

Mottisfont and Dunbridge Station Goods Yard
Report on the Public Consultation December 2023

January 2024

Summary

There is significant support for the redevelopment of the site for housing.

There is strong support for the proposed mix of housing i.e.; half two-bed and half three-bed houses.

There is a preference for a lower number of homes on the site but no clear view on what that number should be.

The preference for a lower number is informed by concerns over insufficient provision of parking, the density of the development, lack of landscaping, impact on the sewage system and increase in traffic in Dunbridge.

There is strong support for the houses to front onto Barley Hill, Dunbridge Lane.

There is strong support for the proposed approach to parking provision. A number of concerns have been raised regarding the amount of parking, vehicle access direct onto the road for some of the houses, that insufficient parking was being provided, that there would be more on-street parking and off-street parking in Dunbridge.

There was strong support for the design approach and the proposed materials.

A number of responses raised the issue of traffic speeds and additional traffic through Dunbridge. The lack of capacity in the sewage system was of concern to a number of residents

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to present the comments received in response to the public consultation on the proposed re-development of the former Station Goods Yard at Mottisfont and Dunbridge Station, Dunbridge.

Background

An exhibition was held on the 4th December 2023 in the function room of the Mill Arms PH between 2.30-6.30pm and the plans were placed on Orchard Homes' web site after the event. The event was attended by more than 40 members of the public. Two representatives of Orchard Homes were available to respond to questions. The chair of the parish council also attended for the duration of the event to listen to the views of local residents.

A questionnaire was available at the event for attendees to complete. 29 responses were received by the end of December 2023 either handed in during the event or received via e-mail. There were 44 visits to the web site.

The parish council provided comments on the drafting of the questions.

Seven questions were set out on the sheet with scope to provide additional comments.

The public were asked to indicate if they lived in the parish and, as an option, to leave a name and address. In total 34 people, individually or jointly submitted comments of whom 31 stated that they were residents of the parish.

This report provides a summary of the comments received and no personal details are included other than to state how many of those responding lived in the parish.

The Results

The results of the questionnaire are set out below for each of the questions asked. Where more than one person was named on the questionnaire the comments have been counted twice. Some questions were not answered which means that the number of individual comments relating to each question will not match the total number of those who completed and submitted comments.

Q1 Having looked at the proposals do you support the redevelopment of the site for housing?

29 supported the principle of development for housing, 3 did not support the principle, one did not answer the question

Q2 The scheme is for a mix of 6 two-bed and 6 three-bed homes. Do you think that the proposed mix of homes will help meet the needs of the community?

8 responses were OK with the proposed number and mix. 9 responses said yes to the proposed mix i.e.; half two-bed and half three-bed houses, but would want to see fewer houses overall. One response suggested more smaller homes, one suggested more three-bed dwellings and one said three-bed homes would generate more cars.

Q3 What do you think about the number of homes proposed?

Of those who supported the principle of housing 19 said that 12 was too many and 12 said the number was about right.

Of those who did not support the principle of housing all three said that 12 was too many.

The respondent who did not answer Q1 said 12 was too many.

Of those who said 12 homes was too many: one response preferred 11 homes, five responses preferred 10 homes, two responses preferred 8 homes and one response preferred 6 homes.

Q4 The majority of existing houses on Dunbridge Lane face the road. We think that the new development should follow that pattern. Do you support that approach?

30 responses said yes to the houses fronting Barley Hill, Dunbridge lane. Of these yes responses: one commented that the houses shown on the layout were too close to the road. 2

responses said no, one suggested not having gardens facing the railway line would be a better layout and one did not like direct vehicle access onto the road.

Q5 To avoid on-street parking, the proposed scheme provides for some houses to have parking at the rear and some at the side. Do you support that approach?

24 responses supported the proposed approach. In responding: two said more parking was needed, one raised concern about reversing onto the road and two were concerned that there would be more on-road parking.

5 responses said they did not support the proposed approach. One wanted more parking side by side, one said there was not enough parking, one said there would be reversing onto the road and one said there would be more on-road parking.

Q6 The design of the homes and the proposed materials have been chosen to reflect the character of Dunbridge. Do you agree?

27 responses said yes with two raising the issue of vibration from the railway

5 responses said no. Three said there was a lack of information to answer the question and one said they were the cheapest houses possible.

Q7 In preparing the current proposals we have taken into account:

1. the character of Dunbridge
2. provision for a mix of homes
3. the need to provide safe vehicular access
4. the need to minimise the risk of flooding
5. providing on-site parking
6. maintaining views of the Dun valley across the site
7. and to minimise noise disturbance from the railway.

Are there any other issues you think we should consider?

The following comments were made:

- Lack of capacity in the sewage system
- The buildings need to reflect up-to-date eco credentials
- There should be more landscaping
- Visitors will park on Barley Hill and Mill Rise

Do you have any further comments?

The following comments were made.

- The scheme constitutes over-development and would diminish the village feel of Dunbridge
- There would be an increase in traffic in the village
- Speed of traffic through the village
- The village needs more houses to rejuvenate the community with hopefully younger people
- Welcome prospect of new families permanently in the parish as opposed to transitory population, which is a consequence of National Trust rentals.
- Hope that the development will provide affordable well-built housing
- Use Michelmersh bricks
- Fewer houses would provide scope for more parking from the rear or side
- Homes could be owned for short periods only
- Prefer more attractive homes in the centre of the community
- Has railway been approached regarding parking which causes a problem
- Retain concept of boundary demarcation between houses by hedging
- Marketability be improved by providing ensuite and family bathroom,
- Electric charging points for vehicles
- Back gardens a good selling point
- Impact of noise measures on the character of the village
- Community should consider purchase of the site
- Plot 12 windows have a clear view of adjoining garden
- Access to plot 12 crosses a drainage ditch and is adjacent to the current lay-by
- Not enough landscaping

Do you live in the parish of Mottisfont?

31 of those responding said they lived in the parish, 2 did not state where they lived.

Summary of Key Points Arising regarding each Question

Q1 Having looked at the proposals do you support the redevelopment of the site for housing?

There is strong support for the redevelopment of the site for housing.

Q2 The scheme is for a mix of 6 two-bed and 6 three-bed homes. Do you think that the proposed mix of homes will help meet the needs of the community?

There is clear support for the proposed mix of 50% two-bed and 50% three-bed houses

Q3 What do you think about the number of homes proposed?

On the issue of the number of homes proposed there was a clear preference, 23 out of 35 responses, for a lower number, but no clear view on what that number should be.

The preference for a lower number is informed by concerns over insufficient provision of parking, the density of the development, lack of landscaping, impact on the sewage system and increase in traffic in Dunbridge.

Q4 The majority of existing houses on Dunbridge Lane face the road. We think that the new development should follow that pattern. Do you support that approach?

There is strong support for the houses facing Barley Hill, Dunbridge Lane

Q5 To avoid on-street parking, the proposed scheme provides for some houses to have parking at the rear and some at the side. Do you support that approach?

There is strong support for the proposed approach to parking provision. A number of concerns have been raised regarding the amount of parking, the vehicle access direct onto the road for some of the houses, that insufficient parking was being provided, that there would be more on-street parking and in off-street parking in Dunbridge.

Q6 The design of the homes and the proposed materials have been chosen to reflect the character of Dunbridge. Do you agree?

There was strong support for the design approach and proposed materials.

Q7 In preparing the current proposals we have taken into account:

A number of responses raised the issue of traffic speeds and numbers through Dunbridge and the lack of capacity in the sewage system