

Open Event 14th January 2016 - Feedback

149 people attended

Goodwood Letter and Plan

1. Area B is a soft target for Goodwood as we are the only private landowners directly affected by development here. However, our business would be hit by tens of thousands of pounds in lost revenue as our ranking on Trip Advisor would plummet and we would lose 20% of the value of bookings in commission when we were forced to use online booking agents instead. The value of our business would also fall significantly. Whether I am on the committee or not, we are pledged to encourage and protect small businesses in the NP, and that includes The Old Store!

In addition, there is currently a beautiful aspect across the fields to the flint wall and beyond from the A285, and also from Redvins Road looking towards Boxgrove Priory. This area has a distinctive rural flavour which would be lost if it were developed.

2. I find the A285 /The Street crossroads inconvenient but not dangerous. Bear in mind that improving the junction will increase the traffic using The Street as a rat-run. Is this desirable?

3. Strategic gap between settlements must be maintained to prevent coalescence.

4. Houses on these plots would be lovely homes but the rural nature of the village entrance would be totally ruined. Boxgrove and Halnaker would be unrecognisable.

5. Way beyond plot 2 is unacceptable.

6. Strongly object to development on the south-western portion of A behind St Mary's Road and North of St Blaise

7. Excellent idea. Needs a new road. Halnaker crossroads very dangerous. Plan A.

8. Strongly object.

9. Build here only. Plot A

10. Very generous and excellent idea

11. Thank you Goodwood Estate very generous.

12. Strongly object to Goodwood's idea.

Employment and Enterprise

1. Windmill is a local landmark and good for a walk. Recognise that parking is an issue.

2. Fully agree with all the policies proposed. Regarding tourism, we need more of it but parking is a problem.

3. Tinwood Wine is a good visitor attraction.

4. Yes to EE1,EE3, EE4, EE5, EE6, EE7, EE 2.1 is unrealistic

5. No point in developing tourism without provision of adequate parking. And speed improvement should be a top priority in the area.
6. Yes I agree to all policies stop
7. Health and exercise studios may detract and take business away from the Village Hall. Craft workshops would attract people coming to Boxgrove Priory.
8. Yes to all the policies.
9. Links to Goodwood estate and tourism opportunities is very important stop
10. I agree with the policies that there are too many of them need to simplify stop
11. Yes to policies e.g. for, EE4, EE 4.1 and EE7.
12. Yes to policies EE 1.1, EE 2.1, EE 3.1, EE5.1, EE 7.1.
13. Yes 2 policies EEE 2.1, E.g. 3.1, EE E 4.1, EE 6.1.
14. Boxgrove Park Priory should encourage tourists to visit the church so benefiting the whole village.
15. Use what we've already have I.E. Rural buildings developments the various business. But would want to better broadband service.
16. Tourism-Only the Priory is worth a visit. Don't encourage tourism as there is no parking in the vicinity.
17. I fully agree with the proposals to encourage employment in the area and promote business.
18. I support policies EE 5.1 and EE 6.0 but object to policies EE 6.1 and EE seven. I question the need for policy EE 7.1 and support policies EE 8 and EE 8.1.
19. I support policies EE1, 2, 3, 3.1, 4, 4.1 and 5
20. I support policies EE1, 1.1, 2, 2.1,4, 4.1, 5.1, 7 and 7.1

Environment and Heritage

1. Please keep Boxgrove Village with green open spaces.
2. Supportive
3. More street lighting needed
4. Keep green areas and agricultural land. This is a village not a suburb of Chichester.
5. Hedges cut down in front of the Village Hall would enhance the street scene to show cricket etc in the summer (this comment was supported by another resident).
6. Strongly agree with EH7. No more unnecessary street lighting.
7. Yes to EH 2.1
8. EH 7.1 I concur

9. EH3 , 4, 5, 6.1, 6.2, EH7 and 7.1 - I agree with

General comments

1. Noise pollution. What can be done to control Aircraft and helicopter noise - Permitted days?
2. Noise pollution is mainly from traffic noise. From me aerial noise pollution is minor.
3. A 27 - is bunding possible?
4. New development should not encroach into strategic gap - planning policy regarding coalescence
5. Modern playground facilities and teenage activities such as sports teams and film clubs
6. All three stated issues - dog fouling - Inferior playground facilities - lack of activity for teenagers

Comments on Green Spaces

1. 6 x yes to all [A1,2,3,4,5, B1,2,3,
2. The village should keep open all spaces
3. Schedule B. Area on site of old power distribution in Priors Acre needs improving.
4. More linked footpaths on west side of village map
5. What about some more links to give a variety of links in the parish?
6. The cars parked outside the shop are the most effective traffic calming measure. Without them no-one could come out of Crouch Cross Lane safely during the daylight hours.
7. The cars parked outside the shop act as a traffic calming measure. Why do vehicles need to speed through the village. Totally disagree with this.
8. The green space and footpaths around the vineyards are delightful and I hope will be preserved for many years to come.
9. Boxgrove Common returned to woodland for public use. That would be great! The flower field is very important. Footpaths provide 'off road' access to Halnaker, important as no pavement on A285.
10. Point 5. Strongly agree with proposal that Boxgrove Common be restored to public use once the quarry is restored.
11. The flower field provides much needed peace and quiet, - very important. Like the idea for Boxgrove Common.
12. Footpaths on Boxgrove Common and the flower field should be for public use.
13. It will be fantastic to have the Boxgrove Common land back for public use. I had no idea that it amounted to such a large space. can we keep housing development off it if it's a green space?

Comments on Leisure and Community

1. More teenage and senior citizen activities in the village hall. Talks, cookery demos etc.
2. Hurray!
3. LC4 - agree very important to acknowledge attractions to visitors. What a ridiculous suggestion to move the shop to the village hall. Better that we had a Tourist Info there.
4. 55 bus very important to connect Boxgrove, Strettington etc. to the outside world, - Chichester, St. Richard's Hospital etc.
5. GP's already use room in village hall [*not any more but check with Pat*] there is a surgery in Tangmere and physio at Tangmere and Goodwood.
6. LC2.1 Village surgery would be an asset.
7. LC6.1 and LC6.2 a must [x8]
8. Healthcare facilities. The village can't provide the level of support required for people with serious / long term medical conditions. OK for everyday stuff though.
9. Good that the pub is to be included in the Register of Assets. It would be devastating to lose it but the place is ripe for developing a bit.
10. Why do so many people in this village not use the shop and or café?
11. I like the idea of the village shop near the village hall and to overcome the bottleneck from parked cars. A community shop like Slindon, Kirdford most welcome too.
12. Village shop. Be careful. The shop relies quite a lot I think on passing trade, especially early morning.
13. Present shop excellent. No need for new one. Village Hall site is not suitable.
14. The village shop must definitely stay as it is invaluable to many of us and is the hub of the community. I do wonder about more of a farm shop / gift shop / café at the village hall after the closure of the Goodwood Farm Shop. But it would need to be different to the existing shop which serves an important and special need to the community.
15. Please stress to everyone that the shop is definitely NOT closing or moving to the village hall in the foreseeable future.
16. Three cheers for the village shop. Long may it remain.

Getting Around

Permitted Paths

1. 'We have a lot of footpaths already'
2. 'Really support this idea. No parking required as most use by local residents!'
3. 'More permissive paths would be a great achievement and the link from the Windmill west would be excellent'

4. 'Agree with cycle paths'
5. 'Supportive'
6. 'Thoroughly enjoy walking on the footpaths in the area'
7. 'Great idea for new footpaths. Would be good if these could be a loop footpath
8. from Boxgrove to the Windmill and back'
9. 'The permitted paths are a great idea. What about cycleways and better foot/cycle paths along the Lavant Straight'
10. 'More paths could be really good'
11. 'Yes to all the permissive paths'
12. 'More foot and cycle paths would be great. We have lots but they need to be improved and a greater network provided'
13. 'Provided car parking space is allowed for – then by all means increase permitted paths'
14. 'Love the idea of permitted paths and some of these routes mean that we can take lovely walks from the house rather than get in the car'
15. 'We need many more cycle routes for access to Chichester'
16. 'Footpaths are not wide enough'

Traffic

17. 'Goodwood direct their traffic through the village'
18. 'Need to discourage use of Boxgrove as a "Rat Run" and introduce speed control on The Street'
19. 'More listed paths on west of village. No more naff walls. Slower traffic'
20. 'GA4.2 Volume of traffic – add A27 to south of village'
21. 'Boxgrove is still the main connection between the A285 and A27/ Tangmere and the south. The bridge crossing/access is not utilised sufficiently. Cut through Boxgrove is the preferred route. Need to slow/ reduce volume of traffic. This does not contribute to the village or as some say use the shop. Ask the owners, most custom is local'

Housing

1. Strongly object to any more than 25 houses in one development.
2. Preferred the idea of infilling or converting to building new, large housing estate. Agree with the new road avoiding crossroads but object to so many homes on that site.
3. Strongly object to development at plot2 as it will destroy the footpath, and the character of this corner.
4. Site 1

10 green dots, 7 yellow dots.

5. Site 2

108 green dots, 7 yellow dots

6. Site 4

1 green dot, 2 yellow dots

7. Site 5

7 yellow dots

Comments on the Small Sites

In total, 77 comments were received about the Small Sites being proposed for development.

GENERAL COMMENTS ON ALL SITES CONSIDERED TOGETHER:

15 specific favourable comments were received concerning all 5 sites considered together.

All 15 local residents supported the proposed developments and are listed below:

1. "All fine."
2. "All good."
3. "Why not?"
4. "All very suitable."
5. "All sound sensible. Why not?"
6. "They all sound very reasonable - no objections."
7. "Support all the small sites."
8. "Prefer the idea of smaller developments over large estates. Individual developments have character whereas estates do not."
9. "A wide variety of building types will keep the diversity of the village and may also provide employment in some cases."
10. "All sensible fill-ins using non-agricultural land."
11. "All these are a good idea. I approve the idea of smaller clusters of a few residences than larger vacuous estates."
12. "Like smaller developments."
13. "Stated in report that development should be spread in Boxgrove."
14. "Do not want developer / builder schemes on one site which may be crudely designed."
15. "Should be this way for village."

SITE 6 - LAND AT PRIORS ACRE, BOXGROVE 2-3 market housing dwellings:

Five comments were received about Site 6. These are listed below:

1. "Struggle to get one house on this plot unless there is no garden provided? Parking would be limited with more than one house."
2. "Site too small."
3. "Not more here!"
4. "Would be surprised if 3 dwellings, parking and outside space would fit! Also, would it be in keeping with the area?"
5. "Who owns this site?"

SITE 7 - THE OLD GRANARY, BOXGROVE

A high-quality, sensitively designed Farmstead Courtyard of 3-6 single storey residences with

gardens and screened car-parking:

In total, 25 comments were received about Site 7.

Of this, 24 comments were clearly in support of the scheme and are listed below:

1. "A good use of site on edge of village. Low level. Only four."
2. "I like the idea of the farm courtyard."
3. "This could be an attractive rural development."
4. "Good idea."
5. "Boxgrove could benefit from small housing sites like this. Better than too many houses on one site".
6. "Ideal for local elderly."
7. "Good – like."
8. "Like the idea. Helps to secure the entrance to the village."
9. "Should be more of these."
10. "Good use of land."
11. "Quite a good spot."
12. "A barn style house scheme would be welcoming."
13. "Single storey needed – agree."
14. "Much needed as single storey for elderly."
15. "Need more sites such as this. No large schemes."
16. "Convert the barns as well."
17. "Can not see any reason for not allowing this if it is developed in a style sensitive to the area."
18. "Could be attractive."
19. "So much nicer than a modern house!"
20. "Please no more large estates this is good."
21. " Could be good, prefer to big scheme, like principle".
22. "Ideal".
23. "Can I move there?"
24. "Good location as one edge of Settlement Area Boundary".

One comment was not in support of the scheme:

25. "No - we need to maintain green sites."

SITE 8 - THE OLD COAL YARD, HALNAKER

One dwelling house for the owner and five tourist units"

Overall, 18 comments were received about this site.

All 18 comments were in support of the development. Specific comments received are listed below:

1. "Good use of space and added tourism."
2. "Better a house than a scrap yard."

3. "Good idea."
4. "Just let the man develop the coal yard - please!"
5. "Much better to have a house than a coal yard."
6. "Interesting spot."
7. "Would have minimal impact and tucked away."
8. "If owns, why not a house - untidy now."
9. "Great to see brownfield sites for development."
10. "Holiday lets better for village than coal yard."
11. "I thought it was in at CDC planning? Liked it."
12. "Good scheme, why was it withdrawn?"
13. "Could be worthwhile!"
14. "Like this idea."
15. "Tourism good for pub and shop."
16. " Only one house?"
17. "Should have been done already."
18. " Marvellous – better than large scheme."

SITE 9 - TINWOOD LANE, HALNAKER
One dwelling house for the owner:

A total of 8 comments were received about this site.

Of these, 4 were not in favour of the development, specifically:

1. "No."
2. "Why?"
3. "I do not like this idea."
4. "I do not think this is required in the countryside."

The 4 other comments were more favourable and are listed below:

5. "Makes sense."
6. "A good site. Not on farmland, which is ideal."
7. "Hidden."
8. "Out of the way. Large site."

SITE 10 - BRAMBLES, CROCKERHILL

One family dwelling for the owner:

A total of 6 comments were received about this site.

Of these, 5 were in support of the scheme and specific comments are listed below

1. "Fine."
2. "Ok."

3. "No problem."
4. "Seems fine for one house."
5. "No, I'm not worried. They are neighbours."

One resident said "No" to the scheme but gave no reason why.