

**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:***

We recognise that a great deal of time and effort has been invested by a valiant team of people to produce the document over the past two years. We appreciate and thank all those people who have undertaken this work.

We attended the meeting at the Village Hall on 30 May. When site KS6 was presented, Mr Brock mentioned that there had been a previous planning approval on the site. I believe that information to be factually incorrect, along with other background history which appears in the Plan in the General Site Information on which your recommendations for site allocations are based.

This issue was queried at the meeting by a resident who has lived in the village for nearly 40 years, during which time has there never been any planning approval on the site. Both Mr Brock and another committee member (Mr Searle) dismissed my concern and vigously claimed that there was an old consent and this information had come from Test Valley. XX i naturally have a particular interest in following planning developments in the village. I have searched the TVBC historical planning application records for the site and the database says that no planning records exist. Test Valley Development Control Section has also confirmed there has never been any application on this site. I beleive there has been confusion over site addresses in the Council's background search.

Your General Site Information Analysis for KS6 considers whether the site has any "archeological remains" and refers to an investigation by "Oxford Archeological Unit in respect of a planning application for the demolition of the existing house and garage, and the erection of 5 new dwellings... "

I can confirm, there has never been any dwelling on the KS6 site in the past XX years, it has always been vacant land and therefore no house to demolish. Furthermore the land has been consistently earmarked in the various adopted planning and conservation framework policy documents as an "important open area to be retained."

The archeological investigation referred to in the Council's report, relates to land OPPOSITE the KS6 site, which is referred to in the planning history as land NORTH of Winchester Road. It lies immediately behind our house in Riverside Green and adjacent properties. The original dwelling on this site was demolished and the land subsequently developed for 6 houses by Berkeley Homes as an extension to Riverside Green. The scheme also included a pair of semi-detached houses fronting Winchester Road opposite Cruck Cottage. It was this land NORTH of Winchester Road for which the archeological report was commissioned and which we witnessed.

We would also like to mention that the analysis omits to mention that KS6 is opposite a significant listed building at Butchers End. It therefore has important listed buildings on both sides and opposite.

In relation to Trees, Vegetation and landscape issues, the report fails to recognise the importance of the line of mature trees at the south end of the end of KS6 site, which perform an important backdrop to the village. A feature of wider landscape significance.

I am afraid that the quality of the background information is inaccurate in a number of respects and questions the validity of the analysis of KS6 as a suitable development option. The site is not "flat" as described within the report , is not within the settlement boundary, and not within the SHLAA. Access to the site has restricted visibility, constrained further by protected trees along the road frontage. Moreover the highway authority does not normally promote a new development access within a distance of 40m if an existing access on the opposite side of the road.

Finally one of the issues mentioned at the meeting to promote KS6, was that the land is derelict and unmanaged, therefore its development would improve the environment. In Planning Case Law, there is a very strong presumption against the promotion of development on grounds of poor appearance and dereliction because of the dangerous precedent. This is not a valid justification for development.