

Turvey Neighbourhood Plan

Sites for New Houses Summary of Consultation Outcomes

March/April 2019

Introduction

1. A consultation process took place in March/April 2019 where Turvey residents were invited to comment on the recommended sites for new housing proposed for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. Sites put forward for development by landowners had been assessed and rated by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and the Steering Group's recommendations were endorsed by Turvey Parish Council. Full details of the consultation process and the information available to residents can be found at www.turveyndp.org.uk
2. A Questionnaire was made available in hard copy at a consultation exhibition held in three sessions on 15th, 16th and 17th March. The same Questionnaire was available on the website through Survey Monkey. A total of 148 responses were received.
3. This report provides a summary of key messages from the consultation with a detailed analysis of all comments received shown in the appendix.

Analysis of questionnaire responses

4. The following three questions were listed in the questionnaire;
 - Question 1
Have the criteria been applied correctly so that the best sites have been chosen (from those available)? *(Please give your reasons)*
 - Question 2
Do you have any different views about the way the sites should be rated? *(Please give your reasons)*
 - Question 3
Do you have any other comments about the sites?
5. For the full analysis, which follows in the Appendix below, responses were grouped into 3 categories based on the answers to Question 1;
 - Agree – 124
 - Partly agree – 5
 - Disagree – 19

6. The following comments were made about aspects of the recommendations that respondents viewed positively;
 - i. Criteria clear and consistently applied (26)
 - ii. Support the small scale of development as proposed (16)
 - iii. Recommended sites have the least impact on surroundings and traffic (12)
 - iv. Minimum impact on the character of the village and historic buildings is a positive (6)
 - v. Recommended sites have minimum impact on landscape and natural features (4)
 - vi. Developments providing smaller homes affordable for young people (6)

7. The reasons given by people who disagreed with the recommended sites were various (see appendix for full analysis). The most commonly cited reason for disagreement was concern about the impact on traffic on Newton Lane. This was mentioned by 11 people as one of their reasons for disagreeing with the recommended development at Mill Rise.

8. The following comments were made regarding sites that should have been included as suitable for development;
 - i. Carlton Road (19)
 - ii. Meadow House (3)
 - iii. Newton Lane East (3)
 - iv. Priory Farm (3)
 - v. NW New Gains Farm (1)

9. A number of comments were made expressing concern about the impact of development on traffic and parking. The number of people expressing these concerns includes 11 people who disagreed with the recommendation to allocate the site at Mill Rise, Newton Lane because of traffic impacts and 26 people who supported this recommendation despite their concern about traffic. There are more comments expressing concern about traffic on Newton Lane, compared to Carlton Road. However, as there is no site recommended on Carlton Road, the number of comments made potentially under-represents overall levels of concern that may exist about traffic on Carlton Road in the event that a site was recommended there. Comments about traffic were as follows;
 - i. Concern about traffic on Newton Lane (37)
 - ii. Carlton Road (8)
 - iii. Concern about traffic at Laws House (3)
 - iv. Concern about traffic at Meadow House (2)

- v. Concern about traffic on Station Road (1)
- vi. Concern about parking at Laws House (4)
- vii. General concern about parking (2)

10. The following comments were made about the number of new homes proposed;

- i. More housing needed than proposed (4)
- ii. Too many houses proposed (3) too many houses at Mill Rise (8)
- iii. More affordable housing needed (9)
- iv. Not sure so many flats needed at Laws House (4)

Key messages and conclusions from responses and comments

11. The following key messages are apparent from the responses and comments submitted;

- i. **84% respondents agreed** with the way the sites were rated and the recommended sites
- ii. **3% partly agreed** with the way the sites were rated and the recommended sites
- iii. **13% disagreed** with the way the sites were rated and the recommended sites

12. There was **general agreement in support of the level and scale of development proposed** and for the policy to recommend smaller scale development at dispersed locations across the village, although a relatively small number thought too many houses were proposed whilst other people thought that the number of new homes proposed was insufficient.

13. Responses showed that a number of people thought that **other sites could be included as suitable** for development, particularly Carlton Road where 19 people commented that the site could be included.

14. There were a range of areas of individual concern expressed about the impact of development. The **largest area of concern was the impact of increased traffic movements** that would follow from development, particularly in regard to Newton Lane and Carlton Road.

Sites for New Houses Consultation – full analysis

1. Respondents <u>AGREE</u> to Q1 - have the criteria been applied correctly and best sites chosen?	124
1.1 Comments made @ Q1;	
• Criteria clear and consistently applied (26)	
• Support the small scale of development as proposed (15)	
• Recommended sites have the least impact on surroundings and traffic (12)	
• Minimum impact on the character of the village and historic buildings is a positive (6)	
• Recommended sites have minimum impact on landscape and natural features (4)	
• Support smaller homes for young people (1)	
• New housing should meet 30% affordable housing requirement (2)	
• Not enough affordable housing (1)	
• Pleased Newton Lane East not recommended due to impact on wildlife and views (1)	
• Reserve options should be considered in case more development is required (1)	
• Overlooking parkland at Carlton Road is an advantage not a disadvantage (2)	
• Carlton Road should be included if more houses needed (3)	
• Carlton Road has the same disadvantages as Mill Rise (1)	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be no more than 10 houses at Mill Rise (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about traffic on Newton Lane (10) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support housing for young people at Laws House (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about number of flats proposed at Laws House (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to make sure parking is sufficient at Laws House (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about parking and access at Laws House (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about more traffic movements at Station Road/A428 (1) 	
<p>1.2 Comments made @ Q2 - do you have any different views about the way sites should be rated?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple answer - 'NO' (87) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on Carlton Road should be included (9) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development at Meadow House should be included (2) with 20 mph speed limit May Rd/Norfolk Rd (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on Newton Lane East should be included (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development at New Gains Farm should be included (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of additional homes on traffic should be considered (4) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of traffic on Newton Lane is a concern (5) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on Newton Lane would have more than moderate impact on traffic (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on Carlton Road would have more than moderate impact on traffic (5) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40 homes for the village should be the maximum because of traffic impact (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic concerns at Laws House should be given greater weighting (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link road from Carlton Road to the A428 should be considered (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should look for one more development and add to the number of houses provided (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are heritage impacts at Meadow House regarding ridge and furrow (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development at Laws House must be within the existing building in order to be 'absorbed sympathetically' (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of wildlife and conservation should be applied to chosen sites (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value of footpaths should be taken into account (1) 	

1.3 Comments made @ Q3 – do you have any other comments about the sites?	
• Laws House development must be sympathetic with Conservation Area (6)	
• Like the Laws House development proposal (5)	
• Should be affordable housing for young people at Laws House(5)	
• 16 flats too many at Laws House (1)	
• Concern that Laws House development would cause parking problems on the Loop (2)	
• All sites need to provide adequate on-site parking (1)	
• Need for more parking (1)	
• Where sites are selected traffic flow onto A428 needs to be given attention (2)	
• Carlton Road not suitable because of traffic congestion (5)	
• Traffic on Carlton Road is a major factor for Carlton Road and Meadow House sites (2)	
• Carlton Road and Meadow House sites should be included with measures to improve traffic flow (1)	
• Develop Meadow House and NW New Gains Farm sites to create access to A428 (1)	
• Newton Lane needs to be improved to cater for increased traffic (1)	
• Concern about traffic on Carlton Road (2)	

• Concern about traffic on Newton Lane (2)	
• Traffic lights needed at Newton Lane/A428 (1)	
• Link road Carlton Road/A428 needed (2)	
• Concern that not enough housing provided for (1)	
• Sites chosen are too limited and development at Carlton Road is a better long term option (1)	
• Concern that plan does not offer clear way forward for further small scale development in future (1)	
• Carlton Road would be a good option for a small scale development (1)	
• Small sites preferred (1)	
• Support small sites distributed around the village (1)	
• Prefer 25 to 30 homes in total (2)	
• Prefer fewer houses at Mill Rise (3)	
• Will there be enough affordable housing to attract young people/families? (3)	
• Criteria for affordable housing and who they are available to needs to be carefully defined (1)	
• Not enough housing to support affordable housing needed (1)	
• Will priority be given to local residents? (1)	
• Will the flats have an age restriction? (1)	

• Not sure flats are needed (1)	
• Small properties for retirees needed (1)	
• Larger sites have potential to keep increasing which is a concern (1)	
• Developments need to be in keeping with the village (1)	
• Mill Rise will not impose on the view entering the village (1)	
• Developments need to have a mix of smaller and larger homes (1)	
• Will there be access to the river bank from Mill Rise (1)	
• Priory Farm could be an extra option (1)	
• Priory Farm could be good with improved footpath and reduced speed limits (1)	
• Concern about flood risk at Newton Lane East from surface water run-off (1)	
• Concern that development at Carlton Road could lead to development creep (1)	
• Extending the village envelope should be avoided as far as possible (1)	
• Further development at Station End would have less impact on the village and link both settlements (1)	
• Impact of more housing puts extra pressure on doctors surgeries (1)	
• Fast broadband should be a requirement on new developments (1)	

2. Respondents <u>PARTIALLY AGREE to Q1</u> - have the criteria been applied correctly and best sites chosen?	5
2.1 Comments @ Q1	
• Not sure Mill Rise meets criteria because of traffic (4)	
• Mill Rise too many houses (1)	
• Mill Rise too close to sewage works (1)	
2.2 Comments @ Q2 - do you have any different views about the way sites should be rated?	
• Meadow House could be included (1)	
• Carlton Road should be included (1)	
• Traffic concerns at Mill Rise (1)	
• Wildlife concerns at Mill Rise (1)	
2.3 Comments made @ Q3 – do you have any other comments about the sites?	
• Serious concerns about Newton Lane East (1)	
• Carlton Road should be considered (1)	
• Burrows site seems too many for the plot	

3. Respondents <u>DISAGREE to Q1</u> - have the criteria been applied correctly and best sites chosen?	19
3.1 Comments at Q1	
• Newton Lane sites unsuitable because of increased traffic on Newton Lane (11)	
• Disagree ratings for encroachment on open countryside at Newton Lane East and Mill Rise (1)	
• Laws House and the Burrows are the only suitable sites (1)	
• Question need for flats at Laws House (2)	
• The Burrows is too far from the village (1)	
• The Burrows is too small (1)	
• 20 houses at Mill Rise is too many (1)	
• Newton Lane East should also be put forward (1)	
• Carlton Road should also be put forward (1)	
• Priory Farm should also be put forward (1)	
• Affordable housing not addressed (1)	
• Traffic safety concerns at Laws House (2)	
• Mill Rise development impacts negatively on Bakers Close residents (1)	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer more development at Station Road (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposing majority of housing at Mill Rise fails to meet principle of dispersed development (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments accessed directly from A428 site preferred (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mill Rise better because of major impact on countryside at Newton Lane East (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about parking at Laws House (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No account has been taken of impact (lack of light, noise and privacy) on neighbouring houses (1) 	
<p>3.2 Comments @ Q2 - do you have any different views about the way sites should be rated?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a visual impact at Mill Rise (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priory Farm should be rated as 'can be absorbed sympathetically' (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carlton Road should be rated the same as Mill Rise for landscape and heritage criteria (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mill Rise is unsuitable because of increased traffic (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newton Lane unsafe for pedestrians and should be rated poor for traffic safety (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Laws House because of impact on surroundings (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer demolish and rebuild at Laws House (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear where SPA needs to be extended, has that been overlooked? (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A428 sites are best because traffic is more important than character (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newton Lane allotment site should be included (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carlton Road site should be included (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More traffic on Carlton Road would make a bad situation worse (1) 	
<p>3.3 Comments made @ Q3 – do you have any other comments about the sites?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about traffic on Newton Lane (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to narrow pavements needed (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laws House and The Burrows only as they are the smallest (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sure infrastructure sufficient for any new houses (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more affordable home for young people (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laws House unrealistic for 16 net gain (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller sites would be better (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current recommendations insufficient, need more homes (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carlton Road should be included (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointed that care village going ahead instead of general housing (1) 	

