

**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:***

This plan is to provide planning guidance for 15 years. If adopted it has been stated repeatedly in open forum that on any site selected there will only be 11-14 houses per site.

In the South Downs Landscape Report KS3 is described as follows: "Quote The site is most sensitive close to the watercourse due to its role as part of the The Functional Flood Plain, its contribution to the riparian character of the valley floor, and its location in Flood Zone 3."

The question is why has this not been fully addressed.

- Despite assurances to me during several meetings NO appropriate highways assessments have been performed and they are NOT available in the NDP proposal. Cllr Brock assured everyone that attended the meeting on Wednesday 10th January 2018 that the highways reports commissioned by the site owners regarding each site would be available within 4 weeks. These reports for every site are NOT available even now.

FLOODING and KS3 and its importance as quote Functional Flood Plain

This does NOT accord with the statements of Counsellor Brock, Mr Searle and other members of the NDP planning steering group that I, and many others, have heard many times in a public forum.

However, on close examination of the Neighbourhood Development Plan proposal relating to KS3 in particular which has been assessed as one of the top rated sites in the plan, there would be 11-14 houses. The final draft then discusses phase 2 in conjunction with KS6 with the balance being allocated to KS3. KS6 could only accommodate 5 houses with the balance allocated to KS3.

NDP ref 2.1 Maintaining character 'key requirement to protect and enhance our natural and historic environment which includes the conservation area, its listed buildings and the numerous rural views'

- The concept of a conservation area that was considered very significant in Planning Terms in 2001 by Test Valley Borough Council re views and the effect on the conservation area related to KS3 have been totally disregarded with inclusion of KS3 as a suitable site.

The following has been STATED many times by members of the NDP planning group at Public meetings:

So assume 14 houses and 9 houses = 23 houses on KS3.

1. Why has this been glossed over during the last few months.

NDP ref 3.1 Preserving landscape features, views and farmland. 'Spaces between build areas contribute significantly to its character. Objectives are therefore to ensure key views of the village and surrounding countryside from the surrounding high points are protected.'

1. No development will be considered in Flood Zones 2 and 3
- Proposed Level of development of KS3 during the life of the NDP plan could result in 23 houses being proposed by the owner for this site has been completely overlooked in all public forum meetings that I have attended with the mantra being repeated that each site chosen will only have 11-14 properties.
2. How is it suitable for any site that the NDP has identified to accept more than 11 to 14 houses

The village viewpoints are clearly shown on the Kings Somborne conservation area map designated 9<sup>th</sup> September 1987 as in NDP proposal

2. In KS3, under the NDP any development would be confined to flood zone 1

Site Selection:

Ten sites were looked at in the village. A number of sites were assessed in the South Downs Report and then the suitability for developing a site was ascribed a numerical score on the basis of this 600 page report.

KS3 was assessed as having "low visibility" in the report, and as such contributed to its suitability for development. This is totally inaccurate as KS3 and Willow Cottage are clearly in the landscape view from the Clarendon Way as attached photograph shows from the viewpoint shown on the Conservation map. As such this should be reassessed as having "high visibility" (other sites were considered unsuitable solely on the basis of having high visibility from Clarendon Way).

The ramification being that KS3 would have achieved a LOW CAPACITY for development

The report on KS3 also states that it has NOT been involved in any formal planning matters. This is completely incorrect. TVS.08933/1 TVBC Southern Area Planning meeting 20th February 2001 Para 7.2. TVS.08933/1 TVBC Planning Control Meeting 6th March 2001. Para 7.2

This application was in reference to two storey dwelling that was rejected and reduced to a single storey dwelling at plot 5 Old Iron Foundry that looks out over KS3

Paragraph 7.2 The previous application (withdrawn) showing a full two storey dwelling was considered inappropriate in the context of the village, particularly for its significant intrusion into and dominance of, the open views from the village, across the site to the rising ground of the countryside beyond. The present scheme for the proposed dwelling however is far more modest in its bulk and general presence on site and as viewed from within the village. It is considered therefore that its impact on the setting of the adjacent listed buildings is insignificant, and that its design preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area.

TVBC made these planning decisions directly about KS3 and its IMPORTANCE in the Conservation area and landscape of the village. As this was a Planning Control and also a Planning matter in 2001, these assessment criteria have NOT CHANGED so how can KS3 now be considered suitable for any development. The arguments advanced by TVBC still apply.

This also totally agrees with the following policy advanced by the NDP report ..... Policy E9- Conservation Area "Any developments must NOT change the character or nature of the conservation area."

Taking both these findings together it very strongly suggests that KS3 should not be a site that should have been considered for development.

At the NDP meeting on 23 May 2018 Cllr Brock agreed to discuss the viewpoint matter with the South Downs Authority, and also to confirm who and how many people they communicated with in the village when assessing "the sense of place". "A sense of place" is another criteria in the scoring system for all the sites that they inspected and prepared reports for and that are the basis of the scoring system for the proposed NDP. We are awaiting a response to this point that was raised in a public meeting.....

At the public meeting XXX on 30th May requested that Cllr Brock should have an independent expert appointed to consider all sites and especially KS3 as it is described as part of the functional flood plain. Also that this should be carried out BEFORE this plan is submitted to TVBC for the next phase. Due to the concern of the whole community regarding flooding this seemed a very important and sensible proposition. It was totally dismissed and Mr Searle and Cllr Brock continued to state their belief that SUDS was the complete solution. This completely contradicts the Environment Agency website statement.

3. As KS3 is clearly described as a functional flood plain this is ridiculous in planning terms

3. That the use of SUDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) would totally negate any issues that a development would increase the flood risk that already exists in Kings Somborne.

· In public meetings the response from NDP is that it will be dealt with by the developer .....

Concern for the Community:

4. Developing the top half of KS3 also in my opinion breaches Policy E5

These Assertions totally conflict with the following Environment Agency website

· How is this an Independent and a Responsible Approach to the most significant cause for concern to the people of Kings Somborne

· Site selection in South Downs Report not accurately determined and therefore the findings have acted as a bias in the site scoring system. It is an incredibly important issue and everyone in the Parish should be able to have complete confidence in the way the system was implemented

Overriding concerns from majority of residents, including myself:

Areas Where Development May Increase Flood Risk Elsewhere

· The plan prioritises visual impact from footpaths over increased risk of flood damage. Flooding is the most overriding concern of parishioners

Flooding after the problems in 2001 and 2014 and no site for development should increase the risk of 2001 and 2014 happening again

'The study of flood risk in this chapter leads to the following conclusion: careful investigation of local flood risk (with detailed investigation of flood incident records, management and maintenance issues) is required at most locations in the SFRA area BEFORE development is allocated. It is NOT sufficient to assume that siting development away from Flood Zones 2 and 3 and localised flooding areas and the use of sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) techniques will automatically render to flood risk adequately low irrespective of location See section 11.4'

· No independent flood risk is considered important in the development of the NDP plan and any assessment will only be commissioned at the planning stage by those who profit from that development.

No detrimental effect on landscape and environment

It is clear that even the Environment agency would always have severe concerns with building in or CLOSE to flood zone 2 and 3.