

Neighbourhood Plan - Housing Site Selection
Further Evaluation of Options



Neighbourhood Plan - Housing Site Selection Options

The South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) has said that, as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, Twyford must allocate land for 20 houses on one or more sites and this has been accepted as reasonable by the Parish Council. A detailed analysis has been done of all potential housing sites and they have been narrowed down to two preferred sites;

Site 26 in the village centre and Site S1 at Northfields.

It may be necessary to consider one other site yet to be identified.

We now want your views on the following four options for locating the 20 houses based on this preference:

All 20 houses on Site 26 (field next to Parish Hall/Surgery car park)

11 houses on site 26, and 11 on Site S1
(Field North of Hewlett Close at Northfields)

14 houses on Site 26 with the balance (6 houses) on Site S1

7 houses on each of Site 26 and Site S1 and 6 on one other site adjoining the settlement boundary but not yet defined.

Background to this consultation

Following consultation on the site selection process earlier this year, the stance of the Technical Committee was that site 26 was to be preferred to site S1 at Northfields. The main reasons are that the field next to the Parish Hall is central to the village and close to all its facilities. Moreover, over 50 houses have been built in the

north of the village in the last 12 years, most in Northfields, 28 of them for social housing, side by side in Hewlett Close and Waterhouse close.

There has been very little building in the south of the village, the last scheme being the Manor Green scheme about 20 years ago. No Social housing has been built anywhere else in the village for about 50 years, while much has been sold off.

The field adjacent to the Parish Hall and surgery has long been viewed for extending the car park; this now forms a key part of this plan.

Our landscape consultants considered the impact of housing on this land and judged that part but part only of the field was suitable for housing. We have not yet established whether the land that the consultants identified is large enough to accommodate the full 20 dwellings without harm to the landscape or impact on the character of the village.

Three further points were made in our consultation. Firstly the houses to be permitted should be small and at higher density. The motive here was that this would reduce the land take and also the impact of new building on the landscape. We have accepted this for the additional reason that smaller dwellings will be more affordable for local people and more suitable for the elderly and will replace the many smaller houses which recent owners have enlarged.

The second point, raised by several people, is that if the 20 houses are split in to several sites this will be more in the character of Twyford. This is debatable. Firstly 20 houses is not a large number in any context.



Neighbourhood Plan - Housing Site Selection Options (cont)

Past developments in Twyford have been e.g.

Hewlett Close	28 dwellings
Waterhouse Close	22
Manor Farm Green	10
Churchfields	26
Northfields	80 approx
School Road/ Hill Rise	39

The initial conclusion is that a group of 20 houses on a single site would not be uncharacteristic of the village.

Conversely, if the numbers of dwellings are reduced, the costs of development rise and make it less likely that a scheme of high quality on the selected site will be achievable. There are multiple public benefits which site 26 is capable of delivering but it is the housing which will generate the profits to achieve this. These benefits can include:

- Car park for up to 40 cars
- Retention of clump of trees on top of site, possibly as open Space.
- Eight social houses in the village centre.
- 12 small market houses in the village centre.
- Possible measures to help prevent further flooding of village car park.
- Comprehensive plan for whole site.
- Integration with village hall/surgery site.

Site S1

The land north of Hewlett close in Northfields has its advantages to. It appears to be fully serviced and very straightforward to

develop, with few impacts on neighbours and none on the wider landscape. Its disadvantage is its remoteness from the village school, hall, shop, surgery, pubs, playing fields and so on. It also lacks the ability to deliver the public the benefits of developing land in the centre of the village.

As for the identification of other smaller sites, we have not done this because the two identified sites are able to deliver 20 houses and are the ones most favoured in consultation. They have also been put forward by their owners for development so we can be confident that, if allocated, these sites would be developed.

One major problem with smaller sites i.e. those of 10 dwellings or less, is that they are not required to provide for on-site social housing, only cash. However in Twyford it is land for social housing which is most necessary as the Parish Council owns no land which it can develop.

As the provision of affordable housing is the top priority of the plan and is widely supported, the option of smaller sites has this fundamental disadvantage. Moreover we have no active interest from landowners in promoting their land for sites of 6-10 dwellings. This is an opportunity for them to do so.

The Technical Committee is in favour of concentrating effort on further investigation of Options A, B and C which would involve development of Site 26 to a greater or lesser extent with some housing being provided on Site S1 if necessary. This is favoured because of:-

The availability of S1 and 26 and their perceived suitability and capability of accommodating all twenty houses without need for further sites the particular advantages of the central location of Site 26 and a desire to seek its wider development for community



Neighbourhood Plan - Housing Site Selection Options (cont)

benefit the inability of Option D or other combinations of small developments of less than 11 houses to provide any on-site social housing.

We have created a table of advantages and disadvantages for each option on the following page.

Notes

1. Site 26 is also proposed for an extension of the parish hall car park for up to 40 extra cars.
2. The provision of affordable housing (social housing for rent) is a key objective of the Plan.
3. Land or money for affordable housing can be secured from the proceeds of development only in carefully defined ways. These are as follows:

On all sites of 11 dwellings. or over, we can insist on provision being made on site.

On sites of 6 to 10 we can require a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision.

On sites of 5 or less there is no requirement for either financial or on site provision.

40% is the limit of affordable housing provision; where there are fractions, it is rounded down i.e. 40% of 11 houses is 4.4 dwellings which is rounded down to 4.

Developers can reduce the affordable housing contribution if they can show that their schemes are unable to afford it.

4. All development would be subject to all the other policies of the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan, in particular HN1 which specifies the size and mix and number of bedrooms in new housing.
5. Past developments in Twyford have been in a range of sizes.

Question

Do you support the Technical Committee's proposal to concentrate effort on further investigation of Options A, B and C which would involve development of site 26 to a greater or lesser extent with some housing being provided on Site S1 if necessary?

If you favour further consideration of Option D which would involve spreading development over three sites, suitable for 6 to 10 dwellings, please give your reasons why.



Neighbourhood Plan - Housing Site Selection Options (cont)

Table of Advantages and Disadvantages

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p>A. All 20 Houses on Field next to Parish Hall (Site 26)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site is central to village and its facilities, is the most convenient for new residents and minimises need for car usage. 2. Delivers the full 40% (8) affordable houses on site 3. Will mean that north of village is not the location for nearly all social housing. 4. Provides opportunity to develop comprehensive plan for site and contribute positively to the appearance and functioning of the village including provision of additional car parking and improved integration with village hall and surgery. 5. Owner is promoting site for development. 6. Ownership of adjacent land gives opportunities for broader approach to landscaping. 7. Potential for mitigation of flooding to adjoining properties and car park. 8. Opportunity for providing Twyford Prep School with direct link to Hazeley Road. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Harm to landscape if too much of site is developed 2. Potential impact on character of the village centre 3. Uncertain if area which can be developed without harm to the landscape, is sufficient to accommodate the full 20 houses and proposed car park. 4. Extent to which landscape harm can be mitigated by design, layout and landscaping. 5. Possible increase in surface water run-off with risk of increased flooding and malfunctioning of foul sewer at times of high surface water.
<p>B. 11 Houses on Site 26 and 11 on Site S1 (Field north of Hewlett Close at Northfields)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Splits the development into two thereby reducing impact of new development. 2. Achieves full (8) on-site affordable houses, but with greater risk to viability. 3. Both owners are promoting their sites for Development. 4. Site S1 is a straight forward development site with infrastructure in place. 5. Pros for site 26 are as Option A but with less opportunity for comprehensive development. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. May not deliver comprehensive plan for development of Site 26 and integration with surgery and village hall 2. Greater difficulty in negotiating community benefits in use of sites 3. Site S1 is the furthest distance from most of Twyford sports and community amenities, disadvantaging, in particular, young families and the elderly 4. Northfields has had about 50 new houses in the past 12 years, many times that of other parts of the village 5. Further concentrates affordable housing at Northfields 6. Other disadvantages as Option A but to a lesser extent



Neighbourhood Plan - Housing Site Selection Options (cont)

Table of Advantages and Disadvantages

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
C. 14 or 15 houses on Site 26 and 6 houses on Site S1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assumes this is maximum number of house that site S26 can accommodate without harm to landscape or character of village. 2. Splits the development into two different locations. 3. Higher potential for realising comprehensive plan and community benefit than option B. 4. Achieves 5 or 6 on-site social houses on site 26 and financial contribution for social housing from development of Site S1. 5. In other respects, benefits are similar to option B. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No land for affordable housing can be required from development on Site S1. 2. Total number of affordable on-site houses that can be delivered is 5 or 6 compared to 8 with options A and B. 3. Disadvantages of development at Site S1 are similar to Option B but to a reduced extent. 4. Disadvantages of development of Site 26 are similar to Option A but to a lesser extent.
D. 7 houses on each of Site 26 and S1 and 6 houses on one other site adjoining the settlement boundary but not yet defined.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development is spread onto 3 sites each of a small scale thus potentially reducing impact of development on character of village. 2. Each site would provide cash contributions for affordable housing but no on-site provision. 3. In other respects, pros are similar to Option C. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provides no land for affordable housing. 2. Uses only small parts of Site 26 and S1 and this reduces scope for comprehensive planning and design of these sites, particularly 26, and thus securing the community benefits from their development. 4. A third site (in addition to S1 and 26) which is both available and suitable for development has not yet been identified. 5. In other respects similar disadvantages to Option C.

The Technical Committee is in favour of concentrating effort on further investigation of Options A, B and C which would involve development of Site 26 to a greater or lesser extent with some housing being provided on Site S1 if necessary.

This is favoured because of:-

- **The availability of S1 and 26 and their perceived suitability and capability of accommodating all twenty houses without need for further sites.**
- **The particular advantages of the central location of Site 26 and a desire to seek its wider development for community benefit .**
- **The inability of Option D or other combinations of small developments of less than 11 houses to provide any on-site social housing.**
- **The reduced viability of Option D or other combinations of small sites to provide the community benefits likely with larger site developments.**

