

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.

FEEDBACK STARTS BELOW:

I appreciate that a huge amount of work that has been done so far on the NDP and I completely support the principle of having a plan, and the approach taken of having smaller developments with a design guide that follows the character of the village. There are so many details in the Plan that are great and a good start has been made. However I think that it is difficult for a parish to draw up a Plan and some errors or omissions have been made during the process but these are all addressable.

Some of the sites that have been excluded may be viable when the flooding and conservation assessments are done and each site is assessed on balance against each other. Some sites were excluded too early in the process because of a weighting towards certain factors which needs to be readdressed:

There are 13 assessment forms of sites which could be suitable for development. Those chosen have been accepted as 'not perfect' but there has not been an equal approach to which issues matter enough to eliminate a site and which don't, and some have been given un-due weight: Sites that have been excluded were eliminated principally because of the following factors 1. the impact on views from the hills around 2. the pre-war settlement pattern 3. the steering group's decision to discount all of the Eldon Road for over development reasons. Sites that have been chosen include many of the following issues, which those excluded don't all have: 4. next to flood zone 3, or creating access via flood zone 3 5. conservation areas or adjoining conservation areas 6. the setting of listed buildings 7. highways access 8. pedestrian access 9. (the balance of development in the village, not thought to be assessed)

This is important because:

2. There are not enough allocated sites in the Plan:

There are not enough allocated sites in the Plan (edited due to correction)

a. There are actually only four developments available within the five sites allocated, as SHELAA capacity for 81 and KS7 are both less than 11

b. Points 4-6 of my feedback illustrate why KS7 should be removed as an allocated site creating more need for other sites to be included

The new addition of SHELAA 54 can be included to help this: it faces the settlement boundary, has capacity for 11-14 houses, has a developer that is interested (indicating viability), it follows the settlement pattern and is less likely than all the chosen sites to have issues with flooding, conservation, landscape views or highway access. The only instantly visible issue with this site is that it only narrowly adjoins the settlement boundary, but as mentioned above all sites have issues and so this should not prevent it from being considered.

KS4,5 and 7 is the only area in all of the Green Spaces document that ticks all the boxes for being a LAG and yet has not been allocated as a LAG. The table in the Green Spaces document provided gives a tick for all the LAG criteria for the 'meadows behind Spencers Farm and Manor Farm House up to Pine Mead', yet it hasn't been designated as a LAG, whilst others that only have 4 out of 5 ticks for the criteria have been designated as LAGs.

I would like to focus on KS7 and the field in which it sits, and why it particularly should be made a LAG.

1. It provides the setting for Manor Farm House and historic farm buildings. The Test Valley Conservation Officer states that "Manor Farm House forms an important cluster with its historic farm buildings – which are listed in their own right. The clear spatial and functional relationship between them and the land which served them are an important part of understanding their history." Furthermore the Officer states "The preserved settings of the listed buildings are... an important part of both their character and special interest and the quality of the conservation area". (reference Planning application 16/03029/FULLS)

2. The field in which KS7 sits was originally an Important Open Area, which the LAGs replaced in the NPF with similar principles, all of which this site meets in the NDP Green Spaces document.

3. From a public point of view the field has a public footpath through which many walkers, including the elderly and ramblers, enjoy the space, tranquillity and wildlife. This has long been the way for villagers at the East end of the village to enjoy the countryside in their walks, without having to walk too far.

4. The LVIA itself states that "any development here [referring to the north side of the hedge] will be seen as an encroachment into the much larger field"

5. The Plan does not factor in the impact of three development sites all within close proximity of each other and green space must be protected within it, otherwise the entire conservation character of the East end of the village will be lost 6. 93% of villagers agreed in the village survey that "landscape features, such as surrounding farmland should be identified and preserved". However only choosing LAGs according to those referenced in the village questionnaire is not viable, as the sites were given as examples not as a comprehensive list to choose from.

In the same way that policy E2 protects green space at the other end of the village, this field should be protected. It holds the same principles as the field opposite the Old Vicarage which is being made a LAG, despite not being in the settlement boundary and not a recreation area and only ticking 4 of the 5 boxes in the LAG criteria. Allocating this field as a LAG is therefore in accordance with the purpose of the NDP stated in the introduction: "A key requirement from Parishioners was to protect and enhance our natural and historic environment which includes the conservation area, its listed buildings and the numerous rural views". The Plan appendices actually uses the picture of KS7 as the illustration of King's Somborne Green Spaces and Landscape Views!!

The allocation of development within KS7 is conflict with the detail of the LVIA which preferred building in the area marked Flood Zone 3 and not the area above the hedgerow The Plan places development in the area north of the hedgerow in KS7, as the area south of the hedgerow is in flood zone 3. The LVIA states “the most sensitive area of the site lies north of the recently planted hedgerow, as this part of the site has a strong downland character and is exposed in views from the north, including from the footpath’. It states the area south of the hedgerow as ‘less sensitive’. The whole site was given a score of ‘moderate sensitivity’ because part of the field was low sensitivity and part of it was high sensitivity. However the site should be re-scored as high sensitivity because the low sensitivity has been eliminated for development. This also supports further why it should be a LAG.

The LVIA shows lack of understanding of Test Valley history in its scoring of KS7. The LVIA states that KS7 is only moderate for value and sense of place. However Manor Farm House, Manor Farm Cottage, The Long Barn all have a historic relationship with the farm land around them. As referenced earlier, this is shown in evidence from the TVBC conservation officer’s description as this part of the village as marking “the transition from the built environment to the open countryside. Manor Farm (Tanner’s Farm in the 19thC) marks the historic end of the village... Such edge-of-settlement farmsteads are typical of the villages in Test Valley, and an important part of their characters”. This warrants a high value and sense of place in the LVIA scoring. (reference Planning application 16/03029/FULLS) Points 3,4 and 5 above show that KS7 should be removed as an allocated site.

The Plan contains no clear guidelines or restrictions for how the setting of listed buildings can and will be preserved. Historic England have pointed this out in their letter “we are still concerned that the development of the proposed sites would harm the significance of designated heritage assets and therefore would be in direct conflict with Policy E9”. The SEA must include clear guidelines on this, which the LVIA failed to do.

The LVIA’s conclusions puts the Plan at risk as it can be challenged
Landscape Sensitivity was flattened by being made up of too many factors, such that all sites have given the same score, making it a mute and nonsensical measure

This means Landscape Value and Historic Settlement Pattern are the determiners of which sites should be developed, but Landscape Value has been given lower importance than Historic Settlement Pattern: 3 out of 4 sites with a High Landscape Value grade are marked moderate in the capacity assessment and therefore the chosen sites for development o Every site with a Negative Value for Settlement pattern are marked as low in the capacity assessment and are therefore eliminated for development. This is only possible if (a) the Landscape Value got scored in reverse or (b) it is a lot less important to the final analysis than the Historic Settlement Pattern

I would like the LVIA to be re-scored so that it can not be challenged at a later point 1. drawing more distinction between sites out of the Sensitivity Value measures which are Historic Continuity, Landscape Elements, Land Cover, Land Form 2. And putting these into equal weight Landscape Value scores and Historic Settlement Pattern

I also question the decision to only use the settlement pattern since before Eldon Road was developed. The history of the village includes the changing shape of it and therefore it should be the settlement pattern as it is. The statement to do so actually ostracizes the residents of Eldon Road from being part of the village.

Policy H2 requires that developments of 14-15 houses require 4 social houses, but Policy H1 states that developments should only be 11-14 in size, so the small amendment of 15 should be removed to avoid confusion

Could screening trees be a requirement of the developer to protect the views and landscape of existing houses?

Given English Heritage's recent request for the sites to be given an SEA, in the same way that all developers must do their own professional LVIA they should do their own professional SEA as well?

It should be added that building height should not be raised above the height of the surrounding houses, even if required by policy E10, as it will dominant and overshadow them

All developments that adjoin the conservation area should be included within the conservation area to protect the character of them and further developments in the future.