



NURSLING & ROWNHAMS PARISH COUNCIL

Answers to Issues and Options Consultation – 2020

It is essential that the local areas of green space are clearly specified in the Local Plan. It is important to ensure that the remaining green space in areas that have been subjected to over development in recent years is not under further pressure. Protection should be written into any future Local Plan. Consideration for green space, development design and environmental issues should form an important consideration in any future planning applications.

It is essential that the local gap is re-instated for Nursling & Rownhams to provide separation from Southampton, for example: Fields Farm. Also, at Bargain Farm where the depth of landscaping is specified in the current Local Plan this must provide visual separation from Southampton.

We do not wish to see Fields Farm developed (see Further Comments below) and any area north of the M271 to ensure that a physical boundary exists between Nursling & Rownhams and Southampton.

Question 1

We suggest that a movement of the boundary further north from Romsey would enable the villages to benefit from development to stop them losing their local facilities eg. shops, pubs, bus services.

More economic growth should be encouraged in the rural areas to help to sustain them. There is evidence that this is occurring, with the closure of schools, churches, banks and local shops etc. and the inability of the children of current residents to remain in their respective Village.

Question 2 and 3

Settlement boundaries should not be changed in respect of Nursling & Rownhams, North Baddesley, Valley Park, Chilworth, Ampfield and Romsey. Therefore, emphasis should be made in increasing settlement boundaries in rural areas to accommodate future demand.

Settlement boundaries should not overlap into other HMAs. Future settlement boundaries should be within parish boundaries. Evidence of this is that planners tend to look at existing developed areas and make them more concentrated and over populated and, as already mentioned, the services either cannot cope with the extra demand or are not in place.

From our perspective, Southampton being the closest boundary we wish to ensure that a gap is re-instated to south of our boundary and remains on the East to prevent coalescence.

Transport links to the settlements should be maintained whilst ensuring that boundaries are not compromised.

Question 4

Possibly - the hierarchy should be re-evaluated to consider rural villages to enable them to be self-sustaining. A policy of dispersal throughout the Borough should be implemented with immediate effect to accommodate future demand for housing

Question 5

Review the need of each settlement area – taking account of design, green space and residents wellbeing. Areas that have already had excessive development and reached their capacity for development should be lower down the hierarchy.

Question 6

It would be a good idea to consider groups of rural settlements together, to ensure maximum benefit of enhanced facilities.

Question 7

In order to satisfy the government's policy of reducing car travel all settlements should be able to sustain themselves and not rely on travelling to neighbouring settlements which could also be outside Test Valley boundaries.

Question 8

No - where recent development has resulted in a huge increase in the population of that settlement it should be allowed at least 15/20 years to embed before any further increases are considered.

Nursling and Rownhams have seen a 32% increase in their population over the past 15 years, this follows over 50% increase in the preceding 20 years. Any consideration of further growth would be unacceptable. Three major housing sites, Rownhams Triangle, Redbridge Lane (Fen Meadow), and Parkers Farm (Broadleaf Park) were not included in the relevant Local Plan at that time and were all granted permission by a Government Appeal Inspector because TVBC did not have a 5 year housing land supply. These three sites will have produced over 1120 homes within a very short period of time placing a great strain on doctors' surgeries, dentists, road capacity, schools, community facilities, air pollution, green infrastructure and recreational space and local shops etc. The increase in population is not being matched by the provision of doctor and dental practices. Existing facilities are unable to cope which is evident by long waiting times and inability to sign on to these services. Many bus services have been curtailed and, therefore, the new developments are not adequately serviced by transport facilities. For example, the Bluestar 4 bus service between Romsey & Southampton only stops at Nursling three times after 6:30pm on a Saturday and no buses stop at all after 6:30pm on a Sunday. An example of the lack of facilities is demonstrated by the fact that new residents on Parkers Farm cannot access the local school for their children beyond the reception class age and will have to be transported to Romsey for their education. This is because the schools have accepted children from outside the Village and their siblings have an automatic right to enrol thus taking up spaces for the children of new residents. Clearly the Government Appeal Inspector totally ignored the future problems created by his decision.

Question 9 and question 10

To give structure to future planning we wish to maintain settlement boundaries and retain the current curtilages. There should not be a move to use physical boundaries which will subsequently have the effect of damaging coalescence between settlements.

Question 11

In view of the excessive amount of development that has occurred in Nursling and Rownhams over the past 30 years we feel we need tighter boundaries. We find it increasingly difficult to maintain the village feel for our community. Any further loss of green space to future developments will only enhance this loss.

Question 12

No – this will only exacerbate the loss of rural and village life and green infrastructure.

Question 13 and question 14

Yes self-build could be appropriate if it is defined within a tight policy and in keeping with the surrounding development. A definition of type of house to be built eg. detached, semi etc., would give flexibility but within parameters. Design quality is essential, not only of the building, but the area within which the building is located.

Question 15

As long as community led development does not conflict with the Local Plan COM 2, community led developments would be acceptable.

Question 16

The issue of climate change should be considered within all developments and the planning application process.

Question 17

Tourism should be encouraged for local areas where adequate facilities exist. It is important to ensure that local centres that can accommodate parking, toilets etc. such as the main centre of Romsey and Andover. Tourism should be discouraged in local areas which will require the use of cars and provision of extra facilities, which will have the effect of commercialising the area concerned.

Existing facilities should be supported and maintained in existing Tourist locations, but care must be taken in areas, such as Forest Park, to ensure the natural landscape is maintained and no attempt is made to commercialise it.

Question 18

It is important that any tourism policy reflects current policies and demands. It should reflect the changing environment and promote sustainable forms of transport to access attractions.

Further comments specifically regarding Nursling & Rownhams

- 1.0** Fields Farm – an application to develop this land which provides visual separation from Southampton City was refused on Appeal. In view of the Government drive to provide more trees and green space this land will provide the ideal opportunity to create woodland and accompanying open space to prevent coalescence with Southampton. This will also provide mitigation for the current nitrate problem.
- 2.0** Bargain Farm – landscaping should reflect the depth requirements detailed in the Local Plan under policies LE5 and T3 to provide visual separation from the Southampton City boundary.
- 3.0** Local Gaps – these were removed in the current Local Plan but must be reinstated for Nursling & Rownhams because the area is under constant threat of development and it should be made clear that these areas are important features when considering planning applications. It is acknowledged that a local gap does not prevent development, but there are certain protections offered with having such a gap.

