

#89

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, February 17, 2024 4:13:19 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, February 17, 2024 5:00:31 PM
Time Spent: 00:47:12
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

Title Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms/Dr/Other(please state)*

Hampshire

Q2

First Name*

Mark

Q3

Surname*

Buckett

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

Organisation*(If responding on behalf of an organisation)

Q5

Email address *

[REDACTED]

Q6

Postal address*

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

Insert any general comments that do not relate to a specific paragraph number or policy in the general comments box below.*If you are suggesting a change is needed to the draft Local Plan or supporting document, it would be helpful if you could include suggested revised wording. If you are commenting on a document supporting the draft Local Plan (such as a topic paper, or the Sustainability Appraisal), please indicate so.

Q8

Insert any specific comments in the general comments box below, indicating which paragraph, policy or matter your comments relate to where possible.*If you are suggesting a change is needed to the draft Local Plan or supporting document, it would be helpful if you could include suggested revised wording.

Velmore Farm - proposed housing and employment use.

The interactive map says the relevant policies are NA4 - NA8 and SA4 - SA7. The relevant policy for this site is SA6, so the interactive map should just say SA6 and not refer to the other policies.

The interactive map does not show grade of agricultural land. SA6 does not say the grade of agricultural land. I have looked in the SHELAA and cannot find it. It does not compare agricultural land grade with other sites. If this information is there, it is not easy or simple to find.

The interactive map and policy SA6 does not state the proposed density of dwellings per ha, or compare this to the existing density of Valley Park. It gives the number of units, but not the area or density. Nor does it compare this to the existing density in Valley Park.

There is no reference to housing density. Housing developers, particularly national businesses build as many houses on the smallest area of land as they can, at the highest density, using the cheapest materials built by contractors who will do it for the lowest price. The policy should state housing density. Given the context of the local area, I would image this to be no more than 30 units per ha. When looking at the housing development that have been allowed by conservative run TVBC in areas north of Romsey, the developments are overbearing high density developments. Valley Park is a low-density area.

It is interesting that the proposal does continue the original 1980's development plan for the continuation of land north of Flexford Road, as the continuation of Valley Park. Instead, this area, which was intended for housing, has now been marked as Local Gap. I wonder what could have influenced the officer and members decision making for the abandoning of this original plan.

In Policy SA6, it mentions the concerns around provision of infrastructure, but fails to show research of need, how many school places will be needed. Simply taking a developer contribution and then saying it is HCCs responsibility is a cop out and passing the buck. There should be clear projection of school places required and where and how that need will be met. The schools that serve valley park are already oversubscribed and on-site provision of primary and secondary education is needed. But the lack of joined up working with HCC fails to meet the future needs of residents and children who would occupy this site.

Policy SA6 refers to provision of SEND. As the parent of a child with an Educational Health Care Plan, this is a subject close to my heart. The policy states 'To be determined'. This as a vile, disgusting and appalling failure of TVBC to identify and address the needs of young people with SEND and treats parents and young people with SEND with contempt.

There is nothing on the interactive map or within Policy SA6 regarding the biodiversity value of the site and comparison with other sites. I understand that developers can now buy Biodiversity off setting credits, but it should be provided on site. Again, if this is in the SHELAA I cannot find it. As there are herds of deer on this site I would imagine it has a high biodiversity value which the conservative run TVBC are happy to build all over. Given the biodiversity within Valley Park, bats, Tawney owls etc. I would have assumed the biodiversity of this site would have prevented it appearing in the housing allocation, but I cannot find a biodiversity study of the area on the TVBC web site. Given the interactive map shows the site is surrounded by SINC's, I am surprised this site is not designated a SINC.

As someone with a Masters in Planning and who worked as a Senior Planning Officer in Local Authority for 10 years, the TVBC interactive map and web site is very poor and shoddy. It does not provide important information, such as biodiversity information, proposed density levels or the need that would be generated and how that need would be met. Having been in Local Government I have heard many times that the decision has already been made and that the public consultation is just lip service and a tick box exercise. Given the lack of detail provided on the interactive map or within the relevant policy I am inclined to feel this is the case. The

Draft Local Plan 2040 Regulation 18 Stage 2 Public Consultation

difficulty in using the interactive map, the lack of detail on the interactive map and the lack of detail in the Policy leaves TVBC open to justified criticism regarding its ethical behaviour in withholding information from the public.

Yours faithfully

Mark Buckett MA (T&CP) AssocRICS.
