

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:

Public Open Space (POS) within a development site for five plus dwellings will be too small to serve any worthwhile purpose or benefit - we suggest retaining this policy but increasing the number of dwellings to 10 plus dwellings which would ensure adequate size to provide recreational opportunities and where it could be designed to relate well to new dwellings would be overlooked (and therefore cared for) and would be accessible to future residents of the development.

I believe that the formulaic method for housing numbers is too narrow in its focus and fails to enable the Neighbourhood Plan to plan positively for sustainable development in this area to meet future needs. Policy H1 in its present form limits development to a maximum of 42 dwellings. Housing requirements should always be expressed as a minimum and there is no justification for restricting the development within Kings Somborne to a maximum of 42 dwellings within the 15 year plan period. At the very least i.e. If no further analysis of the needs of the whole community and not just the population forecast is undertaken the housing requirement for Kings Somborne should be expressed as a minimum of 42 dwellings to reflect the NDP's own evidence base.

This policy, as drafted, fails to demonstrate the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development which is a fundamental principle of plan making and decision making and applies just as much to the Neighbourhood Development Plan. I feel that the Design guidance is too prescriptive itself and that such restrictive covenants generally are too hard to enforce effectively. Each individual application should be determined on its own merits. Deliverability and saleability of any approved development is vital in order to achieve the stated objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The suggested phasing of sites, in my opinion, no way relates to the deliverability of each individual site. The National Planning Policy Framework states that: ... "to be deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable within a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable"... I believe that Sites KS5 and KS7 could/should ideally be developed together to ensure a comprehensive and well-designed development scheme as one - separate ownership of the two sites (as exists at the moment) should not direct preference, numbers of units or suitability for development or for that matter phasing. I feel that all these sites should be allocated for the 15 year term of the NOP without phasing and without preference. The last paragraph of H6 should accordingly be deleted. As referred to above I consider that Policy H6 should be drafted to identify the sites which are suitable for allocation, rather than indicating any order of preference. The number of units provided within any one site will be dictated by other policy requirements "to reinforce character by reflecting the scale, mass, design" etc of the village and therefore the precise number of homes on each allocation site will only emerge at the detailed planning stage and it is unduly restrictive to impose limitations on sites prior to master-planning being undertaken. Significant changes to Policy H6 will need to be made to enable the policy to satisfy "the basic conditions" of Neighbourhood planning and for the policy to be found as "sound".

I believe policy H10 fails to meet the basic conditions test and requirements of any Neighbourhood Plan and should therefore be deleted. This policy is a restrictive and unjustified policy and with its deletion would enable development to come forward on sites that are available now and suitable for development and when there is a reasonable prospect of the development being delivered. In that way, there will be a natural phasing to the delivery of development which might also be dictated by market conditions at the time. If Policy H10 is not deleted it makes a nonsense of Policy H6. There should be no phasing, no period of years and no "in order of preference".

The scoring of the proposed Site Allocations are stated to be ranked in "order of preference". This order appears to be solely based on the site assessments undertaken by a limited number of people on the NOP group which we find somewhat arbitrary. There are a number of inconsistencies in site assessments and scoring in "Existing Use", "Views In" and "How each site relates well or otherwise to its site surroundings".