

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:

We question the need for the number of houses that this NDP suggests should be built in this Parish over the next 15 years. The TVBC Local Plan states a requirement of 36 homes a year to be built in rural areas over the next 18 years. There are many villages in the Test Valley and therefore 36 houses per year could easily be achieved by infill development. Indeed, in our immediate vicinity there are currently two large houses being built and one 2 bedroomed property is going through the planning process. Infill housing is generally on a smaller scale and these small incremental increases in housing stock are much easier to absorb into the life and services of the village, providing they are well planned and include measures to alleviate, where possible, the risk of adding to our flooding problem. Since the publication of the draft NDP, the allotments have been put up for sale. This would be an ideal infill site for development, away from the flood problems with little impact on existing housing and within the existing settlement boundary. The NDP is suggesting developments of between 11 and 14 houses. But what mechanism is there in the Plan to make sure each development is limited to a maximum of 14? What is there to stop such a development becoming much larger? If there is no such mechanism, what is the point of this part of the Plan?

Is there really a need for Affordable Housing? In this area much of the housing that is termed 'Affordable' is still out of reach of many people. Many of the replies to the Action Hampshire Housing Needs Survey do not support the need for affordable housing. New homes, whether 'affordable' or not, usually come at a price premium. The Kings Somborne Parish is well provided with small to medium sized, older stock homes which, when they come on the market, will be priced similar to new 'affordable' homes. We also have above average provision of social housing. Affordable homes and social housing are better located in areas with good employment opportunities and reliable public transport. It would appear that the need to provide affordable housing is the driver to the building of larger developments. Removing the need for 'affordable housing' therefore enables small infill sites to be considered favourably to achieve the target number of houses required.

NDP – undertaking site selection (Traffic Light Method) In this section, the process for Site Allocation Scoring is mapped out. However, not all factors indicated appear to have been considered when the actual scoring of each site was undertaken (2.4.9) For example there is no section on the impact of each development on neighbours, nor is there a section on infrastructure, specifically the problems relating to the capacity of the existing foul water drainage system.

Site Allocation Scoring The factors considered and scored were: ▪ Existing use ▪ How the site related to its surroundings ▪ Proximity of Listed Buildings ▪ Flood risk of the site ▪ Highways i.e. Access ▪ How the site would be viewed from afar We would make the following observations 1. As no weighting has been applied to the factors, this means that proximity of a Listed Building is considered to be as important as the flood risk or access to the site. There are many instances in the village where listed buildings stand beside more modern buildings, so a precedent is already set. Therefore it can be argued that proximity of listed buildings should not be a major factor for consideration and scoring, provided that an NDP policy states that housing adjacent to the listed buildings must be designed sympathetically and/or the Planning Authorities control this aspect. Removing Listed Properties from the calculation makes a considerable difference to the scoring of the sites and the subsequent priority for development. 2. Furthermore, under the access heading, no consideration has been given to the flood risk to each site access. This is very important as virtually the whole of the Winchester Road, Old Vicarage Lane and the bottom of Muss Lane are deemed to be Zone 2 or 3 by the Environment Agency.

Policy H.1 (page 12) clearly states that each development should be a minimum of 11 dwellings to a maximum of 14 dwellings per development. However, Policy H.6 states only the minimum number of dwellings and leaves out the maximum number. The maximum number of 14 should be stated in H.6, in order to avoid any loophole that could be exploited by a property developer.

The paddock opposite the Old Vicarage in Old Vicarage Lane is included as an area to be protected from development. By your definition in Section 3.3, LAGS are areas that are “of particular importance and benefit to the local community “ We have lived in the village for some thirty odd years and I have never placed particular importance to the paddock. The only benefit to the community would appear to be the use of it as a temporary car park for the village fete. There is currently no other use or access by the local community to this plot of land. However, it does sit within the 40m contour and is in close proximity to the A3057 and would appear to have a moderate flood risk. So, judging by the parameters set by the KSNDP, perhaps the paddock should instead be looked at as a potential area for development. Alternatively, should the present allotments be sold, it could be considered as a site for their replacement.

1. Site ref. KS5 is listed as preferred option No.1. It is proposed that access would be via Muss Lane. We consider KS5 to be unsuitable for the following reasons:

- a) Muss Lane is not wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic, nor is there a pedestrian pavement.
- b) In Appendix 2.4.9 (site allocation scoring) this site received the lowest score for access of all the site options, yet it is still placed as preferred option no.1.
- c) Muss Lane is approached via Old Vicarage Lane. Local residents complain that this road is used as a 'rat-run' for cars entering the village and that car speed is an issue. A development of 14 houses would increase the amount of traffic considerably.
- d) The junction of Old Vicarage Lane and Muss Lane is an area prone to flooding and is classified as Zone 2/3 by the Environmental Agency. At a time of flooding, properties in this area suffer additional water ingress caused by the passage of vehicles as they produce a wave effect through the water. This problem would be increased due to the additional traffic generated by a development on KS5.
- e) We believe that some time ago, planning permission was refused for a development of approximately 9 houses with access off Muss Lane. A precedent has, therefore, already been set for the refusal of planning permission for a large development accessed via Muss Lane.

f) Policy E4 states that development should be generally kept below the 40M contour line. This site (KS5) is largely above this contour, therefore preferred option no.1 breaks Policy E4.

Why would a site that has very little chance of being approved at the Planning Stage be listed as a first priority for development? Such a fundamental error makes one question the validity of the whole NDP 2. Access to sites KS6, KS7 and SHELLA 81 may well also pose problems in obtaining planning permission as sight lines along Winchester Road are very poor.

Giving Landscape priority over the major concerns of villagers with regard to flooding. We can only comment on the sites around the Winchester Road area, as we do not know the other areas well enough. However, this does not preclude the comments below being applied to other areas of the village, particularly the potential availability of the allotment site. Within the NDP, an arbitrary maximum limit for development has been set at the 40m contour line. The justification for this would seem to be purely based on the potential impact of development on views from Redhill and Cowdrove Hill. It would appear that little account has been taken of the flooding problems that will result from limiting development and access below this level. Flooding is a serious problem in Kings Somborne, especially along Winchester Road. We do not consider that the existing flood risk or the potential flood risk from developments has been sufficiently covered, or even considered, within the NDP. We should be mindful of the floods of 2014 when Winchester Road was impassable for most cars and the limited bus service had to be rerouted. Surely it would be advantageous to keep traffic generated by a development away from the flooding problem area. A development above the 40m contour line would alleviate the potential flooding problems of lower sites. Effective water catchment options could then be employed within the development with no detrimental impact on the flood zone. We wonder if the drive to restrict development to the valley floor area is because of fears of a "X style" development. We are told by the Chairman at the public consultation meeting that the NDP is an effective document against such development. Is this really true? Or by agreeing to this NDP, are we in danger of opening the floodgates for a large development outside the existing settlement boundary? In conclusion, the imposition of the 40m contour to improve views from afar will mean that any proposed development will be crowded onto existing properties, changing the character of the village and increasing traffic through the village along flood prone Old Vicarage Lane, Muss Lane and Winchester Road.

On the parish website the NDP is introduced as being 'Driven entirely by the views of the Parishioners'. We do not consider this to be true, nor that there has been enough consultation. We attended 2 NDP planning events when we were asked our views on the site location priority. The results of these meetings are not present in this report. Indeed, an extra site was added in the time between these meetings and publication. At the date of publication of the draft NDP, no public consultation meetings had been arranged. The date of the publication and the date of consultation meetings should have been well advertised before publication of the draft NDP.

When the pre-submission consultation meetings were eventually arranged they were not well advertised. They were not in the village newsletter 'The Gauntlet', which is widely read. They were not advertised on social media, which may have attracted the interest of younger residents. Instead, advertising was limited to signs stuck up around the village, and some of these did not include the time of the meeting. Unless one walked in the village, they were not seen. The majority of people use their cars and do not walk. In addition, two of the consultation meetings are far too near the deadline for submission of comments by 22 June.

Residents who may well be affected by these proposed developments should have been leafleted throughout the consultation process so that they were fully aware of what was being planned. Indeed, if the NDP was 'Driven entirely by the views of the Parishioners', the whole village should have been leafleted. The documents are incredibly difficult to make sense of and it is not easy to read the summary together with the relevant appendices. This poor presentation, together with the lack of adequate publicity makes one think that the Parish Council do not really want feedback on this NDP. Having attended one of the pre-submission public consultations, we also feel that the various views of those attending were not being listened to. There is no point in these meetings if it is felt by the Parish Council that the policies stated in the draft NDP are unable to be adapted or changed.