

Option 1: Allocate the site as a Local Green Space in its entirety

Pros

- *Would safeguard the entire site against any future development that is deemed unsuitable for Green Belt site, so long as the reason for designating it can be fully justified. In turn this would maintain the inter settlement gap in its entirety.*

Risks

- *The landowner may object, which could leave the decision to an Examiner.*
- *Aside from the public right of way across the site, the landowner may choose to deny public access to the site.*
- *No local housing need is met.*
- *As this is the only site that has come forward as potentially suitable for development, the Examiner may feel that not allocating any housing would not meet the Basic Conditions here is also the possibility that the Examiner would increase the developable area of the site, by more than the 25% currently offered by the owner.*

Option 2: Allocate the site in the Neighbourhood Plan as set out by the land owner's proposal – 25% development; 75% safeguarded green space

Pros

- *Would contribute to the identified housing need, thus meeting the Basic Conditions.*
- *Would enable CIL to be brought forward for the parish, to spend on local priorities.*

- *The Neighbourhood Plan would have a say in the design and mix of housing on the site, including appropriate buffering, noise mitigation, site layout and so forth.*
- *Remaining 75% of the site would be retained as a country park, possibly gifted to the community. It could be designated as a Local Green Space, thus protecting it from development.*

When the HDC Plan is updated, the pressure for housing might increase. By allocating this site now, and protecting the remainder, this would be done under current policy as opposed to future policy.

Risks

- *25% of the field will be lost to development.*
- *The Neighbourhood Plan does not pass referendum as the residents unhappy – although the wider risk is that the site will ultimately be developed in any case if left to HDC. If the Plan does not pass referendum, all policies are lost, not just this allocation.*
- *Reduces the biodiversity potential of the site.*

- *Impacts negatively the green strip preventing coalescence between Bramber and Steyning.*
- *Impacts negatively on the historic setting of nearby Bramber Castle.*
- *Potential negative impact on archaeology at the site.*
- *Additional traffic, noise, air and light pollution.*

Option 3: Allocate the site but for smaller proportion of housing

Pros

- *Delivers some housing need as identified, hence meeting the Basic Conditions.*
- *This would be done against the existing HDPF, which states that neighbourhood plans should contribute to 1,500 housing need – this number is expected to rise in the future.*
- *Safeguards the rest of the site.*
- *The neighbourhood plan has the opportunity to set out the constraints of the site.*
- *CIL contribution is enabled.*

Risks

- *Examiner may feel that the site is suitable for higher numbers/density and require greater numbers to be allocated.*
- *Other sites may come up in the future and there may be a need to allocate those too, particularly in light of the HDPF Review.*
- *Unclear what might happen to the remainder of the site.*

Option 4: Deliver the Neighbourhood Plan without site allocations and commit either to an early review or to look at sites with HDC as part of the review – dependent on HDC ‘offer’

Pros

- *The site is currently not currently developable according to the HDC SHELAA – including because it is not in the settlement boundary and provides an inter-settlement gap - so there is no imminent risk, therefore site retained as is for the time being.*
- *Waiting until we know HDC’s housing position could give greater clarity about housing numbers and expectations for Bramber.*
- *Additional sites in Bramber may arise between now and later, which could be better suited/locally accepted.*
- *Speeds up the Neighbourhood Plan process.*
- *Site may not be allocated, even by HDC.*
- *The NDP could explore ‘design codes’, which would set out expectations for any sites coming forward during the lifespan of the Plan – and which could assist in limiting negative impacts.*

Risks

- *There is an identified housing need and it is likely the developer will object to no site allocations – the Examiner could take this into account and, for instance, say we have not met the Basic Conditions and allocate the site anyway – a greater area might be allocated.*
- *No local housing need is met in the short term.*
- *HDC’s position may increase the housing number, which would mean Bramber would have less of a case to argue against numbers.*
- *HDC are re-examining sites, including this one, and the site could be allocated in the future by HDC. This could result in the land owner changing his position on the 75% of the site currently proposed being left as a green space/gifted to the community.*

Option 1: Allocate the site as a Local Green Space in its entirety

Option 2: Allocate the site in the Neighbourhood Plan as set out by the land owner's proposal – 25% development; 75% safeguarded green space

Option 3: Allocate the site but for smaller proportion of housing

Option 4: Deliver the Neighbourhood Plan without site allocations and commit either to an early review or to look at sites with HDC as part of the review – dependent on HDC 'offer'