

**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 is a very comprehensive document following a significant amount of work. This has obviously been a significant effort and should be applauded. The comments below are my personal views on more detailed elements of the plan to assist in the goal of publishing a document for Examination which is in general conformity with the Test Valley Revised Local Plan and has regard to National Policy.

Whilst Preserving Landscape Features, Views and Surrounding Farmland is an important objective and is supported, policy E2 preserving a specific field seems to appear within the document with no background evidence or testing of the boundaries or significance of the land. No other areas seem to be tested as a strategy. Also, the sterilisation of land should be the minimum required to protect the landscape setting of the settlement. There appears to be no robust analysis of the land, or options, to support the specific identification. Indeed the site may be able to deliver some housing as well as the gap, but this does not appear to have been tested. It seems to appear as a very specific policy without technical evidence.

Support the identification of important open spaces, especially the field opposite the Old Vicarage. However, the allotments should be removed from this list as this is based on use rather than the landscape contribution and could easily be replaced elsewhere. They also have other protection policies.

This does not seem in accordance with policies within TVBC Revised Local Plan.

Support the phasing of development into years to ensure a steady managed supply and not all site developed in the short term.

This appears hugely onerous and without any justification, to the detriment of the whole NDP. For example, the 10% restriction on additional floor space is significantly below even that by the New Forest National Park Authority (of 30%) which has special circumstances for such a restriction. The restriction on additional stories is without justification and contrary to emerging allowances within the consultation NPPF. Restricting loft extensions is not based on particular local circumstances either and appears too controlling. It is also not clear if this is proposed to apply to new development or all existing dwellings. Either way the policy is attempting to achieve far too much and seeks to place blanket bans on development which is highly unlikely to cause harm and would be considered through the normal planning application process.

The desire to safeguard key facilities is supported, however the policy is too restrictive and doesn't allow for the fact that uses, buildings and operators may change over time (and which may be desirable for all parties). For example, there may be a strategy to combine two community buildings into one larger facility. This may result in the closure of one (and redevelopment to assist finances) which may be appropriate for parishioners. Therefore I would recommend some caveat wording such as "unless part of a wider strategy with maintains or enhances local provision or ensures its operation in the long term"

(REF 81) I have strong objection to the allocation of the land south of Winchester Road for housing. There are a number of issues within the site allocation process which present the site in more favourable terms than exist. \* In terms of the site selection process, you cannot sum individual severity of constraints/issues to then identify the least severe site. This misses the key issue of some constraints being weighted significantly differently. This requires a reasoned professional judgment, not a summation of views which treat issues of as equal. \* The site is identified as having a small area of high flood risk. Whilst the area may be small it is actually at the access point so is key to entering and exiting the proposed site. It is therefore a sensitive and key issue which prevents escape from the site in the event of an emergency. This needs detailed assessment and should not be assumed. \* Access is identified as suitable from the west. There is an existing field gate which actually has limited visibility. Any vehicle leaving the field has to be "waved out" by a pedestrian as the curve of the road and existing hedgerow severely restricts visibility to the east particularly. This is dangerous, and below standard. Any improvements would require the loss of a significant amount of important hedgerow which has been identified as a positive feature in the site analysis, and a key characteristic of the area and approach to the village (and loss of associated ecology and habitat). Access cannot be assumed, as seems to be the case. \* The slope of the site would make development highly visible and dominating on the rural entrance to the village, the historic conservation area and the significant listed building opposite. \* The thin nature of the site would make it difficult to develop suitably, especially providing sufficient appropriate gardens, open space and retention of the historic tree.

Given the wide housing site selection process, it appears the village allotments have been excluded from consideration before detailed analysis. Whilst they are a key part of the village and very important, they can be (and often are) relocated to accommodate development in more suitable, appropriate, and/or accessible areas. As long as allotment provision is maintained, or enhanced, then the village benefits. Some of the potential housing sites identified that are shown to be harmful in landscape terms could then accommodate the allotments, as a more suitable use, and release this village centre site, which is well screened, to come forward to support important village housing needs.