

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* Miss		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 6months 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>

Part B: Your Comments

Please use the boxes below to state your comments and questions. Please make it clear which paragraph or question your comments relate to where possible.

Paragraph / Question Ref	Comments
1.15	Does it really take 4 years for the plan to be adopted?? It could be obsolete by the time it gets adopted! Can the process be sped up?
2.3	The government's net zero target of 2050 gives us only a 50% chance of avoiding the worst effects of climate change, and since then, things are unravelling faster than scientists predicted. The government's target is not even clear, for example the legislation in question doesn't mention consumption vs territorial emissions. We should be aiming for an earlier date, as some council bodies are, eg Herefordshire County Council is aiming for 2030/2031.
2.5	Point 1 mentions offsets. We should try and avoid these as much as possible, they tend to just be an excuse to carry on as usual, and don't actually result in a reduction in carbon emissions (for example, schemes to protect existing forests).
2.26	The government's new planning policy is terrible, and could see much damage done to the natural environment. Maybe the default position would be to mark zones for "growth" and "renewal" and mark everything else "protected". But I anticipate there would still be many issues. I don't see how this prevents developers from sitting on brownfield sites to increase pressure to permit development on greenfield sites, which is the first thing the government should have addressed in the new policy. Mind you, the existing policy doesn't afford much protection either – my road of 23 houses now contains 67, including a housing estate on a recovering SINC and 2 houses built in a garden next door to me, totally overlooking my garden and not complying with conditions imposed by the council. None of the new houses are at all in character with the existing ones.
5.1	The built environment currently contributes approximately 50% of the UK's annual green house gas emissions, and construction emissions are increasing. We can't just keep on building ad infinitum.
5.10	I think more emphasis needs to be placed on use of existing homes before even thinking about building new ones. Building adds to carbon emissions, and the larger the house, the more emissions. There are too many overlarge "executive"-style homes and luxury buildings (like that ridiculous house in Belbins which was built several years ago, with personal gym, cinema, games room, swimming pool, more bathrooms than bedrooms etc). How many abandoned

properties are there in the area? Are there any that are being deliberately left empty for tax reasons? Are there too many second homes or holiday homes?

Please use next page if necessary

Q1/2/3	I don't understand the purpose of an HMA, so can't answer these questions. Why do we need them at all? Certainly areas outside the borough need to be taken into account when planning where to put homes, because people could be travelling into or out of the borough for work, shopping, or leisure.
5.24	"see Local Plan Policy COM2 and Table 7" - where are these?
Q4/5	No idea, can't see the existing hierarchy.
Q6	Yes, that sounds sensible.
Q7	Should be careful to retain separation with a decent amount of green space, and consider transport.
Q8	I don't really understand the question (you should probably define "allocations" somewhere – an allocation is just a distribution of something). If you mean that, when updating boundaries, the number of houses allocated to existing areas should be taken into account, then my answer is yes.
Q9-12	Can't answer these questions without knowing what the purpose of a settlement boundary is.
5.30	To solve the issue of affordable housing, I suggest having state-owned development organisations that don't cream off the Help to Buy scheme in order to pay their CEOs millions. Then stop treating housebuilding as an essential prop to the economy which means we must build forever or the economy will collapse.
5.32	No-one needs a house with 3 or more times as many bedrooms as people in it. Rich people tend not to have large families yet they buy enormous houses. In order to address the climate crisis, we need to think about what's necessary and stop building bigger and bigger houses for rich people, especially when poorer people can't buy a house at all. Building multi-generational housing could help older people remain more independent, protect them from fraudsters, and address loneliness.
5.33	I think there should also be provision for people with a medical or mental condition that requires a peaceful environment (like maybe PTSD for example) to live in such an environment, especially because the current regulations effectively do nothing to protect people from noise pollution.
Q13	Yes, as these homes are likely to be more eco-friendly but might need more space to achieve that, so usual rules about number of dwellings per unit area might need to change. At the moment it seems that carbon-spewing large developers get more permission (possibly

Q14	<p>because they have more money to throw at lawyers). Perhaps there could be something like the Welsh One Planet initiative (http://www.oneplanetcouncil.org.uk/).</p>
Q15	<p>I think self-builders would probably prefer their own plots rather than being part of a hideous housing estate, but I guess it might access to services (electricity, water etc) easier.</p>
Q16	<p>Not necessarily.</p>
5.40	<p>Definitely, see the One Planet initiative mentioned earlier, which was adopted by the Welsh Government. In fact, one eco-development, Timsbury Deeping, has already been rejected by the council I believe.</p>
6.2	<p>Why would you charge a fee to join the self-build register?? That sounds unfair.</p>
6.4	<p>Personally, I'd prefer to not shop online. I think a better way forwards is for retailers to be both online and street, and for someone to take an axe to Amazon. Great shops like Lemon & Jinja in Romsey can't afford to be in the town centre (actually better for more because they are closer, but not so great for them).</p>
6.5	<p>There are no nice green spaces to sit in the centre of Romsey. If you've just bought a sandwich or something, the nearest nice spot to sit and eat it would be the abbey grounds (the new market area is not green so doesn't count). Hopefully the plans for the bus station area will rectify that.</p>
6.7	<p>Please get some houses on that concrete wasteland in the centre of Romsey, instead of on greenfield sites!</p>
Q17/18	<p>I don't think I'd count Broadlands as a tourist attraction, as it's only open for 2 hours on some Fridays for 3 months of the year or something daft. I've lived locally for nearly 2 decades and I haven't been there. Romsey itself is a lovely place to visit though.</p>
6.12	<p>Impossible to say whether the policy should be more flexible/supportive without knowing what the existing one is! But new attractions should definitely be considered – look at the Eden project, for example. People were visiting that even when it was just a building site because it was innovative.</p>
6.15	<p>I'd just like to point out that the obsession with economic growth is why we are in a climate and ecological emergency. We need to get away from that obsession before it destroys us. Doughnut economics is a good place to start (Amsterdam is trialling it) – it's a framework for considering the needs of people while staying within planetary boundaries.</p>

6.22	<p>I think that noise pollution needs to be looked at more, especially in light of the increase in working from home. It's a challenge to concentrate when there are power tools, weird industrial noises, screaming kids, noise-enhanced cars/motorbikes, building-shaking heavy goods vehicles, and loud music going on every day. Other countries have much stricter noise regulations than the UK, so it is possible!</p>
7.1	<p>Shops in the countryside can work well if they have enough draw for customers, eg be on a main road / have a cafe / are unusual. They could be multiple shops sharing a barn or a large individual shop, like Oasis on the Isle of Wight (https://oasis-iow.co.uk/pages/contact-us). Sometimes, a farm can be a tourist attraction, eg I've spent hours at farms in Cornwall, exploring their land, viewing the dairy, buying ice-cream and food from the farm shop.</p>
7.6	<p>Biodiversity in the UK is plummeting. Development must place the environment in high priority, and require improvements to biodiversity. It also means, for example, not building on a recovering SINCS, not relying on an ecological survey from 3 years previously when considering planning when the land use has been quite different since then, and monitoring a site afterwards to ensure that promised biodiversity improvements actually exist (the aforementioned site was promised to increase biodiversity, but some years later, no sign of the heather than used to grow there). SINCS and other designated wildlife areas should get better protection – more monitoring, more powers to stop them being destroyed.</p>
7.7	<p>Can we please abandon the idea that housing estates should be covered in as many wiggly, narrow roads as possible, making it hard for anyone to figure out where they're going or park if they are visiting.</p>
7.9	<p>It seems to me that to stand the best chance of getting planning permission in a protected area, you need to have a modern, minimalistic design that is totally out of keeping with the surrounding landscape. I think that is totally wrong. A thatched cottage would look much more appropriate in the New Forest, for example, than some shipping container-like steel and glass structure. In protected areas, biodiversity and environment is even more important. All structures in such areas should be relatively small, unless the structure is not housing (for example, it's an educational field centre).</p>
7.10	<p>Design quality should take into account carbon emission from materials. Has anyone trialled hempcrete in Hampshire? Straw bale houses? Cob houses? Concrete is one of the most environmentally-damaging materials.</p>
	<p>I think there should be some minimum density standards. Too many modern housing estates feel so oppressive with their high brick walls and 3-4 storey townhouses packed in together that they seem more</p>

7.13	like prisons. And when houses are crammed in there is little space left for greenery or gardens big enough to grow fruit and veg in, but plenty of noise and opportunity for social tension.
7.16	Local gaps should be kept unless there is a conscious decision to merge settlements (I wonder how many settlements comprise what is now Southampton!)
7.27	This ought to be publicised more, as should the designations of habitat. I had no idea that there were multiple SINCS in my road, or an SSSI round the corner, or an SAC nearby. I think they are better advertised now, albeit too late to save one.
7.29	<p>Many people do not get the urgency of the climate and ecological crisis. Residential property comprises a big chunk of our emissions - whatever can be done to reduce them, should be done, no matter how prescriptive. We have wasted so much time – all new homes in the UK could have been carbon neutral from 2016 if the Conservative party hadn't squashed the proposed legislation. Now Boris Johnson's government is saying houses don't have to be carbon neutral until 2050, which is the date the entire nation is supposed to be carbon neutral – bonkers! (And as previously mentioned, 2050 is too late). I will mention Timsbury Deeping again, as that proposes to use earth sheltering to reduce the need for heating. These are the kind of ideas we need to be embracing, and so far we're not even exploring them.</p> <p>The Future Homes Standard (which seems to have already been superseded) only required homes to be 80% carbon neutral from 2025 – similarly entirely lacking in ambition and too late. If this plan can do better, it should.</p>
7.34	<p>We need greater protection for sites such that they don't get destroyed and end up being turned into housing estates. But that isn't enough - we need MORE sites too. Last year, the WWF published a report that said the UK is one of the most nature-depleted countries in the world. Whenever I see pictures of Amazon rainforest that has been turned into cattle farms, I think "looks like the UK". Looking at Google maps satellite view, there is very little natural landscape left across the country. Rewilding is a powerful natural solution to tackle the climate crisis so we need to be looking for ways to restore habitat. Organic, natural farming is one (a good example is the Knepp estate in West Sussex) – a lot of farmland is essentially dead, lacking even soil life and requiring farmers to buy artificial fertilizers (whose runoff poisons land and streams nearby) in order to get anything to grow. Forcing developers to build on brownfield sites first would protect greenfield sites. Even reducing the number of horses kept would free up pasture land for reforestation (though you could probably have some of each).</p>
7.37	Open spaces should be designed for wildlife as well as people.

7.39	<p>Grantham Green in Eastleigh was much improved by some landscaping and addition of trees and wildflowers, as well as play facilities and benches. Before, it was just a boring flat bit of grass.</p>
7.43	<p>The more trees, the better! As long as they are carefully chosen, eg native trees. Trees that produce food could also be useful, and some are native, eg hazelnut, crabapple.</p>
7.47	<p>What about collecting rainwater? New build homes could have built-in ways to easily use collected water rather than drinking water for everything, even washing the car!</p>
8.1	<p>Light pollution can be detrimental to nature and wastes energy. Most streetlights shed too much light to the side. Are all the streetlights in the borough LED? Can we turn some off at night (maybe with motion sensors so they come on when needed) or reduce the number? I lived on a residential road in West Sussex with no street lights at all, and you could see glow worms in the verges on summer nights. Noise pollution is a big problem for me and I'm astonished we don't have more protection from it. It seems there is literally nothing you can do about any kind of noise produced at any time of day or night for any period. I even had to put up with the radio that builders were using 20 feet from my window, despite complaints to both the council and the property developer.</p>
8.9	<p>Somehow, we need to stop people trashing these areas too!</p>
8.10	<p>I think there should be more encouragement for people new to cycling, eg training for adults returning to cycling. Some councils provide this apparently, but none local to me appear to.</p>
8.12	<p>I look forward to being able to cycle from North Baddesley to Romsey without having to ride on a busy road :)</p>
8.13	<p>I can't travel to work by bus. There is a bus route, but it's a subsidised school route and the infrequency of buses during holiday times means it would be 12 hours before catching the bus in the morning and getting back home! Public transport is also slow, unreliable, expensive, and unpleasant (noisy, smelly) as well as being infrequent. You can't even expect a bus to wait at a bus stop if it gets there early, so you have to get there even earlier, but the bus is usually late so you end up waiting ages in total. I can't cycle like some people do because frankly I'm not brave enough to risk the windy country lane rat-runs with the blind bends and hills and thoughtless drivers. So I use the car but I'd very much like to stop or at least cut down.</p>
8.13	<p>I've seen some terrible new developments in Eastleigh where there is inadequate parking provision and wiggly, narrow roads, so people park partially on the pavement, obscuring both pavement and road. I'm sure on occasion there hasn't been room for an emergency</p>

8.20	<p>vehicle to pass. But on the other hand we need to reduce the number of cars – there aren't the resources to just switch every car to electric. We need to encourage car-sharing and public transport.</p> <p>I can walk to my local surgery but I sometimes need to travel to a different settlement to see my own doctor now. Getting an appointment is harder than it was nearly 20 years ago and the services on offer are more limited.</p>
8.26	<p>Extreme weather events are not only likely to be more frequent, they are likely to be more extreme. Heat waves will get hotter, for example.</p>
8.27	<p>Perhaps the CIL should be used exclusively for measures to tackle the climate and ecological emergency, since that is by far the most dangerous issue we face.</p>

What happens next?

All valid responses will be acknowledged and you will be given a reference number. Please quote this number when contacting the Council about the next Local Plan. If you have an agent acting on your behalf, correspondence will be sent to your agent.

All response received will be taken into account as part of the preparation of the next Local Plan.