

Liz Pulley

From: Lucy von Schoenberg <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 11 June 2015 13:02
To: Neighbourhood Planning
Subject: Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan objections
Attachments: Wisborough_Green_response_form - Lucy von Schoenberg objection.doc

Please find attached my objection comments relating to the Wisborough Green Neighbourhood Plan.

Kind regards

Lucy von Schoenberg

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.



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	Mrs L von Schoenberg
Address	Oakfield Billingshurst Road Wisborough Green R14 0DZ
Postcode	Rh14 0DZ
Telephone	[REDACTED]
Email	[REDACTED]
Organisation (if applicable)	N/A
Position (if applicable)	N/A
Date	11 th June 2015

PART B

To which part of the document does your representation relate?

Paragraph Number		Policy Reference:	SS4
------------------	--	-------------------	-----

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:

I am firmly opposed to the inclusion of one of the sites Winterfold in the village neighbourhood plan. This site was not included in any consultations since 2006 and when it was considered by the community as part of a choice with other sites (2006) it came second to last. Including it now in the final draft with no other options from which to choose clearly undermines the entire consultation process as it does not allow it to be judged against the merits of the other sites, especially as there are other alternative sustainable sites preferred by the community available.

- Part of the site is opposite the village school. Apparently the developer asked the school to move its current car park in the front of the school to the rear, presumably to allow an additional access to the site. This would take away much needed play area for the children, where there is already not enough room for the children to run and play. Last winter the children were banned from running in the playground due to lack of space and overcrowding.
- Access to the development would be via Durbans Road. Durbans Road is already compromised by cars parking for the Cricketers and the houses around the pub. The road is dangerous and speed is already a concern on this road with traffic accelerating from the bend adjacent Sweaphurst Farm towards the site. This was cited as an objection to the site in 2006 but has not been taken into consideration at all within this plan. No traffic calming has been offered by the developer despite it being cited as an issue within the NP – why has the opportunity not been taken to require this of the developer?
- Winterfold is a greenfield site. Throughout the consultation process the village has favoured brownfield sites. Only one was selected originally (Clarkes Yard) and Greenways was added at the last minute when planning was granted for 10 static mobile homes and another greenfield site was dropped (Glebe Field) to accommodate it – why was the community's view and preference not taken into consideration? We assume because the plan had to comply with national and local policy, but the council's own solicitor has advised when considering an objection to the Loxwood NP that the Neighbourhood plan should reflect the views of the community and does not, legally, have to be in accordance with either national planning policy or the district's local plan. Practically all of the brownfield sites that the villagers preferred have been excluded from the neighbourhood plan, aside from Clarkes Yard and the one forced on them by the successful appeal for the ten mobile homes. Had Greenways been included originally the village may well have

ended up with a better class of development at this location. There has been no transparency in the way the public's expressed views have been discounted.

- Kirdford Road sites are now established as sustainable by the granting of permission by a planning inspector for mobile homes, so why are the most preferred adjacent sites of Carters field and The Nurseries being ignored in the plan. Surely the logic for rejecting these sites should have been revisited to see if the wishes of the community could now be accommodated given the inspector's opinion. The fact that Greenways was included at the last minute without further consultation on the impact of this on the whole plan undermines the whole consultation process. Had further consultation been allowed then this may well have further reinforced the low appeal of Winterfold.
- There is no buffer between the Winterfold site and the conservation area. This is in contradiction of the direct planning policy of the council.
- The visual impact of up to 30 houses in open view when travelling south along Durbans Road would be massively detrimental to the character of the village and severely harm the open characteristic of this part of the village. The NP says it will have "minimal visual impact" this is clearly a totally false statement. The development will also be highly visible from Newpound Lane where it appears to overlap the local gap.
- The NP also says it's close to the village centre, it would be but for the fact that the entrance is located some way down Durbans Road which is in fact almost 500m from the village shop.
- The scheme from the developer offers a 'biodiversity area'. This includes a man made pond. The developer is clearly forgetting that this is a countryside location and there are already 3 natural ponds all within walking distance of the development. We don't need a bio-diversity area. We have the countryside! Looking at the parish council's recent minutes it would appear that the school has suggested they would rarely use this facility. The NP also says some of the land could be used for sport facilities but what would actually fit on this site. The developer appears to be offering nothing to the village that is needed or usable. In addition, how can the use of part of the site for recreation be legally secured as such in perpetuity as stated in the NP? Surely there is nothing that can stop this being developed in the next 5 year housing supply?
- The footpath opposite the site on Durbans Road that provides access to the village contravenes planning policy. It is 1m wide at best and it should be at least 1.8m wide. How is it possible to provide this without encroaching on the road or into the hedge and private gardens. Is the site deliverable?
- Throughout the consultation process 30-39% of the villagers asked for retirement homes and upwards of 20% specifically sheltered accommodation. This has not been included within the plan despite the fact that this type of housing would have the least effect on the

village infrastructure, most notably the school which is already full and would free up bigger houses which in turn would free up smaller family houses. The NP hardly mentions older people and the words retirement and sheltered are not mentioned. No choice is being provided for people who want to stay in their village as they grow old. Providing 'lifetime homes' mixed into other sites does not work if there is no form of support available at the same time so we will be driving out our older residents. There is no transparency as to why the decision was made to exclude the expressed need for retirement and sheltered homes within the plan – who and how was this choice made?

- What is to prevent the developer gaining planning consent on the garden of Winterfold once the settlement boundary has been moved to include it? This could provide more than 10 more houses clustering development in this one area. There is also no natural boundary to prevent this development sprawling further into the greenfield in the future.
- The Winterfold site must be exposed to the same public scrutiny as the other sites, the impact of the inclusion of Greenways on the whole plan and the exclusion of preferred brownfield sites should be re-examined either by further consultation or public hearings. There needs to be far more transparency about why decisions have been made because in some instances this is totally absent.

(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

(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.