

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:

Generally, design guidance is to be welcomed but the restrictions which the Plan seeks to place on development is too detailed to be practical and is based on some doubtful assumptions. Housing mix, while in principle desirable, cannot be predetermined in detail but will have to be assessed on a site-by-site basis. The apparent exclusion of any house with more than four bedrooms is extraordinary. The prohibition on mirrored or repetitive designs runs contrary to the character of parts of the village and seems to be the predetermined design of the author of this section. Arbitrary ratios of public open space area to development area can lead to unused and un-cared-for space which is neither accessible to the village 'public' nor useful to nearby residents. These and many other attempts at fine-grain control should be edited and reduced to more open-ended, generic and practical constraints.

The principle that the village can and should only grow out of its existing population and growth does not address the fact that the village has been subject to incoming population for many decades and this is a pattern that continues to the present day. The village is well served with retail, community and education facilities and public transport and is entirely suitable for limited expansion as a contribution to the national housing shortage. Indeed, the identity of appropriate housing sites, is evidence of this suitability. Any attempt to halt this process by artificially limiting supply is a method of protecting the interests of those fortunate enough to have made such a move. The concomitant assumption that such a policy is supported by the lack of employment in the Parish ignores the undoubted fact that the village has long been unable to support the employment of its residents many of whom work outside the Parish and can do so sustainably using public transport. The basis for evaluating the proper expansion of the village should be re-examined in the light of these facts and in particular that it is the responsibility of all communities to assist with the national housing shortage.

The proposal that the sites be brought forward on a series of five-year phases is a facet of the above assumptions on population and takes predictions outside both planning policy thresholds and reasonable prediction of need. The numerical limitations on the identified sites does not allow for proper master planning and makes inexpert and very broad assumptions on their capacity and density. The process of prioritising sites in this putative programme is at best arbitrary and at worst subject to challenge if any of the six-person panel has any interest in or would be affected by any of the proposed development. Furthermore, key factors do not seem to have been taken into account, viz., capability of delivery, access restrictions and opportunities, landscape impact as evidenced in Policy E4. Where sites would be equal in status according to other criteria given in the Plan they appear for no given reason to have been assessed higher or lower in a scoring process. The restrictive programme is impractical and once sites have been identified, which they have through a satisfactory democratic and qualitative assessment, they should be offered for development according to availability and practicality. To do otherwise could compromise the key premise of housing delivery.