

Refined Issues and Options Consultation for the next Local Plan

Members made the following comments for the review of the Consultation of the Local Plan:

- 1) Should (a) we maintain the two existing HMAs, but perhaps with a revised boundary between them, such as enlarging the area within STV HMA. If so, what additional area(s) of the Borough should be included within STV HMA? Alternatively, (b) should a single HMA for the whole of Test Valley be used? Or (c) should additional HMAs be created, increasing the number to 3 or 4, with the additional HMA(s) applying to the rural area?
 - (a) No
 - (b) No
 - (c) Yes

- 2) In determining HMAs, how should wider relationships with settlements beyond the Borough's boundaries, be taken into account, including with Southampton, Salisbury and Winchester?

Yes, sample Andover, Ludgershall and Tidworth.

- 3) Should an alternative approach to using parish boundaries be used for HMAs? If so, would this be easily be identifiable and practical for monitoring purposes?

No

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

Yes

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

On the basis of services and infrastructure that the settlement has, i.e. station, doctor's surgery, primary school, secondary school and A-roads.

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

Yes

- 7) How should we treat rural settlements which are close to other larger settlements and can therefore also easily access their facilities and services?

As satellites.

- 8) In updating the settlement boundaries to reflect recent development with planning permission, should we also include new allocations?

Yes

- 9) How should we define settlement boundaries? What types of land users should be included, such as public open space?

Need to include amenities and public open spaces.

- 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?

We should be using physical boundaries.

- 11) Should settlement boundaries be drawn more tightly or more loosely and perhaps reflecting which tier settlement is within the settlement hierarchy?

Status Quo – Stick with what we've got.

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

Yes

- 13) Should we have a specific policy for self-build homes?

Yes

- 14) Should we have a policy for large housing sites to include a proportion of serviced plots to be made available for sale to those seeking to build their own homes?

Yes

- 15) Should self-build housing to be delivered as part of community led development?

Yes

- 16) Could the introduction of a self-build housing policy also be an opportunity for the Council to tackle the issue of climate change?

All houses should be subject to climate change.

- 17) Should a revised tourism policy be more flexible for potential new tourist attractions?

Yes

- 18) Should a revised tourism policy be more supportive of innovative proposals?

Yes