

Planning Policy

From: M&T Parish Clerk <
Sent: 14 September 2018 12:57
To: Planning Policy
Subject: Response to the Local Plan 'Issues and Options' Consultation
Attachments: KH265Sep2018.pdf

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find correspondence in response to the TVBC Local Plan 'Issues and Options' Consultation from Michelmersh & Timsbury Parish Council attached.

Kind regards,

Parish Clerk
Michelmersh & Timsbury Parish Council





MICHELMERSH and TIMSBURY **PARISH COUNCIL**

Clerk:

Chairman:

The Planning Policy Team
 Planning Department
 Test Valley Borough Council
 Beech Hurst, Weyhill Road,
 Andover, Hants, SP10 3AJ

14th September 2018

Our Ref: KH265SEP2018

To whom it may concern,

Please find the response from Michelmersh & Timsbury Parish Council to the TVBC 'Issues and Options' Consultation for the next Local Plan attached.

Yours sincerely

Parish Clerk

On behalf of Michelmersh and Timsbury Parish Council

**TVBC Issues and Options Consultation for the next Local Plan
Response from Michelmersh and Timsbury Parish Council**

Responses relate to Question numbers in the consultation document

Q	Response
1	No input
2	No input
3	No input
4	No input
5	No input
6	No input
7	More focus on brownfield sites? Lobbying government to penalise developers with large inactive land banks?
8	Proportionate distribution to parishes would not take account of sustainability issues - parishes with schools, shops; public transport etc. could support more houses than parishes without these facilities. Perhaps this could be resolved by grouping several parishes together for the purpose? Or could apportion houses to parishes based on relative sustainability ratings.
9	The adoption of the settlement boundary approach has merits in controlling development in the village but the existing boundary is in some cases arbitrary. Also there is a problem at the edges of the settlement where established housing reduces in density and merges into countryside. Where the boundary has been drawn to include all or part of the curtilage of these houses this can encourage over-dense development in these areas which is out-of-character with the edge-of-village locations and has an adverse visual impact on the surrounding countryside. This approach should be reviewed.
10	No input
11	No input
12	There is demand in the village for smaller 'open market' houses for older people (downsizing) and younger people wishing to live in the village. The existing stock of smaller houses is limited. Because of high land prices there is no incentive for developers to provide such houses - there is more profit in squeezing large houses onto small plots, which is undesirable on some sites because of the adverse effect on local character.
13	No input
14	The issues of 'exceptional quality' and 'innovative' are very subjective and perhaps more specific guidance could be introduced. The 'test' should be very stringent to limit the possibility of abuse by aggressive developers. It is noted that the 'Paragraph 55' provision only applies to 'isolated houses' not houses in close proximity to others.
15	See 12 above - yes, should be considered
16	No input
17	No input
18	A housing-mix policy should be considered -reliance on market forces in an area of high land prices will inevitably lead in most cases to the construction of large houses to maximise developer profit.

19	Do market forces not determine what room volumes etc. are acceptable?
20	There is a good case for requiring homes to be wheelchair accessible (or capable of being readily-adapted) and for internal layouts to be wheelchair-friendly (door openings, capable of accepting a stair lift etc.).
21	The definition of 'rural worker' needs to be refined, perhaps to refer to the need for a worker to live in a particular location to carry out his/her job. The current system could be open to abuse by permitting houses to be built in the countryside without proper justification.
22	The need for these sites is recognised. The Borough Council needs to ensure that the Needs Assessment document is robust and up-to-date to limit opportunities for it to be challenged. There is strong public opposition to gypsy and traveller sites close to existing settlements which must be recognised, although such locations are in other ways preferable in terms of access to facilities etc. A big concern is the perception that these sites can be very untidy and have an adverse effect on the landscape and the amenity of local residents. It is not clear whether/how this could be addressed.
23	Improving Health and Wellbeing should be fundamental to all the Council's planning policies. Apart from that, suggest that a local authority should not attempt to dictate lifestyle but should focus on education, not restrictions through policy.
24	Yes. Community buildings operated as charities or by volunteers deserve a higher standard of protection than commercial operations. Some means of temporarily supporting failing facilities of this nature would be beneficial. Some means of supporting community purchases of shops, pubs etc. should be considered. There is no point in the local authority attempting to protect buildings which are not commercially viable (particularly pubs). But applications for changes of use for commercial premises should be supported by robust evidence on non-viability.
25	No input
26	No input
27	Yes, the provision of smaller units in the villages should be promoted.
28	Home working is only a concern if it results in visits by customers, frequent deliveries, or if additional (non-resident) employees are based in the house. There could be a case for requiring home workers who are self-employed or running a business (rather than being employees of a company based elsewhere) to be registered and some restrictions being placed on the types of activities permitted, even if the activity would not justify a planning application for change of use.
29	No input
30	No input
31	No input
32	Yes, but suggestions are limited. Locally, enhancing Romsey as a place to visit (greater range of specialist shops? Improved parking etc.) . Encouraging development of tourist accommodation.
33	Simply 'avoiding coalescence' is hardly an ambitious aim. Suggest that local gaps should be defined to avoid creeping development. Inevitable that some development will be needed in some existing gaps but new boundaries should be defined, perhaps on the basis of natural features such as field boundaries.

34	Many parishes, including ours, do not have Neighbourhood Plans. . The Local Plan should aim to define these areas in conjunction with communities but it is not clear what mechanisms are available for this for parishes without a Plan.
35	Yes
36	Yes, if not doing so would encourage developers to submit applications on speculative sites. But the need for community support for any designated area for wind turbine developments is a key factor. Perhaps Hampshire should commission a study of wind resource in the county to assess whether the area is in fact a contender for wind farm developments on the basis of current national energy policy: the decision might be made not to identify any areas. The Test Valley landscape is much valued and there are few lightly-populated areas where wind farms or solar farms could be accommodated without adverse impacts (visual, landscape, noise).
37	No input
38	Suggest to be reviewed in the light of developments in Building Regulations
39,	No new suggestions, but needs addressing. Input from bodies such as the Architects' Advisory Panel 'Panel and Romsey and District Society has been useful in the past and perhaps more 'informed third party' advice could be sought to advise and support TVBC views.
40	No input
41	No input
42	No input
43	No suggestions, but a comment: some recent decisions on planning applications have, in the view of the Parish Council and residents, adversely affected listed buildings or their settings. We question whether the existing policies are applied robustly and consistently.
44	We appreciate that it would be difficult to provide separate cycle tracks in the town because of limited road widths, and none of the approach roads are very 'cycle-friendly' so options are limited. Perhaps attempt to create more of a cycling culture - more dedicated cycle parking? more events and publicity? For this village, completing the Timsbury to Romsey cycleway (off-road), and maintaining the existing route in good order, would be appreciated.
45	We do not think that the local authority can deter car ownership and use by limiting parking space (or allowing developers to do so) on new developments, and imposing a requirement to provide cycle storage.
46	The current parking provision guidelines are inadequate. They leave no room for car ownership by large families or for visitors, resulting in obstructed access and uncontrolled roadside parking.

12 September 2018