

**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@kingssomborne-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@kingssomborne-pc.gov.uk).*

***FEEDBACK STARTS BELOW:***

..."key requirement to protect and enhance...rural views" ~ this point is backed up by the use of the 1987 Conservation Area map which highlights the views that need to be protected. One of which is the view from the top of Froghole Lane across the valley, taking in KS3. KS3 should therefore not be part of this plan.

..."key considerations...safer & quieter roads" – adding extra houses with an access on to Cow Drove Hill, which is already dangerous with the high speed Tarmac lorries that hurtle up and down in spite of it being a single track road, is madness. KS3 should therefore not be part of this plan.

..."spaces between (build area) 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." Again, my point above regarding the views to be protected marked on the 1987 Conservation Area plan is relevant here. KS3 should not be part of this plan

"inappropriate development in areas at high risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere....." (NPPF para 100). The Environment Agency website states "careful investigation of local flood risk.....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 flood risk to third parties adequately low...". This plan bases all the flood mitigation on the use of SUDS for all developments. If the EA is warning that this is not sufficient to prevent third party flooding, then this is not enough of a policy in the high flood risk area that is Kings Somborne. Those of us living next to the bourne have recently lived through a major flood event. Any development above the bourne is going to speed up water run-off, raise the level of the bourne too quickly for the bridges to cope with and inevitably flood homes up and downstream of the development. We would like the council/developers to indemnify properties adjacent to the bourne against potential flooding. KS3 should therefore not be part of this plan.

NDP states "In compliance with the sequential test, all sites that incorporate areas designated as being in Flood Zones 3 or 2 have been excluded". Over 60% of KS3 is in Flood Zone 3 and therefore should also be excluded on this logic. KS3 should therefore not be part of this plan.

NDP states “notwithstanding the findings of the landscape report, the topography of the Parish renders some areas unsuitable for either the elderly or the very young as it precludes easy access to the facilities and amenities of the village which are largely, and conveniently gathered on the valley floor with flat and level access. These factors are of principal interest in the site assessment process”. KS3 is up a steep hill with no footpath down to the village floor. The only way down is Cow Drove Hill which has an incomplete pavement to Highfield, is subject to speeding of Tarmac lorries, from the Tarmac plant at the top of Cow Drove Hill, and is not suitable for pedestrians with pushchairs or wheelchairs. These pedestrians then have to cross the busy A3057 trunk road from Romsey to Andover, without any pedestrian crossings in place and with limited and poor visibility, in order to reach the school, pre-school, shop and village hall. Speeding is already an issue in King’s Somborne – additional pedestrians trying to cross the road, especially at peak times, is a recipe for disaster. KS3 should therefore not be part of this plan.

This paragraph states that any new development should be “integrated with the village and its existing street pattern” and that they should allow for “access to existing parts of the village” and try to avoid “bolt-on” new estates in the form of cul-de-sacs. KS3 will be a development on a greenfield site with only a farm track as the existing access. This cannot be described as an existing street pattern. It will certainly be a bolt-on cul-de-sac with only one way in and out. KS3 should therefore not be part of this plan.

This report states that KS3 has Moderate Sensitivity as a result of its Moderate Sense of Place and Low Visibility. It has a High Value from the contribution it makes as an open space within the conservation area and the setting it provides to listed buildings. There is only one listed building, Old Froman’s, noted as adjacent to KS3 but in fact there are 3 more – Willow Cottage, Crown Hill Cottage and Yew Tree House, which all back on to KS3. KS3 therefore has a High Sense of Place with regards to the setting of these listed buildings. KS3 also has High Visibility in my opinion – it can be seen from Froghole Lane, from the Clarendon Way as it goes down inside the hedge line along Cow Drove Hill and as you drive in to the village from Romsey (Froghole Lane footpath is visible as is the top left part of KS3). If the Low Visibility ranking was changed to High Visibility, the overall ranking would change from Moderate Sense of Place to High Sense of Place, which in turn would change the capacity from Moderate to Low and would therefore disqualify the site. KS1 & KS4 were both disqualified for having High Visibility from the Clarendon Way so this criteria should be applied equally across all sites.

NDP site assessments state “Listed Buildings close to developments especially if densely populated will tend to be marginalised and their visual impact compromised”. Further to the discussion of the 4 listed buildings that garner their sense of place from KS3, above, I argue that by this logic, KS3 should not be part of this plan.

The NDP states that we must “conserve open spaces”. Building on KS3 does not do that. Independent reports demonstrate activity of Barbastelle Bats from the Mottisfont colony feeding and roosting in KS3. There is evidence of significant owl activity, kingfishers, martins, water voles and stoats. The nettles also create the perfect habitat for a broad range of butterflies and dragonflies. This land has not been touched for decades, nor sprayed nor ploughed. There is an abundance of wildflowers. I cannot understand why a council on the one hand wants to destroy a perfectly natural wildlife haven in KS3 and on the other hand is applying for grants to create an artificial biodiversity site in a playing field elsewhere in the village. KS3 should therefore not be part of this plan.

NDP states that additional secondary schooling is available in Winchester. This is not true as for the last few years no child has got in to a Winchester school from Kings Somborne, due to increasing numbers of children in Winchester.

“Any developments must not change the character or nature of the conservation area”. The 1987/1996 map of the Kings Somborne Conservation Area also includes views which are to be protected. One of which is from the top of Froghole Lane down the valley, over KS3, and one of which is from the church up the valley to the North West, over KS3, and one of which is down the valley from the Clarendon Way. KS3 is visible, to a greater and lesser extent, from all of these protected viewpoints. KS3 should therefore not be part of this plan.

1996 Local Plan ~ KS3 is included on this plan as an Important Open Area. Most other Important Open Areas in the village were converted to LAGS. Why was KS3 not converted? Especially when it is noted on the Conservation Area map, mentioned above. KS3 has RV042 (protected road verge) bordering the access. None of the other sites has any SINCS, RVEIs or SSSIs so I don't believe the priority ranking as KS3 being 2nd in line for development is acceptable. English Heritage Report notes a Ring Ditch (prehistoric early Bronze Age) transecting Cow Drove Hill plus a possible Bronze Age Barrow on the site. There is also evidence presented of a possible Bronze Age burn barrow on Froghole Lane – none of this is mentioned in the site assessment for KS3. These are important facts, not to be ignored. Other sites have been excluded on the basis of possible archaeology and therefore using the same logic KS3 should also be excluded.

KS1 was rejected as not being large enough to contribute to social housing stock but the site assessment states that 14 houses are achievable. The KS3 site assessment states that 11 houses are achievable so therefore using the same logic, this site is not large enough either, and should also be excluded. KS1 was rejected for having poor connection to the village and poor access. KS3 uses the same access as KS1 (a narrow 5-bar gate next to a listed Cob wall ~ photographs below) and is adjacent to KS1. Therefore if KS1 has poor connection to the village, it follows that KS3 must also have poor connection to the village. If KS1 was rejected for visibility from the Clarendon Way, poor acc

Other sites were rejected for being outside the settlement boundary and within the conservation area. KS3 is outside the settlement boundary and within the conservation area so KS3 should also be rejected on this basis. Each site must be measured, accepted or rejected, using the same criteria. This does not seem to be the case with KS3. KS3 is the only site on the North of the A3057 which involves crossing the main road to access everything in the village. All the other sites are on the other side of the A3057, with good pavements and crossings, allowing safer and easier access to the main village facilities and bus stops

Noise ~ the KS3 site assessment states there is minimal noise coming from the Tarmac plant. This is not true as there are huge lorries up and down Cow Drove all night, making huge noise when they are empty and hit a pothole. There is also the bird cannon which fires all night and all day.

Covenants ~ there should be covenants added to the land to specify a maximum number of houses that can be built on any one site, into perpetuity

Screening ~ new developments should have mature trees planted as screening for those overlooking it.

Remove KS3 from the NDP and I will happily get behind it and vote yes in the referendum.