

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:

I believe the plan is far too prescriptive in trying to define the number, the phasing, the number of houses per phase and even the type of property. The numbers are so small and typical of infill that I believe it will be impractical for a developer. Each developer will want to fill each of your prescribed sites to the maximum in one go. An inspector is unlikely to refuse two lots of 20 or even one development of 40. This becomes more acute as soon as you start placing the additional affordable house requirement on top of this. In my time, I have not come across the sort of control you are trying to advocate in the plan other than within settlement boundaries. I do not think the community was given the right questions in order to allow them to choose say an Ampfield type development with its excellent mix of social, part rent, family and bungalow type accommodation only achievable with 39 houses. One every 10 or 15 years in Kings Somborne would have been perfect. In asking people what size development they would like to have they always default to the lowest number option when in reality a bigger number might achieve far more benefits. A further risk if you actually find a developer prepared to phase a development over a number of years is a mini version of the Brewery site in Romsey where the developer is building in dribs and drabs. The site permanently looks like a building site and is a disaster for the residents who have already moved in to completed properties.

I was not able to find what the current need is and whether you have a backlog to overcome in addition to your aim of maintaining the current ratio. There is also a weakness in the argument of maintaining the ratio because as the house price/earnings ratio increases the demand for affordable housing increases and the ratio will change. A developer will exploit any backlog as justification for additional houses.

As far as I know covenants cannot be enforced by planning

My understanding is that the TVBC assumption is that NDP numbers are in addition to any and all windfalls within the settlement boundary – otherwise there would in reality have been no point in pursuing the NDP process. It is fundamental to the dispersal concept. This has not been made absolutely clear in your plan. A classic example will be if the allotments are developed with 25 houses then your plan for 42 over 15 years will still be available not reduced.

The amount of work that has been put into this project is phenomenal and the whole team and in particular the Chairman needs to be congratulated for their hard work and perseverance.

I have found it incredibly difficult to find my way around the document without clickable links and is certainly in its full form unprintable for the average resident. Many times, I found myself reading a statement and desperate to see the evidence behind it and failed.