

**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](mailto:clerk@kingsomborne-pc.gov.uk).*

***FEEDBACK STARTS BELOW:***

I moved to XX, so we were not involved in the early stages of the NDP. Whilst I fully support the objectives of the NDP, I would have opted for a single site development rather than over development of what are essentially a number of small compromised sites. However, I understand and respect the direction given to the project team at the outset.

My comments relate to the Site Assessment for SHELLA 81. Policy F6 states 'That any development contributes to the sustainability and provides good pedestrian access to the village school and Pre-School'. There are several constraints to SHELLA 81 in this respect, notably that there is no pavement along Winchester Road adjoining the plot (the pavement commences further along into the village opposite Red Hill Cottages). Because the speed limit changes from 40mph to 30mph along the boundary of the plot, traffic tends to be fast at this point, particularly vehicles departing the village. Further there is no street lighting, which makes negotiating the road after dark quite intimidating. There is limited scope to put in a pavement due to the Bourne and diverting pedestrians up New Lane and then onto the footpath across the field into the village is unrealistic. It is therefore likely that development of the site would lead to an increase in car usage and is thus inconsistent with Policy F4. I believe the site assessments should have taken more cognisance of the safety of pedestrians, particularly children going to and from the school.

My comments relate to the Site Assessment for SHELLA 81. With respect to the Site Information it should be noted that there is a very mature Ash tree on the site near the gate entrance, which has a hollow trunk that may be a habitat for bats and other wildlife. The tree has its own character and should possibly be retained?

My comments relate to the Site Assessment for SHELLA 81. As was mentioned at the Consultation Meeting with respect to other sites, there would presumably be an increased surface water run-off from the development to Winchester Road and hence into the Bourne that needs to be addressed?

ref site 81: The report makes much of landscape 'views into the village' from the surrounding countryside but should also I suggest be concerned about maintaining the 'views out' for existing residents. Whilst accepting that in planning terms no one has a 'right to a view', I am concerned that developments proposed would seriously prejudice the outward views from some properties. At the consultation meeting a map was presented showing the possible development footprint for the sites. This showed development directly behind some property.

Ref site 81. I'm rather confused about the number of houses you are proposing for the site. The Site Assessment references building 7 dwellings in the original SHELLA but states that 11-12 houses can be built, making reference to SHELLA 19 and SHLAA 20? However, I would suggest the site is unsuitable for development of the suggested 11-12 houses and that any development should be restricted to the area North East of the existing Pump House, building fewer houses (3 or 4?) along the road boundary. This would be consistent with the existing ribbon development along Winchester Road and would allow the view entering the village to be maintained at the northern end of the village. Would it be possible to combine SHELLA 81 with KS7 as I understand they have the same owner? KS7 is planned to accommodate 11 to 13 houses. Could the addition of a smaller number of houses on SHELLA 80 (3 or 4) be added to bring a combined total of 14 to 17 units?