

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENT 8 MAY 2013  
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES**

The attendance list was signed by 54 individuals

A total of 33 questionnaires were handed in during the consultation event. Three further questionnaires were returned after the event (by 16/05/13)

**Q1 Do you support the principle of housing development on the site?**

|       |    |
|-------|----|
| Yes   | 20 |
| No    | 13 |
| Other | 3  |

Comments made by those answering 'yes':

- more housing needed to sustain the existing village amenities
- to improve the visual appearance of the site
- to bond the two parts of the village
- the need for affordable housing for young people
- housing will provide open space which is greatly needed
- to meet national housing need, noting the village has had little development for a number of years
- sensible place to build more houses in the village

Comments made by those answering 'no':

- it is an open space and should be left as such
- the orchard is a special place, last one remaining in the village so of historical importance
- orchards are disappearing and trees should be replanted
- site could be used as a place for people to sit
- the thin end of the wedge
- the village does not need new housing developments as it will no longer be a village
- harm to the natural countryside, animals and wildlife (woodpeckers particularly mentioned)
- insufficient drainage and sewers – sewer cannot deal with existing demand
- the site floods and development will increase flooding elsewhere
- plenty of housing at the former army camp

**Q2 We have indicated two possible options for the site, which do you prefer?**

|                      |    |
|----------------------|----|
| Option 1 (15 houses) | 15 |
| Option 2 (23 houses) | 7  |
| Other                | 10 |
| No preference        | 2  |
| No response          | 2  |

Comments received in respect to Option 1:

- More in keeping with village, need for green areas and large gardens
- Development should be proportional to size of village

- 23 houses would be overdevelopment
- Less cars and traffic
- Fewer houses the better

Comments received in respect to Option 2:

- Need for more houses in area
- More housing provide additional support for shop and PH
- All housing needs met on one site
- Need mixed community
- More affordable homes

The 'other' responses included:

- Neither / none – the need to keep the village as it is, need to preserve the orchard
- 12 – the original proposal

**Q3 What sort of dwellings should be provided on the site? (e.g. terraced; semi-detached; detached; bungalows; family houses; single person houses)**

Comments include:

- A variety, a mix to meet the needs of everyone (most common response)
- Mainly affordable for first time buyers / renters
- Single dwellings/bungalows
- Bungalows for the more mature
- If any development is to take place we need bungalows
- Cottage style 2 bed properties
- Low density of really affordable housing
- Semi detached family homes
- Detached family homes with some semi detached
- Need for some low cost starter homes and bungalows somewhere in the village but not on this site
- None

**Q4 Do you support the provision of public open space and playing fields on the land to the rear of The Orchard?**

|             |    |
|-------------|----|
| Yes         | 22 |
| No          | 12 |
| Other       | 1  |
| No response | 1  |

Comments made by those answering 'yes':

- Play area/open space is very much needed
- It should include children's play equipment
- Relocate village hall to site with parking
- Open space and playing fields have been wanted for well over 30 years
- Nice to have a communal open space all year round
- Somewhere finally for children to play safely

Comments made by those answering 'no':

- It would be neglected and vandalised

- Children could not be easily supervised, particularly as so close to the Greenway, not visible from the road
- Security issues
- The orchard adjacent to the road would be a better location
- Wrong end of the village / should be more central
- Would become a gathering place for local youths
- A disused open space would be another possibility for development
- Costly to maintain, too big an area
- Wrong site unlikely to be used
- Full recreational facilities are being provided at old MOD camp which will be able to the villagers
- White elephant some distance from the main body of the village
- Need to cross busy main road with poor visibility

**Q5 Would you object to the diversion of the existing public footpath so it is not obstructed by games and events held on the proposed open space and playing fields?**

|             |    |
|-------------|----|
| Yes         | 7  |
| No          | 28 |
| No response | 1  |

Comments made by those answering 'yes':

- No change would be acceptable
- Footpath has been in place for 3 centuries
- Running the footpath at the back of the houses would be a security concern
- No support for open space, thus no need to divert footpath.

Comments made by those answering 'no':

- Sensible idea

**Q6 Would you support provision of a new permissive footpath linking the proposed housing and open space/playing fields to The Greenway?**

|             |    |
|-------------|----|
| Yes         | 25 |
| No          | 10 |
| No response | 1  |

Comments made by those answering 'yes':

- Create circular walk around the village
- Great idea

Comments made by those answering 'no'

- Many of the responses mainly note the security issue of unknown people coming from The Greenway
- Safety of children using open space
- One respondent noted a wider security risk of people using the footpath as an unseen back way into the village
- Increased public access not desirable
- Lead to further nuisance problems
- Walking along village pavement is already hazardous in parts

- Possible future planning implications

**Q7 Is there anything else you would like us to consider?**

General comments received are as follows:

- We desperately need a play area for children in the village e.g. swings, slide, climbing frame etc. This needs to be included in the open space
- No need for more housing here due to the planning permission for 500 houses in close proximity to the village, a development which is to provide various sizes and styles of houses including 4-5 bedroom properties
- Traffic calming measures should be introduced as traffic at this end of the village regularly exceeds 30mph
- Provide drainage to the north brook not via roadside, which is often overloaded
- Very concerned about drainage – when we have heavy rain the sewers cannot cope
- Consult the village flood team re: previous flooding in 1998 and 2007
- We strongly object to this development for the following grounds: it is not needed; open space is just a carrot and route to future development; landowner will not maintain drainage; site is greenfield; site liable to flood; orchard is established and has a plethora of wildlife
- There is already too much speeding in the village, particularly at that end of the village. More houses = more cars = more speeding
- This would be very dangerous if children were being encouraged to go to this end of the village to the 'open space'
- There would be problems with flooding and with sewage
- The pumping station is minute and cannot cope now, never mind if the proposed site is built
- All the concrete bases for all the houses and compressed driveways will obviously have an effect, and not good, on the lias clay beneath whether you tank or not – it will put the water elsewhere i.e. towards other houses that have been badly flooded before
- The prospect of a playing field is not enough of an incentive when people's homes are put at risk
- I am not against this development. 15 houses are better than 23. We suffer badly from flooding, this is our main worry, and also the type of people we will get on the playing field coming from the Greenway
- We agree with the housing but not the open space – and leave the village hall in the centre of the village
- Flooding issues – not adverse to an open space in another location visible and adjacent to the main road
- The open space should be provided off the main road. This would be more suitable for a new village hall, sports field, village green etc
- Site for a new village hall and parking? Parking area for open space / playing field
- Surface water at present in the winter flows off the land both north and south into gardens of existing house and in 1998 and 2007 into the houses
- Please make provision for any surplus water to drain away and not cause any flooding
- Leave it all alone we are happy with the village as it is
- Provision in diagram and planning application for new village hall and parking
- That the village hall be relocated to the public open space
- More homes within the confines of the village envelope are needed urgently

- Not a development crammed with houses
- Can some of them be bungalows for the elderly, plus camping facilities (tourist attraction) – could there be some sort of hut / clubroom on the open space/playing field?
- How about relocating the village hall to the ‘public open space’ – look at Pebworth model – why not create a village green environment with the houses would the open space
- Move the village hall onto the open space – to incorporate the whole lot together would be more inclusive
- I loved in a village that build two affordable houses together on one site. This was called ‘vicarage court’ but became ‘benefit court’ – don’t build a ghetto
- We were promised some years ago that the orchard would be kept as an open space. It is a pleasant part of the village making a nice break from housing – a place where people walking through the village can stop and stare
- Flooding – this area will flood from surface flooding – all houses at north end are at risk. My house floods below the floor boards cutting off my electricity
- Pretty please build it!

Stansgate Planning  
16/05/13