

# 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](http://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](http://www.testvalley.gov.uk/nextlocalplan)

## Part A: Your Details

Please fill in all boxes marked with an \*

Title*Mrs		First Name*	
Surname*			
Organisation* (If responding on behalf of an organisation)			

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
	Please see separately supplied document which addresses Section 5 Living in Test Valley (Housing and Communities) Paragraphs 5.1 to 5.29 with specific reference to Lockerley

*Please use next page if necessary*

### 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.





**BJC PLANNING**

**COMMENTS OF THE REFINED ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION  
ON THE TEST VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL  
EMERGING LOCAL PLAN**

**Comments made on behalf of  
Romfield Holdings Ltd**

**Comments are made regarding  
Section 5 Living in Test Valley (Housing and Communities)  
Paragraphs 5.1 to 5.29 with specific reference to Lockerley**



### 1.0 General Comments

- 1.1 This Issues and Options papers has been published for comment shortly before the publication of the government White Paper 'The Future of Planning'. The latter document indicates that there will be an exceptional change in much of the current planning system. The White Paper suggests that the timescale for change will be rapid. If this is the case the proposed changes are implemented, even in part, the impact on this emerging plan will be profound.
- 1.2 It seems highly probable that the methodology for calculating housing need will change. Whatever methodology is uses it seems probable that the Council will need to find land for housing. It is the quantum that is unknown.
- 1.3 The distribution of new housing is an important consideration. New houses are the life blood on communities and are essential to sustaining and expanding shops, services and transport links for settlements.
- 1.4 Previously the focus of development within Test Valley Borough has been the larger settlement centres which have been considered the most sustainable. This Practice considers that this has led to lost opportunities in terms of sustaining some of the smaller towns and villages in the Borough. This Plan provides the opportunity to redress the balance.

### 2.0 Housing Market Areas

- 2.1 The current HMAs are not logically drawn and do not relate to the hinterlands of the major settlements of Andover and Romsey. It appears that the Southern Test Valley (STV) HMA is defined with regard to boundaries of the Partnership for South Hampshire. Many of the settlements just to the north of Romsey such as Braishfield, Lockerley, Michelmersh and Timsbury have far closer relations with Romsey than Andover in whose HMA they are located.

#### Question 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?**

### Response to Question 1

- a) If the two HMAs are to be retained then the boundary between the two should be more rationally drawn. Settlements up to and including Kings Somborne and Houghton should fall within the southern area.
- b) There is no apparent rational for adopting one HMA when evidently there are two significant urban areas in Test Valley Borough.
- c) There may be merit in creating a third HMA centred on Stockbridge. This town is located broadly midway between the two major towns. Whilst Stockbridge is itself limited in terms of future expansion it does act as an important local service centre for rural villages in the central part of Test Valley Borough.

### Question 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?**

### Response to Question 2

- 2.2 It is considered that seeking to consider the impact of towns outside Test Valley Borough on HMAs is unduly complicated and without much benefit.

### Question 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?**

### Response to Question 3

- 2.3 Parish boundaries provide a rational approach to defining HMAs.

### 3.0 Housing Distribution and Settlement Hierarchy

#### Question 4

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

#### Question 5

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



### Responses to Questions 4 and 5

- 3.1 The definition of the settlement hierarchy should be more sensitive having regard to the size and service provisions of the smaller settlements. The subdivision of the villages into two categories may assist the hierarchy. However, this becomes complicated if two or more smaller villages are to become considered as a group. (Refer to Q6) Would it be appropriate to consider the grouped villages as one settlement? A matrix of facilities and services available for each settlement as prepared as part of the previous evidence base is a logical approach.

#### 4.0 Settlement Boundaries

- 4.1 It is important to review all settlement boundaries in the context of the new Local Plan. It is inevitable that boundaries become out of date as changes occur to settlements over time. Boundaries must be logical for the public to have confidence in them. For example, if an appeal is allowed just outside a settlement boundary then it might be logical to amend the boundary to include the new development.

#### Question 6

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

#### Response to Question 6

- 4.2 Where settlements are physically in quite close proximity these should be considered together if they can share services. New development including housing, jobs, services etc can be to the benefit of the grouped villages.
- 4.3 The village of Lockerley is quite spread having effectively two centres one at Lockerley and the other centred on Butts Green just 1.5km (1 mile) to the southeast. This is a settlement which already has a range of services including a primary school. It would benefit from additional development to consolidate the settlement, support the existing services and perhaps see an increase in the range of services offered.

#### 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?**



**Response to Question 7**

- 4.4 Rural settlements which are located in close proximity to larger settlements should be encouraged to expand where it is evident that the settlement can benefit from the shops, services etc of the nearby town. Equally access to a hinterland with a larger population will be to the benefit of the main settlement.
- 4.5 Lockerley (and Butts Green) are located to the north of Romsey at about 8.8km (5.5 miles) from the town centre. The settlement looks to Romsey as the nearest market town for goods and services that are not provided locally. Expansion of Lockerley would benefit not just the settlement itself but also the market town of Romsey and there would be increased demand for goods and services of the type provided by a higher order centre.

**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?**

**Response to Question 8**

- 4.6 If a Local Plan allocates new land for development it appears perverse to exclude it from the settlement boundary. The review of Local Plan boundaries can sometimes take so long that the boundary loses credibility if new development remains excluded for many years. Take the example of the Fareham Local Plan the settlement boundary was last reviewed in 2000.

**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?**

**Response to Question 10**

- 4.7 The definition of settlement boundaries is not simple because there will always be anomalies. The Council should seek to adopt a consistent approach, but not be prevented from making exceptions where local circumstances suggest a different approach is required. Boundaries are best defined having regard to whole curtilages except in circumstances described in the response below.

### Question 11

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

### Question 12

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

### Responses to Questions 11 and 12

- 4.8 A review of settlement boundaries should provide for a reassessment, the correction of anomalies and the relaxing of boundaries to allow for limited development, without actually making a specific allocation. If certain settlements are deemed suitable for expansion there is a case for choosing a more loosely drawn boundary to allow for limited infill, not necessarily identified as a small allocation. The important consideration is that such decisions are based on planning merits.