
From:
Sent: 16 July 2020 14:57
To: Planning Policy
Subject: Comments on Refined Issues and Options Consultation paper

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Test Valley,

Here are my comments on the Refined Issues and Options Consultation paper dated June 2020. I support the overall direction being taken in the various sections of the Consultation paper so my comments take the form of answers to the Questions posed in the document.

Para 5.14

Question 1: Test Valley should retain the two existing HMAs. If additional HMAs are proposed then I would want them to be based broadly on centres of employment within the Borough.

Question 2: Wider relationships for HMAs should take account of commuting patterns and support for commuters.

Para 5.15

Question 3: Having HMAs aligned to parish boundaries presumably makes it easier to assess impacts on communities through parish-oriented feedback. Creating an alternative structure could create extra bureaucracy. However if there was a clear advantage to not using parish boundaries in a specific situation then this could be pursued.

Para 5.24

Question 4: The number steps of the hierarchy should only be increased if the settlement already has more than one existing sub-division. If you create artificial sub-divisions where none exists in real life then you would have to explain the rationale for this.

Question 5: Decisions on which settlements to include within a step should be based on the existing relationships between those settlements and on the purpose for which the particular step was created.

Question 6: Yes, groups of rural settlements should be considered together unless there are obvious existing divisions which needed to be taken account of.

Question 7: Rural settlements close to others could share facilities & services but it would depend on the current level of 'independence' of those settlements. If one rural settlement is deprived of existing facilities in favour of another that is allowed to keep them then this would create a sense of injustice.

Para 5.27

Question 8: Yes, new allocations should be included where practical.

Para 5.28

Question 9: Ideally a "settlement" should be a specific community of people or businesses, together with the land they occupy, so boundaries should reflect that.

Para 5.29

Question 10: Ideally a "settlement" should be a specific community of people or businesses, together with the land they occupy, so boundaries should reflect that.

Question 11: Ideally a "settlement" should be a specific community of people or businesses, together with the land they occupy, so boundaries should reflect that.

Question 12: Yes, boundaries should provide opportunities for growth.

Para 5.36

Question 13: All homes, self-built or not, should fit in with general planning guidance regarding suitability & appropriateness for location, etc.

Question 14: Yes, but not if self-build homes would displace affordable homes.

Para 5.38

Question 15: Yes, Self-build housing could be delivered as part of community-led development and such buildings should fit in with general planning guidance regarding suitability & appropriateness for location, etc.

Para 5.39

Question 16: No. A few self-built houses would have a negligible impact compared to the preferred goal of setting higher standards for all new homes and reducing emissions, heat loss, etc from existing houses.

Para 6.10

Question 17: Yes, if the infrastructure requirements outlined in Para 6.10 can be support the additional flexibility.

Para 6.11

Question 18: Yes, tourism policy should never be static - it should respond to what tourists want, provided it can be delivered without completely disrupting everything else. Test Valley would need to be wary of innovations that were purely seasonal in nature, with facilities unused and going to waste at other times of year.

regards,