

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*Mr		First Name*	
Surname*			
Organisation* <i>(If responding on behalf of an organisation)</i>			

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>



BJC PLANNING

RESPONSES TO THE TEST VALLEY

**ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION
FOR THE NEXT
LOCAL PLAN**

RESPONSES MADE ON BEHALF OF

BJC Planning

**Response to Questions 4 - 12
SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES**

Question 4

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

There are benefits in sub-dividing the settlements 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.

Question 5

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

The Council has previously developed a Matrix of the populations, facilities and services in the villages (Evidence Base). This could be updated and this could form the basis for the separate tiers. The villages with the greatest populations and the most facilities and services could form the top tier. There would have to be a further consideration related to any constraints.

Question 6

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

I have proposed groupings in response to the HMA Question. There is a case to create a group based on Stockbridge. Stockbridge is significantly constrained but the surrounding villages including Kings Sombourne, Broughton, The Wallops and Longstock all look to Stockbridge for many of their needs rather than to Andover or Romsey.

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.

There is the opportunity to tie some smaller settlements to larger ones. Braishfield is very close to the Town Centre of Romsey. There is the opportunity to create mutually beneficial relationship. Braishfield could provide more land for development while improved transport links to the Town Centre could improve the viability of its shops and services.

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 needs to 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?

Settlement boundaries should be updated to reflect recent developments which have been permitted and 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 and size of settlement (to be defined).

Question 9

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. The existing criteria for defining settlement boundaries is logical. However, it needs to be implemented in a sensitive and pragmatic way. All existing boundaries should be reviewed with a view to making minor modifications where appropriate. For example: where an appeal has been allowed that changes the situation on the ground; or where a boundary tightly follows a curtilage resulting in the exclusion of a small area of land which is effectively surrounded on three sides by defined urban area.

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?

There is no method that fits all settlements. In the main whole of curtilages should be retained to defined settlement boundaries. On the other hand, physical boundaries that extend beyond curtilages should also be used.

Question 11

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

There must be a case to keep settlement boundaries more tightly where the settlement is in the lower tier. Settlements with few facilities and that are the least sustainable will need greater restrictions.

The corollary is that boundaries for the larger settlements that are more sustainable and the least constrained need to be looser.

Question 12

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

The failure to provide more housing in the rural villages has created enclaves of great wealth and expensive housing and an ageing population. The less wealthy have to rely on affordable housing. The services including shops and schools and community facilities suffer gradual decline. Every settlement and village needs to be assessed to examine its potential to accommodate more development.

