

Test Valley Borough Council Next Local Plan - Refined Issues and Options Consultation

COMMENTS FORM

Test Valley Borough Council has published for public participation its Refined Issues and Options document. This is the second stage of preparing the next Local Plan, which follows the Issues and Options consultation in 2018.

You can respond to our consultation by filling out the form below. Further information can be found on our website at: www.testvalley.gov.uk/nextlocalplan

The consultation period runs from Friday 3 July 2020 to 4.30pm on 28 August 2020. Please respond before the close of the consultation period.

Once the form has been completed, please send to

If you are unable to send via email, please send a postal copy to our address below.

Contacting us

We are happy to help. If you have any queries, please contact us at:
Planning Policy and Economic Development Service
Test Valley Borough Council
Beech Hurst
Weyhill Road
Andover
SP10 3AJ

Tel: 01264 368000

Website: www.testvalley.gov.uk/nextlocalplan

Part A: Your Details

Please fill in all boxes marked with an *

Title*		First Name*	
Surname*			
Organisation* (If responding on behalf of an organisation)			

If you wish your comments to be acknowledged and to be kept informed of progress, please provide your email address below:

Email Address*	
----------------	--

If you don't have an email address and wish your comments to be acknowledged and to be kept informed of progress, please provide your postal address.

Address*			
	Postcode		

If you are an agent please give the name/company/organisation you are representing:

--

Personal Details and General Data Protection Regulation

Please note that representations cannot be treated as confidential. If you are responding as an individual, rather than as an organisation, we will not publish your contact details (email/postal address and telephone number) or signatures online, however the original representations will be available for public viewing at our offices by prior appointment. All representations and related documents will be held by the Council for a period of 6 months after the next Local Plan is adopted.

The Council respects your privacy and is committed to protecting your personal data. Further details on the General Data Protection Regulation and Privacy Notices are available on our website
<http://www.testvalley.gov.uk/aboutyourcouncil/accesstoinformation/gdpr>

Part B: Your Comments

Please use the boxes below to state your comments and questions. Please make it clear which paragraph or question your comments relate to where possible.

Paragraph / Question Ref	Comments
	<p>Question 1</p> <p>Should (a) we maintain the two existing HMAs, but perhaps with a revised boundary between them, such as enlarging the area within STV HMA. If so, what additional area(s) of the Borough should be included within STV HMA?</p> <p>Alternatively, (b) should a single HMA for the whole of Test Valley be used?</p> <p>Or (c) should additional HMAs be created, increasing the number to 3 or 4, with the additional HMA(s) applying to the rural area?</p> <p>Two HMAs should be maintained at least. The Housing Market Area boundaries in Test Valley currently appear to be very skewed towards Andover and there is no explanation for the vast difference in size of the two HMAs. The HMA boundaries should be redressed to provide a better balance between Andover and Romsey and to better reflect the choices that people are likely to make.</p> <p>a) On the face of it those parishes to the north of Romsey relate more to Romsey than to Andover. Anyone looking to move to the Romsey area would inevitably also consider the parishes of Braishfield, Michelmersh & Timsbury, Wellow and Sherfield English.</p> <p>Parishes up to and including Kings Somborne and Houghton should fall within the southern area.</p> <p>b) No.</p> <p>c) There is the potential to create a third HMA including Stockbridge and its surrounding rural villages.</p>

Question 2

In determining HMAs how should wider relationships with settlements beyond the Borough's boundaries, be taken into account, including with Southampton, Salisbury and Winchester?

No.

Question 3

Should an alternative approach to using parish boundaries be used for HMAs? If so, would this be easily be identifiable and practical for monitoring purposes?

It would seem sensible to continue with the approach of using current parish boundaries but revise the boundaries between the existing HMAs.

Question 4

Should the number steps of the settlement hierarchy be increased, for example by sub-dividing the 'rural villages' into two separate tiers?

This would make sense. There are currently 37 identified rural villages listed in Policy COM2 in the Revised Local Plan, and there will be much variance between the villages in terms of the number of services and facilities, population and number of existing dwellings.

One way of splitting the rural villages would be to separate them into large and small villages.

Question 5

How should we decide which settlements to include within each step of the settlement hierarchy?

The Council previously used a matrix for assessing the villages. This formed part of the Evidence Base for the Revised Local Plan. It was based on the services available within each village and then scored. Villages should be categorised based on the different criteria and then selected for different tiers.

Test Valley should update their matrix and split villages depending on the number of the services and facilities which each contains.

They could also look at adding extra categories to the matrix, if required.

Question 6

Should we consider groups of rural settlements together, where these are closely related to each other and/or share facilities and services?

Yes, this already happens in the case of some of the rural villages listed in Policy COM2 in the Revised Local Plan. There may be other examples where other rural settlements are closely related to one another.

Question 7

How should we treat rural settlements which are close to other larger settlements and can therefore also easily access their facilities and services?

This is the case with Braishfield, which is so closely related to Romsey that it is illogical that it is currently in the Northern Test Valley HMA.

Notwithstanding the proximity to Romsey, Braishfield is a village with its own identity and a number of services and facilities. The long-term failure to provide more housing in the rural villages such as Braishfield has created enclaves of great wealth, expensive housing and an ageing population. The less wealthy have to rely on affordable housing through any rural exception schemes that may come forward, such as the 9 affordable homes built by Hyde Housing on land off Braishfield Road, Braishfield. The services including shops, schools and community facilities suffer gradual decline due to the increasing elderly population.

Every settlement and village should be assessed to examine its potential to accommodate more development. Nevertheless, housing allocations around the edges of Braishfield would enable the village to at least sustain the services and facilities which it still has and for new families with children to move into the village.

Question 8

In updating the settlement boundaries to reflect recent development which has been built and development with planning permission, should we also include new allocations?

It would be extremely helpful if all settlement boundaries could be updated to reflect recent development which has been built and development with planning permission. There were a huge number of sites in the countryside with planning permission for residential prior to the adoption of the Revised Local Plan in January 2016 which were not incorporated into settlement boundaries.

Following the examination of the emerging Local Plan, there must be the ability to update settlement boundaries on Inset Maps to reflect what has been built and permitted close to the date of adoption of the Local Plan.

Every parish with a designated neighbourhood area should be given a housing figure, as per paragraph 65 of the NPPF. All other settlements should have their own housing figures and housing allocations relative to their status in the hierarchy. As an example, the Winchester Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy proposed a housing figure of about 250 new dwellings for its larger settlements and its Local Plan Part 2 allocated sites within those same settlements.

Land south of Lionwood, Braishfield Road, Braishfield is one such site in the Council's SHELAA (Site 164) which should be allocated for residential development and included within an enlarged settlement boundary for the village. It currently adjoins the settlement boundary and is located centrally within the village.

Braishfield benefits from several local services and facilities, accessible from within the village or from the outside by public transport. Its proximity to Romsey also helps makes this a sustainable settlement for further housing.

The concern with too many neighbourhood plans seeking to allocate sites is that some of them will fall behind and the Local Plan will need to step in and take over the process.

It would be preferable for settlements with no parish neighbourhood plan area designations to have allocations determined via the Local Plan process, as this way there is more of a guarantee that housing would come forward in these areas. Local Plan Allocation also has the benefit of the application of professional planners' judgements on where housing might best be accommodated. However, the fear remains that the Council will continue with the *status-quo*, in that the majority of new housing will come from strategic sites, again, close to the two main centres of Andover and Romsey.

Question 9

t

How should we define settlement boundaries? What types of land uses should be included, such as public open space?

Public open space should be included in settlement boundaries.

Question 10

Should the approach to using whole curtilages for defining settlement boundaries be retained, or should we take account of physical boundaries which extend beyond curtilages, or limit settlement boundaries to only parts of curtilages?

Yes, the principle of using whole curtilages should be retained. Some properties have paddocks which extend beyond curtilages and these should not be included.

Question 11

Should settlement boundaries be drawn more tightly or more loosely, and perhaps reflecting which tier settlement is within the settlement hierarchy?

Settlement boundaries should be loosely drawn around settlements to allow for additional housebuilding on small sites, infilling between properties and new housing allocations appropriate to the tier of settlement in the settlement hierarchy.

Question 12

Should settlement boundaries provide further opportunities for further limited growth beyond infill and redevelopment?

See answer to Q11.

Question 13

Should we have a specific policy for self-build homes?

Yes, the White Paper: Fixing the Broken Housing Market sought to diversify the market. Self-build and custom build housing were encouraged.

A specific policy could also provide encouragement for sites that are solely for self-build/custom build, whatever their size.

Between 1st April 2018 and 31st March 2019 there were 29 valid requests by individuals and associations of individuals to be added to the Test Valley Self-Build Register. Whilst it is not known how many individuals are on the Council's Self and Custom House Building Register, there is clearly unmet demand within Test Valley for plots. It is understood from the latest AMR that the preferences of those on the register are generally for plots of 0.25+ acres and for plots for individual, predominantly detached dwellings. Plots are generally sought within semi-rural or rural areas, within relatively close proximity to Romsey or Andover, or other villages within the Borough.

Question 14

Should we have a policy for large housing sites to include a proportion of serviced plots to be made available for sale to those seeking to build their own homes?

Yes, Fareham's Draft Local Plan 2017 included a policy (H7 Self and Custom Build Homes) requiring schemes in excess of 100 dwellings to include provision for 5% self-build/custom build housing. Test Valley should devise a similar policy.

Question 15

Should self-build housing to be delivered as part of community led development?

Only if there is a demand for it. The local community and parish councils can advise those promoting community led development schemes whether self-build (or custom build) housing plots are required.

Question 16

Could the introduction of a self-build housing policy also be an opportunity for the Council to tackle the issue of climate change?

Every development should make their own contribution towards climate change and not just self-build (or custom build) schemes.

The idea being muted in paragraph 5.40 of introducing a fee to join the Register will be a disincentive to join the Register in the first place.

Question 17

Should a revised tourism policy be more flexible for potential new tourist attractions?

No answer.

Question 18

Should a revised tourism policy be more supportive of innovative proposals?

No answer.

Please use next page if necessary