** – can the area cope? (15/10/4)(9/11/6) (23/11/3) (23/11/26) (e/22/10/27)(L/15/10/31) (15/10/32). Given the current increase in storm discharges, assurances that sewage disposal capacity is not a problem are not accepted. It is irresponsible to rely on "at will" storm discharges to service new development (9/11/2). Thornham Sewage Works serves areas in Hampshire, West Sussex and Thorney Island MOD. All 3 areas have potential housing growth and it is suspected that there is no co-ordination. There are already problems with raw sewage in Chichester Harbour during periods of heavy rain. Facts required from Southern Water as this is being treated in a cursory manner (9/11/5). Sewage disposal problems must be sorted out before any new development permitted or started (23/11/27)

**1.31 Surface water flooding** needs resolving (15/10/4) (15/10/22) (23/11/3) (23/11/12) (e/18/10/24) (e/22/10/27) (L/15/10/31) (15/10/32), especially at A259/Stein Road junction (9/11/1) (9/11/6). Will residents have any come-back if drainage proves inadequate once new development completed? Will flooding problems on A259 be resolved and what if problems worsen, who is responsible? (9/11/7). Flooding occurs from Woodfield Park Road to Nutbourne and any new development in the area will make this worse (9/11/8). Surface water problems must be sorted out before any new development permitted or started (23/11/27) slow release from individual sites should not be allowed to happen simultaneously, otherwise flooding will be worse (e/18/10/24). Flooding also occurs on Inlands Road, what plans are there to improve drainage? (15/10/6). Drains on A259 need up-grading to deal with existing winter flooding (15/10/21).

**1.32 Medical facilities (doctors and dentist)** can they cope? Will expansion of services be funded? (15/10/4) (15/10/5) (15/10/22) (9/11/6) (23/11/3) (23/11/7) (23/11/10) (15/10/32). Assuming 4 persons per family.  $350 \times 4 = 1400$  additional people, can the local Surgery cope? (23/11/26). What steps will be taken to ensure local doctors' surgery and dental facilities can cope with increased numbers of people (15/10/8) (L/25/11/13) (L/15/10/31).

**1.33 Schools** – can they cope? (15/10/4) (15/10/5) (15/10/8) (15/10/21) (15/10/22) (9/11/1) (23/11/3) (23/11/7) (23/11/10) (23/11/26) (L/15/10/31). 350 X 2 children – can the schools cope? (23/11/26).

**1.34 Library capacity?** (23/11/3).

**1.35 Recreation facilities** need improvement to stop children hanging around the streets (9/11/1). Public Open Space needed, not just token “village greens” and allotments shown on developers’ schemes so far (23/11/11). Proposed allotments appear too small (23/11/12). Recreation and allotment sites need parking provision (9/11/7). Green spaces should be retained and brownfield sites preferred for new development (e/18/10/23). Greenspace within developments required and important (e/22/10/27). Playpark needed for children and a skateboard area (L/15/10/31).

**1.36 Shopping** Is there any provision for new shops within development proposed east of Kelsey Avenue as only minimal facilities available locally? (L/25/11/13).

### **1.37 SPECIFIC SITES**

#### **1.38 LAND SOUTH OF KINGS COURT, HERMITAGE (SHLAA HT08231) – developer : Mr Perkins**

1.39 Object due to location within and effect on Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, outside existing Settlement Policy Area and would erode Strategic gap between developed areas (23/11/17).

1.40 Very concerned especially about flooding in Roundhouse Meadow/Slipper Mill Pond area, little detail on plans displayed (23/11/2). Field drains already blocked by previous development causing flooding in Slipper Road. Will this be rectified? Where will surface water be drained to? (23/11/10). Surface water drainage concerns here (15/10/8) (e/18/10/24).

1.41 Would like more information on numbers of houses on this site and timing (23/11/2).

1.42 Houses will be expensive due to need for deep foundations and dealing with the high water level. Not enthusiastic about scheme which appears to be mainly for pensioners, and described as a development where residents wouldn’t have cars because they could walk into Emsworth where their needs would be met. Yet there is doubt about the future of the Emsworth Doctors’ Surgery. A mixed population of all ages is needed rather than an enclave of the elderly, which is not appropriate for Hermitage and which would throw responsibility for services onto Hampshire. Hermitage is not a good location for the elderly as it has no shops and poor bus services (23/11/24).

1.43 Will there be adequate parking for new development ie 2 per house + visitor parking, and will parking for existing Thorney Road residents be addressed? (23/11/10). Cycle route into Emsworth needed, not feasible for residents to walk into Emsworth (23/11/10). Traffic issues related to existing houses on east side of Thorney Road need addressing as well as increase in traffic turning right at junction with A259 (e/18/10/24).

**1.44 LAND NORTH OF PENNY LANE SOUTH, HERMITAGE (SHLAA HT08337) – developer : Seaward**

1.45 Concern about re-housing of elderly living on caravan site in Penny Lane if this site progressed (23/11/12) [NB appears to be wrong site - Morcumbs Mobile Home Park is not on this site]. Not suitable due to poor access from surrounding roads to site, parking on Penny Lane restricts road width, poor junctions with other local roads and access to Morcumbs Caravan Park. Site floods, especially in south east corner and down onto A259 (15/10/5) (15/10/18) (15/10/8) (9/11/8) (15/10/33). How will the significant drainage problem on this site be addressed? (15/10/14).

**1.46 LAND NORTH OF SOUTH LANE, SOUTHBOURNE (SHLAA SB08329 AND LAND WEST OF STEIN ROAD, SOUTHBOURNE (SHLAA SB1201) – developer : Carter Jonas/Church Commissioners**

**1.47 Both Sites** Favour development on both these sites provided direct access to A27 is provided this being necessary to avoid congestion at level crossing and existing rat-running through “Westbourne and Woodmancote” (23/11/13). Access directly to A27 should be considered (15/10/15). Good evident green values, good connection of green spaces and wildlife corridor (15/10/6). Noted that additional services could be made available but who would fund them? (15/10/7). The best location and scheme (15/10/11), exceptionally well presented at meeting (15/10/11) (15/10 17). Best sites provided level crossing up-graded (15/10/28).

1.48 No satisfactory answer given to resolve additional traffic onto Stein Road and level crossing, footbridge at Stein Road crossing not a solution (15/10/3) (15/10/17) (15/10/9) (23/11/15) (15/10/30) (L/15/10/31). How would traffic problems arising in Stein Road/Cooks Lane/Priors Leaze Lane as a result of this development be managed/mitigated? (15/10/6). Noise from A27 would be a problem on both sites (23/11/15). Existing roads through Westbourne and Woodmancote are too small to accommodate traffic generated by this development, and used by cyclists, equestrians etc. (15/10/9) (15/10/17). Definitely the wrong option, placing pressure on level crossing (15/10/32).

1.49 Look to be the most likely sites but no attention given to flooding which already occurs on A27 and swales/ponds within site will not cope. Should include new doctors' surgery (existing surgery already

oversubscribed), chemist and shops (e/22/10/27). Too far from bus service, doctors and dentist on A259 (15/10/30).

1.50 Object to both sites as too large to integrate with village (9/11/3) (23/11/16). Object to both sites (23/11/18). Object to both sites as would not meet needs of community and use for the most part prime agricultural land (23/11/19). Object as outside Settlement Policy Area, Grade 1 agricultural land and roundabout at South Lane/Stein Road junction would cause problems on school run (15/10/12) (15/10/15). Is it the intention to develop all of both sites or will Strategic Gaps be maintained? What is the timescale? Would all buildings be low enough to protect views as appeared from display plans? Is the "village green" to contain anything other than green space, eg café/shops to make it a real village green centre? (e/19/10/25). Will land owners enter binding legal agreement to back up assertion that they will not pursue development of other land owned nearby in future (e/18/10/26). Strategic landscaping required to strengthen/create boundaries and with maintenance plan should be an integral part of any scheme for these open, less well defined sites. Existing tree group requires protection (e/18/10/26). Style of housing unclear, this important as with landscaping would show how intended to integrate into landscape and mitigate visual impact. Dog walking paths and open space should be retained (L/15/10/31).

1.51 Local workforce should be used for construction to boost local economy and local resources used to reduce carbon footprint (15/10/6). Sustainable drainage systems required for both sites (15/10/6).

**1.52 Western site** is Grade 2 agricultural land which farmer is concerned about losing (23/11/14). Replacement provision would be required for any loss of footpaths around field currently used by dogwalkers (15/10/3).

1.53 Effect on Park Road. This site would not accommodate 300 houses without a massive impact on safety (Senior School, Junior School and residents – Park Road is very narrow) (23/11/4) (23/11/6). New access roads will be detrimental for already overloaded Park Road, people drive to the Schools and don't walk (23/11/6).

1.54 The Industrial Estate at Clovelly Road should be moved and no more industrial development provided nearby as Park Road is already congested due to industrial and school traffic, large buses and lorries. (23/11/4). Industrial estate should be re-located out of the village and the area redeveloped for housing (23/11/6). Strong objection to additional industry on this site (23/11/15).

1.55 North western site access dangerous because part way down hill in Stein Road (23/11/16). The privacy and environment of the small number of residential properties already fronting the field on the south eastern corner need to be protected by a "buffer" planting/open space. There may also be flooding problems (15/10/3) (15/10/17).

**1.56 Eastern Site** If north eastern site progressed should have vehicular access directly onto Stein Road not onto South Lane which is too small. A mini roundabout at the South Lane/Cheshire Way junction might be helpful. (23/11/8). South Lane access dangerous as lane too narrow and new access comes out on a very sharp bend (23/11/16).

1.57 have been told that Farmer less concerned about losing north eastern site but would want to retain access for machinery (23/11/15).

**1.58 LAND EAST OF KELSEY AVENUE AT BREACH AVENUE, SOUTHBOURNE (SHLAA SB08328) – developer : RPS**

1.59 Minimal information provided about proposed 42 units as no representative present on 23/11 (23/11/5) (23/11/13) (L/2/12/13). Please could contact details for developer be provided (23/11/5). Breach Avenue unsuitable access due to being narrow, road-side parking, poor surface and potholes. Large service vehicles already have problems (L/2/12/13) (L/6/12/13) (L3/12/13) (L/1/12/13). Development will result in flooding (L/1/12/13) (L/30/11/13). The quiet and friendly character of the road would be changed if new development of this scale permitted (L/30/11/13)

**1.60 LAND EAST OF KELSEY AVENUE, SOUTHBOURNE (SHLAA SB08328) - developer : Rydon Homes**

1.61 Seems the best option, not rich ecologically and could accommodate recreational space within new development (23/11/7). Benefit of giving choice of using either Stein Road or Inlands Road to reach A259, especially if Inlands Road widened (23/11/27). Better site than Church Commissioners as distributes housing better around village (L/15/10/31).

1.62 Cooks Lane is not suitable for 2 way traffic and Inlands Road (used as a rat run) too narrow and is not suitable either (15/10/2) (15/10/7) (15/10/8) (9/11/1) (9/11/7) (15/10/28) (15/10/32). Cannot understand how WSCC Highways consider development can be undertaken without improvements to these roads (15/10/2). Concerned about amount of traffic turning into Cooks Lane, Stein Road and Priors Leaze Lane (9/11/7) (23/11/22) (L/25/11/13). Concerned about noise created by children and by traffic from new development affecting existing residents (L/25/11/13) (23/11/22). The proposed access point on Cooks Lane would create danger (9/11/7). At what time of day did WSCC Highways carry out its traffic survey? (9/11/7). Cooks Lane would need to be widened, is this proposed? (15/10/9) (L/15/10/31).

1.63 Recreation area should be adjacent to existing development on western side making it safer for children and allowing new housing to be further away into eastern part of field. Concerns about loss of natural sunlight, drainage and wildlife (23/11/20) (23/11/21) (23/11/22). Loss of view over countryside will devalue property (15/10/2) (23/11/22).



1.64 Not clear what the landscape buffer proposed between the existing and proposed houses consists of, how big it is, and who is responsible for maintaining it as it could become a dumping area (23/11/23).

1.65 Site not suitable, adjoining existing residents will lose open aspect of farmland currently enjoyed (L/25/11/13). Fields either side of Cooks Lane already retain water during heavy rain, what measures would be taken to ensure no flooding? (9/11/7) (L/25/11/13).

1.66 Will the Vodafone Mast and telegraph poles on the site be relocated? (9/11/7). Are water, gas and electricity supplies to site adequate? (L/25/11/13). How would construction noise be alleviated? (15/10/6).

**1.67 LAND EAST OF KELSEY AVENUE AND SOUTH OF COOKS LANE, SOUTHBOURNE (SHLAA SB08328) AND LOVEDERS MOBILE HOME PARK, SOUTHBOURNE (SHLAA SB08411) "The Paddocks and the Orchards" – developer : Seaward**

1.68 Development on these sites would affect fewer existing properties (less than 20) than the Kelsey Avenue site (about 50 properties) so are better (23/11/22). Benefit of giving choice of using either Stein Road or Inlands Road to reach A259, especially if Inlands Road widened (23/11/27). How would construction noise be alleviated? (15/10/6). What does "proper provision for cars" mean? And which designated public areas would parking be allowed in? What does "no parking needed on roads" mean? And garages must be wide enough to accommodate cars with car doors open (15/10/13).

**1.69 Land South of Cooks Lane "The Paddocks"**

1.70 Cooks Lane is not suitable for 2 way traffic and Inlands Road is not suitable either (9/11/1) (15/10/7) (15/10/28) (15/10/29). How would drivers be discouraged from using Inlands Road? (e/19/10/25) (15/10/28). Fields either side of Cooks Lane already retain water during heavy rain, what measures would be taken to ensure no flooding (9/11/7). Cooks Lane would need to be widened (15/10/9) (15/10/28). Not suitable as north of the railway making problems at crossing gates worse (L/15/10/31).

**1.70 Loveders Mobile Home Park "The Orchards"**

1.71 Caravan sites are best placed to take brunt of housing as associated issues are small by comparison, including traffic and drainage issues (9/11/20). If Loveders Caravan Park is not available for a few years, will it still be included in the Plan? (9/11/7). Favour Loveders as close to A259 and avoids level crossing problem, and widening of Inlands Road could be part of the development (23/11/27). Assuming this scheme requires access onto Inlands Road would it be widened? (15/10/11). There is already an increasing amount of surface water in the vicinity causing flooding in Farm Lane and School Lane, Nutbourne and it needs to be

dealt with (15/10/20). Access should be direct onto A259 (15/10/28) (15/10/29). Access onto A259 would lead to an extra burden of traffic affecting the whole Emsworth/Fishbourne length of the A259 (15/10/20). Do not support employment units so close to proposed housing (15/10/28) (15/10/29). Most suitable site as south of level crossing(15/10/32).

**1.72 ALFREY CLOSE - developer : Hallam Land and LAND AT GOSDEN GREEN (SHLAA SB08332) – developer : Crayfern**

1.73 Sites west of Southbourne adjacent to the A259 would avoid making problems at the Southbourne level crossing worse (23/11/27). Access through Alfrey Close to Hallam Land site not suitable, an alternative access to both Hallam Land and Gosden Green is required. (L/25/11/13). Support Gosden Green site in principle but “green initiatives” need addressing (15/10/6). Surface water drainage issues on Gosden Green site need addressing (15/10/13). Gosden Green acceptable (L/15/10/31) because south of level crossing (15/10/32).

**1.74 LAND AT NUTBOURNE WEST, NUTBOURNE (SHLAA NB08304) – developer : Mr Jupp**

This site would affect fewer existing properties than the Kelsey Avenue proposals (23/11/22). This site is close to the A259 and would avoid making problems at the Southbourne level crossing worse (23/11/27).

**MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS** People should be advised of the 6<sup>th</sup> Jan 2014 cut-off date for comments to be submitted on the new Chichester District Plan (23/11/14). Developers have insufficient knowledge of sites being proposed (23/11/18). When will it be known which sites have been selected? What happens if more than 50% vote no in the local referendum? When would building begin on selected sites? Can the 350 houses be delayed till after 2019? (9/11/10)

ST/Jan 2014