

# Housing Site Selection

## Comments from residents

# General concerns and queries from residents

- What exactly do we mean by affordable? What type of affordable housing do we want? What price will they be?
- Why are we building more than 10 houses? Survey said less than 10.
- Could/should we rely on small sites and infill to meet the 11 – 20 quota over the next 3 – 10 years?
- Why do we have to have developers involved now?
- Need infrastructure improvement – shop, roads, traffic calming, larger school, green space.
- Need provision for visitor parking on both sites.
- Cranford Road too busy for more houses/traffic.
- Should use existing brownfield sites.
- Neither site maximises eco design/good practice principles
- Site construction traffic needs managing to avoid Main Street junction
- Neither developer to date has offered the village any improvement to traffic or amenities through their developments
- Either site should be in keeping with the Design Guide.
- Need to ensure adequate street lighting.

# North Site

Pros mentioned by residents:

- Site gives potential for village use of field rear of site
- Proximity to existing village centre and existing boundary
- Design/quality of houses and site looks good
- Site less visible from footpaths
- Latest proposal for communal use of field to the rear of the site is positive.

# North Site

Cons mentioned by residents:

- Potential for further development rear of site
- Too many houses
- No communal garden
- Limited parking, especially for affordable houses
- Limited gardens for affordable houses
- Design not good for small children due to road proximity
- Two entrances to site could be less safe? Entrance opposite Rushwell Close could be dangerous?
- Rushwell Close properties would be overlooked.
- The site could interfere with the view of All Saints Church; need to look at roof lines.
- No bungalows provided.
- Future maintenance costs for proposed communal land and the SUDS drainage scheme to rear could be problematic.

# South Site

Pros mentioned by residents:

- Pond and play area on site, giving children a safe area
- Sightline to fields
- Site is in a better position than the North
- Community feel with layout
- Single access point to Cranford Road

# South Site

Cons mentioned by residents:

- Too many houses, and too dense
- Parking spaces limited
- Development to 'on the road'
- Would displace the newt colony rear of Rushwell Close
- Unattractive design
- Entrance closer to brow of hill; potentially more dangerous
- No bungalows provided

# Evidence and Possible Mitigation

- New proposal from North site addresses use of land at rear, and our planning consultant is confident the confines of the site can be controlled.
- New design from South site changes the colour of the red brick houses to buff.
- Both sites would be capable of introducing speed reduction measures as part of their proposals.
- Every day more than 4000 vehicle movements are recorded on Cranford Road; an extra 20 houses would add approximately 100 movements, which is insignificant.
- The site at Rectory Farm (old bus depot) is very unlikely to get permission to build 5 dwellings as the application was turned down and the appeal was rejected.
- If North plan changed to have one entrance/exit, developer could be asked to install a roundabout at Rushwell Close junction.
- Currently the view of Church from North site is already limited and obscured by trees