

## Salehurst & Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Site Presentations to the NDP Steering Group

Independent moderator: Donna Moles (Moles Consultancy)

@ The Youth Centre, George Hill, Robertsbridge

June 2015



### Worksheet

**Developer/Owner:** Chichester Diocesan Fund and Board of Finance

**Land/site name:** Site of the Church Hall and St Mary's Vicarage, Fair Lane, Robertsbridge

Possible issues	Key indicators	Notes
Are you landowner and/or developer?	Ownership	Landowner
Are there multiple ownerships?	Boundary	Site is owned by the Chichester Diocesan Fund and Board of Finance (Incorporated) of Diocesan Church House, 211 New Church Road, Hove, East Sussex, BN3 EDF.
Is the site identified in the SHLAA?	Evidence/location	The site has not been included in the SHLAA, however it is within the settlement boundary.
Is the entire site being developed as part of one proposal?	Site capacity	The entire site identified in this exercise is capable of being developed. The site could hold a greater number of new units if church hall and St Mary's vicarage were demolished.
How many units are being proposed?	Scale of development	No site layout plan has been prepared at this stage, and formal discussions have not been entered into with the Parish Council at this stage. The number of units has therefore not been clearly established.

What will the housing mix entail?	Conformity with Rother CS	The scheme is still in the very early stages, therefore details of the housing mix are yet to be established.
What are the infrastructure requirements for the development?	Infrastructure	The site is small scale and as such there would be limited impact on local infrastructure, however S106 contributions would be discussed at a later stage. The central location allows for good access to amenities and public transport, meaning future residents would not be heavily dependent on a private car. All parking could be provided on site, and as such there would be no increased pressure on local parking.
What are the physical constraints? (e.g. access, contamination, steep slopes, flooding, natural features of significance, location of infrastructure / utilities, heritage/conservation)	Site constraints	The access is currently on a sharp bend meaning visibility would need to be improved prior to the scheme coming forward. The Parish Council has been provided with a copy of a transport statement which was prepared previously. It would be necessary to realign the access in order to meet standards in terms of visibility.  The site is not within the Flood Zone.  The topography is favourable for development.
Are there any potential environmental constraints (heritage/conservation)?	Environmental constraints	The site is in the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Robertsbridge Conservation Area.
What are the energy saving measures being proposed?	Sustainability	All proposed houses would be built in line with CSH 3. There is a possibility this could be increased to CSH 4 subject to viability.
How is surface water run off addressed and mitigated?	Sustainability	A mitigation strategy would be prepared alongside any application to reflect potential impact on nearby flood zone areas.

How is parking addressed and not impact on the rest of the village?	Impact	All parking for additional dwellings would be onsite with some shared visitor parking to ensure there was no harmful impact on local traffic and parking facilities.
What employment uses if any will this development provide?	Economic development	n/a
What community facilities will this development provide?	Vision and objective/ Suitability	<p>The site is small scale and as such there would be limited impact on local facilities however S106 contributions would be discussed at a later stage. Given the site is owned by the church, their aims are slightly different from a normal landowner and as such they would be keen to provide a replacement vicarage, either onsite or in a different location and replace the hall with some form of community center subject to viability.</p> <p>Given no discussions have been entered into with developers at this stage, they would not want to commit to the provision of any specific facilities yet, however it would be their preferred option if achievable to use the sale of the site to provide some form of community facility.</p>
Phasing of the sites will be desirable for periods 2018/24/27. Would timescales for this development be aligned to this phasing?	Deliverability/viability	The site could be bought forward within the first time phase.
<b>Misc</b>		The site is in the early stages of promotion, however its location within the settlement boundary would allow for a sustainable redevelopment of an underused site, with fantastic access to local services and limited impact on the surrounding area.