

Responder no.:**REDACTED COMMENTS*****Disclaimer:***

There are more than 65 feedback responders, with some sending in multiple documents and responses. Many reaching more than 3 pages and including a lot of technical information.

This document has been constructed by a volunteer and consists of (as far as possible) data which has been redacted to protect the privacy of those submitting feedback.

Some editorial amendments or deletions have been made and in some case this includes whole sections of submitted documents including sections of prefaces, context and/or background information, (particularly provided by consultants) has been removed. This has been done purely in an attempt to make the document more readable, but no actual feedback on the NDP has been removed.

Please note that spellings and/or typos and irregular spacings are likely to be a result of the compiling (copy and paste or typing).

If you would like to check your own feedback or have any queries with regards to this document, please email clerk@kingsomborne-pc.gov.uk.

FEEDBACK STARTS BELOW:

XX, I am anxious to assist in the future of the village. However, while I do in general support the concept of the plan, I seriously question a number of conclusions reached within it.

It is my belief that the Design Guidance is too specific and predetermined, and should have more latitude, particularly regarding the mix and numbers of dwellings.

I believe that to make projections of the future population of the village based solely on the growth of the existing population is erroneous, and is not the way the village has grown in the recent past. That belief seems to be just a form of protecting the present population from in-comers...the Not In My Back Yard syndrome. To justify this limitation by a suggesting lack of employment within the Parish contradicts the current situation where many people work outside the Parish. The village has good facilities, and should also contribute to the British housing crisis.

The five-year phasing proposal seems to be have been assessed in a rather questionable process by six unidentified individuals, and is not based on any objective criteria. It does not seem to have taken into account whether sites can in fact be delivered for development, and there is no analysis in terms of numbers, highways etc. With reference to the questionable way housing need has been arrived at, considering the doubtful way the site phasing has been considered, and taking into account the lack of a proper analysis of the deliverability of sites, all the identified sites should be available for immediate development.