

Kings Somborne Neighbourhood Development Plan Decision Statement: September 2023

1. Introduction

1.1 Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), the Test Valley Borough Council has a statutory duty to assist communities in the preparation of neighbourhood development plans and orders and to take plans through a process of examination and referendum. The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) sets out the Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning.

1.2 This statement confirms that the modifications proposed by the examiner's report have been accepted, the draft Kings Somborne Neighbourhood Development Plan will be altered as a result of it; and that this plan may now proceed to referendum.

2. Background

2.1 The Kings Somborne Neighbourhood Plan relates to the area that was designated by Test Valley Borough Council as a neighbourhood area in December 2015. This area corresponds with the Kings Somborne Parish Council boundary that lies within the Test Valley Borough Council Area.

2.2 Following the submission of the Kings Somborne Neighbourhood Plan to the Borough Council, the plan was publicised and representations were invited. The publicity period ended on Tuesday 7 March 2023

2.3 David Hogger was appointed by Test Valley Borough Council with the consent of Kings Somborne Parish Council, to undertake the examination of the Neighbourhood Plan and to prepare a report of the independent examination.

2.4 The examiner's report concludes that subject to making the modifications recommended by the examiner, the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

3. Decision

3.1 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the local planning authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations of an examiner made in a report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4A to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to a neighbourhood development plan.

3.2 Having considered each of the modifications made by the examiner's report and the reasons for them, and the modifications to reflect comments made Test Valley Borough Council in consultation with Kings Somborne Parish Council have decided to accept all the modifications to the draft plan. Table 1 below outlines the alterations made to the draft plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of 2004 Act) in response to each of the Examiner's recommendations and the modifications required in response to comments made at the Regulation 16 consultation. This statement should be read alongside the Examiners report.

Table 1

| Consultee | Support / object / comment | Section / Policy / Paragraph. | Comments | Ref | Examiners Recommendation | Proposed Modification |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----|---|-------------------------------|
| Mr Alex Collins | Comment | Para 1.9 | "With a predominately white population" Whilst this is a statement of fact, I do not see how the skin colour of the residents affects planning of housing needs. Unlike other elements of demographics (e.g. young children needing school places), would we have different policies if this referenced one or more different skin colours? If not, we should remove it. | PM1 | Modify the start of paragraph 1.9 to read: With a predominantly white population of approximately 1,600 | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Examiners Modification | Modification | Para 2.1 | | PM3 | Modify the introductory sentence of paragraph 2.3 to read: To deliver this the vision , the NDP is structured around three core areas: | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Examiners Modification | Modification | KS/E1 | | PM5 | Modify the title of Policy KS/E1 to read: Preserving the Landscape, Features Views and Surrounding Countryside Farmland . | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | KS/E1 | Amend policy to read '1. Applications Development that is likely to have potential for a significant impact on the landscape and views, a Landscape Appraisal shall be prepared will be required in accordance with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Landscape Institute & IEMA) or its successors. | PM6 | Modify the first clause in the policy to read: All Planning Applications that are likely to have potential for a significant impact on the landscape and views, must include a landscape Appraisal shall to be prepared in accordance with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact assessment (Landscape Institute and IEMA) or its successors. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | KS/E1 | Amend policy to read - 5. Development shall be contained within the settlement boundary and reflect the nature and density of building in the proximity | PM7 | Split clause 4 into two separate requirements: 4. Consideration of the settlement pattern shall form part of the Assessment; and 5. Development shall be contained within the settlement boundary and reflect the nature and density of building in the proximity. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Examiners Modification | Modification | KS/E2 | | PM8 | 4- To preserve the separate identities of King's Somborne and Horsebridge, the land between the two communities is identified as a local gap. Development within this area will only be permitted where it would does not lead contribute to the physical or visual coalescence of the communityies, either individually or cumulatively, communityies, either individually or cumulatively, or where it meets essential needs that cannot be met elsewhere. | Accept Examiners Modification |

| Consultee | Support / object / comment | Section / Policy / Paragraph. | Comments | Ref | Examiners Recommendation | Proposed Modification |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|------|--|-------------------------------|
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | KS/E3 | For clarity, the number of the green spaces should be at the beginning of the description, For example: 'LGS01 - Muss Lane Recreation Ground (KSLGS01) | PM9 | Place the site reference number at the start of each area of LGS (e.g. LGS01 – Muss Lane Recreation Ground (KSLGS01)). | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Jennifer and Peter Crouch | Comment | KS/E3 | With regard to policy KS/E3 and the identification of Local Green Spaces (LGSs), I am sure that residents welcome this policy as a means of protecting these areas. However, three to my knowledge are in private ownership, namely LGS4 (opposite the Old Vicarage), LGS11 (Behind Manor Farm) and LGS9 (Up Somborne Down). I understand that any proposed development is treated as though the site is in a Green Belt, but what control is there if work not constituting development but harmful to the appearance and character of the LGS is carried out? Has there been prior discussion with the owners of the areas with a view to them accepting the designation and managing these areas responsibly? I believe historically the owner of LGS4 accepted its designation as an important open area in the 1987 Conservation Area review, but I am not sure whether this remains the position. But what of the other two? It is noteworthy that LGS11 is I believe a SHEELA site and so one would hardly expect much cooperation there. | PM10 | Delete: Allotments – Furzedown Road (KSLGS05). Area directly behind Manor Farm House up to 40m Contour Line (KSLGS11). | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Mr John Pybus | Comment | KS/E3 | With regard to policy KS/E3 and the identification of Local Green Spaces (LGSs), I am sure that residents welcome this policy as a means of protecting these areas. However, three to my knowledge are in private ownership, namely LGS4 (opposite the Old Vicarage), LGS11 (Behind Manor Farm) and LGS9 (Up Somborne Down). I understand that any proposed development is treated as though the site is in a Green Belt, but what control is there if work not constituting development but harmful to the appearance and character of the LGS is carried out? Has there been prior discussion with the owners of the areas with a view to them accepting the designation and managing these areas responsibly? I believe historically the owner of LGS4 accepted its designation as an important open area in the 1987 Conservation Area review, but I am not sure whether this remains the position. But what of the other two? It is noteworthy that LGS11 is I believe a SHEELA site and so one would hardly expect much cooperation there. | PM10 | Delete: Allotments – Furzedown Road (KSLGS05). Area directly behind Manor Farm House up to 40m Contour Line (KSLGS11). | Accept Examiners Modification |
| CB Morgan | Objection | KS/E3 | LGS05 - Allotments – Furzedown Road. As noted at Section 1, planning permission (Ref: 22/01359/OUTS) has been granted for the development of the existing allotments for 18 dwellings (outline) and change of use of the adjacent agricultural land to an allotment (full). The proposed site for the new allotments has been provided by the Trust (in collaboration with the adjoining landowner and developer). The provision of the new allotment site (identified as KSLGS05 in the NP) is clearly dependent upon the housing development coming forward. Or else it is not needed. At this stage, the housing element has an outline planning permission and a further reserved matters application(s) and discharge of conditions will be required before development can commence. As a result, the Site will remain in private agricultural and grazing use until there is certainty that the housing development will be delivered. With the above in mind, the NP is premature in designating this potential new allotment site as LGS. If and when the new allotment is delivered (and it meets the criteria of LGS), only at that point may the Parish Council seek to designate KSLGS05 for LGS as part of any review and further iteration of the NP. However, the current outline planning permission secured the delivery of the replacement allotments site through a Section 106 Agreement and as such should the housing be delivered on the Site the allotments would be secured in perpetuity negating the need for any LGS designation. At this stage of the NP, KSLGS05 needs to be assessed against its current position. The Parish Council has not updated the LGS Background Information and Evidence document and Appendix 2 of the NP refers to the Site's recreational value (as a potential allotment). The NP provides no assessment of the existing site against the requirements of paragraph 102 of the Framework. Currently, the Site is in private agricultural and grazing use with no public access. Accordingly, the Site currently does not have any recreational value and it does not function to "...serve a local community". Furthermore, the site was not previously identified by the Parish as a green area "...of particular importance to them" in accordance with paragraph 101 of the Framework. The designation of KSLGS05 as LGS does not meet basic conditions (a) and (d) and should therefore be removed. | PM10 | Delete: Allotments – Furzedown Road (KSLGS05). Area directly behind Manor Farm House up to 40m Contour Line (KSLGS11). | Accept Examiners Modification |
| CB Morgan | Objection | KS/E3 | KSLGS11 – Area directly behind Manor Farm House up to 40m Contour Line. There is no robust assessment of the proposed LGSs against the requirements of paragraph 102 of the Framework. These requirements, and the Trust's response to them in relation to Ref: KSLGS11, are set out at Table 1. In summary, Table 1, demonstrates that the designation of KSLGS11 as LGS does not meet basic conditions (a) and (d) and should therefore be removed. | PM10 | Delete: Allotments – Furzedown Road (KSLGS05). Area directly behind Manor Farm House up to 40m Contour Line (KSLGS11). | Accept Examiners Modification |

| Consultee | Support / object / comment | Section / Policy / Paragraph. | Comments | Ref | Examiners Recommendation | Proposed Modification |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|------|--|-------------------------------|
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | KS/E5 | Bullet 5 - ' <i>required</i> ' - Does this apply to all development? Bullet 6 - ' <i>should be undertaken</i> ' - When and why? Bullet 7 - ' <i>is required</i> ' - When and why? | PM11 | Insert at the start of both clause 5 and clause 6: For sites other than minor developments, | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Southern Water | Comment | KS/E5 | Southern Water is the statutory water supplier and wastewater undertaker for the parish of Kings Somborne. With reference to criterion 4 of this policy, as the statutory undertaker we cannot currently refuse new connections to our network for either surface water or foul drainage. We strongly recommend therefore that policies are in place to ensure surface water and wastewater drainage systems are kept separate. Page 16 of the Regulation 15 Consultation Statement makes reference to this, however we feel that this could be made more explicit in the policy. We support the changes that were made to criterion 4 since the last consultation, but in order to reflect the above with greater clarity, would recommend the following amendment (new text underlined); 4) New development which increases the flow of wastewater into the sewerage system must be accompanied by a detailed drainage strategy for <u>fully separated systems</u> of foul sewerage and surface water disposal and must not be occupied until the accepted detailed plans for foul and surface water drainage plans are fully constructed. | PM12 | Modify clause 4 to read: New development which increases the flow of wastewater into the sewerage system must be accompanied by a detailed drainage strategy for fully separated systems of foul sewerage and surface water disposal and the development must not be occupied until the accepted approved detailed plans for foul and surface water drainage plans are fully constructed. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | Para 3.27 | A map showing the course of the stream would be helpful. TVBC can assist with mapping if required. | PM13 | Insert a plan which identifies the course of the Somborne Stream. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| CB Morgan | Comment | KS/E6 | This Policy appears to be mainly related to trees and landscaping/planting rather than biodiversity. The criteria within the policy are covered by existing policies in the Test Valley Local Plan (2016) e.g. Policy E2. | PM14 | Delete policy KS/E6 in its entirety. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Examiners Modification | Modification | KS/E8 | | PM15 | Insert a plan which identifies the extent of the New Forest SPA, as it applies to King's Somborne Parish. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| CB Morgan | Objection | KS/H1 | The 41 new homes should be expressed as a minimum. We note that Policy KS/H1 says that "around 41 new homes" will be accommodated. It is recommended that this wording is still not strong enough and the Policy should include the following alternative wording such as "a minimum of" or "at least". This modification would provide clarity that the 41 homes is not a 'ceiling' or 'cap' to development and, therefore, accords with the government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing (paragraph 60 of the Framework). Without this change, the Policy would not meet basic conditions (a) and (d). It is not clear what the Parish Council is trying to achieve with the additional reference to 'utilisation of sites within the settlement boundary with at least 10 houses or more'. This approach will have a negative impact, by effectively acting to restrict growth by impeding small-scale 'infill' opportunities within the settlement boundary and is contrary to Policy COM2 of the Test Valley Revised Local Plan (January 2016). There will also be opportunities for development to come forward outside of the settlement boundary, including rural exception sites etc. The supporting text should refer to Policy COM2 of the Local Plan that provides the broad outline for where development will be appropriate in the 'countryside'. This approach therefore does not meet basic conditions (a), (d) and (e) and should therefore be removed or amended. | PM16 | Delete last part of clause 2: with at least 10 houses or more. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | KS/H1 | <i>With at least 10 houses or more</i> This conflicts with the local plan and the NPPF, as within the settlement boundary, the principle for development is acceptable, and this could be for individual dwellings, and not only schemes of 10 or more. This text should be deleted. | PM16 | Delete last part of clause 2: with at least 10 houses or more. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | KS/H1 | <i>in these proportions as a general guidance</i> This is a policy and not a guideline, and so this text can be deleted. | PM17 | Modify the first sentence of clause 1 to read: In order to meet local need, all new residential developments should provide the following mix of properties in these proportions as a general guideline: | Accept Examiners Modification |

| Consultee | Support / object / comment | Section / Policy / Paragraph. | Comments | Ref | Examiners Recommendation | Proposed Modification |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------|--|-------------------------------|
| Mr Alex Collins | Comment | KS/H2 – Housing Mix | As previously noted during the Reg 14 consultation, the proposed housing mix differs from that identified in the Action Hampshire Housing Needs report. As shown in Fig 12, that suggested a breakdown of needs at that point in time of: 1 Bed – ~5% 2 Bed – ~38% 3 Bed – ~35% 4+ Bed – ~22% It seems that if we are claiming to be working to an evidence base, we should ensure that we are building newer energy-efficient homes in all of these categories roughly according to the demand evidence. Otherwise, a selective approach to the evidence is being taken in not developing for categories surveyed, or only aiming to meeting demand in a category with older, less energy efficient properties. | PM17 | Modify the first sentence of clause 1 to read: In order to meet local need, all new residential developments should provide the following mix of properties in these proportions as a general guideline: | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Jennifer and Peter Crouch | Comment | KS/H2 – Housing Mix | <p>The narrative in paras 4.8 to 4.12 of the KSNDP Reg 16 Consultation is clear that the housing proposals are based fundamentally on the needs of local residents, both in terms of market and affordable housing. I suggest that this is an utterly erroneous approach. No local authority, Borough or Parish, can have any control over the ownership or occupation of market dwellings, and developers will sell to whoever is willing and able to purchase at that point in time. Furthermore, depending on a variety of factors including the housing market generally, developers may not be willing to build to the dwelling mix postulated in policy KS/H2. I recognise that with affordable housing in its various forms the situation is very different and provision has to be made more locally. The Borough Council is able to quantify this need from its waiting list and other data. However, affordable housing is required to be provided under Review Borough Local Plan policies (RBLP) as part of any market housing scheme, and presumably there would be control of occupancy of such dwellings. Furthermore, there are community led schemes permitted beyond the settlement boundary as provided for in the RBLP which could provide for affordable housing. And so some affordable housing, whether or not for Kings Somborne residents specifically, would be provided in any site allocated for development.</p> <p>A more appropriate assessment of housing need would be via a more simple approach. The RBLP provides for 648 new dwellings in the rural areas of Test Valley in the plan period to 2029. Kings Somborne, in common with the other more substantial and well serviced villages in Test Valley would need to consider whether in principle some contribution towards this overall need would be appropriate. And additionally, would the settlement benefit from some additional growth? In assessing future housing provision in the village, I suggest that regard should be had to paras 78 and 79 of the NPPF where it is suggested that development should be located such as to enhance the vitality of a community and provide for market housing where it would significantly increase affordable housing. An Infrastructure Group was set up to assist the preparation of the NDP, but whilst it provided a comprehensive assessment of existing facilities and services, it did not look specifically at their future viability. One thinks immediately of the three 'Ps' – the post office, the primary school and the public house, and these surely should have been the subject of individual examination, but there should be some similar assessment of all facilities and services. Any assessed need for additional housing would then be considered against environmental factors and constraints. In my view one is not looking for a precise number of new dwellings, rather, depending on the sustainability test and the public's general views about growth, one or more sites. Whilst census data, small area population forecasts, past building rates and population projections by age group are all very interesting and are very relevant in assessing housing need at the District/Borough level, I suggest that they have little relevance at the 'macro' level of a Parish.</p> | PM17 | Modify the first sentence of clause 1 to read: In order to meet local need, all new residential developments should provide the following mix of properties in these proportions as a general guideline: | Accept Examiners Modification |

| Consultee | Support / object / comment | Section / Policy / Paragraph. | Comments | Ref | Examiners Recommendation | Proposed Modification |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------|--|-------------------------------|
| Mr John Pybus | Comment | KS/H2 – Housing Mix | <p>The narrative in paras 4.8 to 4.12 of the KSNDP Reg 16 Consultation is clear that the housing proposals are based fundamentally on the needs of local residents, both in terms of market and affordable housing. I suggest that this is an utterly erroneous approach. No local authority, Borough or Parish, can have any control over the ownership or occupation of market dwellings, and developers will sell to whoever is willing and able to purchase at that point in time. Furthermore, depending on a variety of factors including the housing market generally, developers may not be willing to build to the dwelling mix postulated in policy KS/H2. I recognise that with affordable housing in its various forms the situation is very different and provision has to be made more locally. The Borough Council is able to quantify this need from its waiting list and other data. However, affordable housing is required to be provided under Review Borough Local Plan policies (RBLP) as part of any market housing scheme, and presumably there would be control of occupancy of such dwellings. Furthermore, there are community led schemes permitted beyond the settlement boundary as provided for in the RBLP which could provide for affordable housing. And so some affordable housing, whether or not for Kings Somborne residents specifically, would be provided in any site allocated for development.</p> <p>A more appropriate assessment of housing need would be via a more simple approach. The RBLP provides for 648 new dwellings in the rural areas of Test Valley in the plan period to 2029. Kings Somborne, in common with the other more substantial and well serviced villages in Test Valley would need to consider whether in principle some contribution towards this overall need would be appropriate. And additionally, would the settlement benefit from some additional growth? In assessing future housing provision in the village, I suggest that regard should be had to paras 78 and 79 of the NPPF where it is suggested that development should be located such as to enhance the vitality of a community and provide for market housing where it would significantly increase affordable housing. An Infrastructure Group was set up to assist the preparation of the NDP, but whilst it provided a comprehensive assessment of existing facilities and services, it did not look specifically at their future viability. One thinks immediately of the three 'Ps' – the post office, the primary school and the public house, and these surely should have been the subject of individual examination, but there should be some similar assessment of all facilities and services. Any assessed need for additional housing would then be considered against environmental factors and constraints. In my view one is not looking for a precise number of new dwellings, rather, depending on the sustainability test and the public's general views about growth, one or more sites. Whilst census data, small area population forecasts, past building rates and population projections by age group are all very interesting and are very relevant in assessing housing need at the District/Borough level, I suggest that they have little relevance at the 'macro' level of a Parish.</p> | PM17 | Modify the first sentence of clause 1 to read: In order to meet local need, all new residential developments should provide the following mix of properties in these proportions as a general guideline: | Accept Examiners Modification |
| BJC | Comment | KS/H2 | Objection is raised to the Housing Mix Policy KS/H2 – Housing Mix in respect to the other ten dwellings. These are proposed as self or custom build dwellings. The Mix Policy should not be applied to the self or custom build dwellings. The size and number of bedrooms must be judged on design criteria. This usually established in Plot Passports that establish the relevant considerations in order that prospective purchasers can decide whether to make an offer for one of the plots. | PM17 | Modify the first sentence of clause 1 to read: In order to meet local need, all new residential developments should provide the following mix of properties in these proportions as a general guideline: | Accept Examiners Modification |
| CB Morgan | Comment | KS/H2 | The policy is too restrictive and not reflective of the approach taken by the Borough Council in the Local Plan, which simply requires the provision of a mix with reference to the most up to date SHMA (para 5.31). The proposed mix also appears to be based upon a housing need survey in 2017 which is already over five years old. We consider that the Housing Mix policy should be deleted, and like the Local Plan, the NP should simply refer to developments including a mix of properties having regard to the character of the immediate area in the text. In this way, housing mix would be assessed on a site-by-site basis with the inclusion of smaller houses encouraged where needed and appropriate. | PM17 | Modify the first sentence of clause 1 to read: In order to meet local need, all new residential developments should provide the following mix of properties in these proportions as a general guideline: | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | Para 4.23 | <i>The Northern part of the site is visible in long distance views. Development where practical should be limited to the lower Southern side.</i> This text is not needed as the plan only allocates the southern part of the site. | PM18 | Delete the first sentence: The Northern part of the site is visible in long distance views. Development where practical should be limited to the lower Southern area. | Accept Examiners Modification |

| Consultee | Support / object / comment | Section / Policy / Paragraph. | Comments | Ref | Examiners Recommendation | Proposed Modification |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------|--|-------------------------------|
| Jennifer and Peter Crouch | Comment | KS/ALL2 | Site ALL2 was introduced as a housing site at the Regulation 14 stage, and quite frankly it shocked not only myself but several others who have a keen interest in planning matters in the Parish. It is part of the larger site which was the subject of fairly recent planning applications for housing development by Gladman, and which was roundly opposed by the local residents, the Parish Council and refused twice by the Borough Council. An appeal against the first refusal was withdrawn. To permit housing on part of the site – which does not appear to follow any logical boundary – would be to substantially weaken any case against the remaining land being developed. The main and most compelling argument against the Gladman proposals, namely the visual impact and lack of sympathy with the form of the village, would be largely lost if permission was sought on the remaining land. For these reasons I feel that this site is also unacceptable. | PM19 | Modify clauses 3 and 4 to read: 3. Development should be maintained is restricted , if practicable, when considering the site layout to below the 48m contour line to reduce the visual impact from wider views. 4. Landscaping is provided throughout including providing the trees and hedging to the Southeast and northeast boundary of the site to screen from Furzedown Road. In order to mitigate landscape and visual impacts, any development should incorporate a soft boundary to demarcate appropriate planting along the edge of the development where it meets the open countryside. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Mr John Pybus | Comment | KS/ALL2 | Site ALL2 was introduced as a housing site at the Regulation 14 stage, and quite frankly it shocked not only myself but several others who have a keen interest in planning matters in the Parish. It is part of the larger site which was the subject of fairly recent planning applications for housing development by Gladman, and which was roundly opposed by the local residents, the Parish Council and refused twice by the Borough Council. An appeal against the first refusal was withdrawn. To permit housing on part of the site – which does not appear to follow any logical boundary – would be to substantially weaken any case against the remaining land being developed. The main and most compelling argument against the Gladman proposals, namely the visual impact and lack of sympathy with the form of the village, would be largely lost if permission was sought on the remaining land. For these reasons I feel that this site is also unacceptable. | PM19 | Modify clauses 3 and 4 to read: 3. Development should be maintained is restricted , if practicable, when considering the site layout to below the 48m contour line to reduce the visual impact from wider views. 4. Landscaping is provided throughout including providing the trees and hedging to the Southeast and northeast boundary of the site to screen from Furzedown Road. In order to mitigate landscape and visual impacts, any development should incorporate a soft boundary to demarcate appropriate planting along the edge of the development where it meets the open countryside. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| James and Liz Frampton | Comment | KS/ALL2 | We are very concerned about the wording 'at least 10 dwellings'. At the public meetings we were told that the existence of an NDP would mean that planners had to take account of the community wishes. We were led to believe that the number of houses presented were the maximum, thus ensuring small developments. The addition of the words 'at least' changes the emphasis completely. The words were also absent from the Regulation 14 Consultation, the document that residents were asked to comment on. The comments could have been very different if 'at least' had been included because this alludes to the possibility of a much larger development. ALL2 is outside the Settlement Boundary and we feel that it does not comply with Test Valley COM2 policy. It is of a size which could easily facilitate an unacceptable expansion of housing that would overwhelm the village. It is unlikely that any developer would consider the building of just 10 houses when they can see the opportunity for a much larger development. Both of the above points open the door to large developments and we feel the Parish Council is being naïve to put these proposals forward. | PM19 | Modify clauses 3 and 4 to read: 3. Development should be maintained is restricted , if practicable, when considering the site layout to below the 48m contour line to reduce the visual impact from wider views. 4. Landscaping is provided throughout including providing the trees and hedging to the Southeast and northeast boundary of the site to screen from Furzedown Road. In order to mitigate landscape and visual impacts, any development should incorporate a soft boundary to demarcate | Accept Examiners Modification |

| Consultee | Support / object / comment | Section / Policy / Paragraph. | Comments | Ref | Examiners Recommendation | Proposed Modification |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | | | appropriate planting along the edge of the development where it meets the open countryside. | |
| CB Morgan | Comment | KS/ALL2 | <p>The Site is above the 40m contour line and, therefore, would be at odds with the Parish Council's own aspirations in the NP to deliver development below this line to protect the landscape character of the village (Policy KS/E1). There are a number of suitable and available sites that are below the 40m line and, therefore, this adds to our concerns with regards to the robustness of the site selection process. The impact on landscape character is also evidenced by a refusal of a planning application (ref: 16/02378/OUT) in April 2017 for 60 dwellings on the wider site. The reason for refusal states that the development would be "...to the detriment of the prevailing landscape character and established countryside setting, particularly in medium and longer range views from the south and south-east of the application site...".</p> <p>The proposed parcel for the development of around 10 dwellings would create a protrusion of random built form into the open landscape which would be out of character with the existing settlement form and pattern of King's Somborne. Furthermore, a development of 10 dwellings on 0.22ha is around 44dph. Again, we consider that if the Site is to come forward for residential development, a development of c.4-5 dwellings could be accommodated on site which would respond more positively to the character of the village and the site context.</p> | PM19 | <p>Modify clauses 3 and 4 to read:</p> <p>3. Development should be maintained is restricted, if practicable, when considering the site layout to below the 48m contour line to reduce the visual impact from wider views.</p> <p>4. Landscaping is provided throughout including providing the trees and hedging to the Southeast and northeast boundary of the site to screen from Furzedown Road. In order to mitigate landscape and visual impacts, any development should incorporate a soft boundary to demarcate appropriate planting along the edge of the development where it meets the open countryside.</p> | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Jennifer and Peter Crouch | Comment | KS/ALL3 | <p>Site ALL 3 now has planning permission for 18 dwellings and a relocation of the existing allotments, but with an area of 1 hectare this represents a fairly low density, and in some measure represents a wasted opportunity. Given that housing needs generally, whether from within the Parish or elsewhere, are predominantly for lower cost market housing as well as affordable housing, the NDP could be used to encourage a larger number of dwellings. I realise that the developer Shoreditch Homes specialises in the lower density end of the market and with permission granted may well want to build to that scheme. However, more houses here on a site which is within the settlement boundary would reduce needs elsewhere.</p> | PM20 | <p>Insert after paragraph 4.25 a new paragraph 4.26 (and accompanying footnote), to read:Test Valley Borough Council has granted outline planning permission on the site for 18 dwellings (with all matters other than access, to be reserved) and full permission for change of use of land from agricultural to allotments, with associated access, erection of a storage/toilet building and a car parking area.** Application Ref: 22/01359/OUTS.</p> | Accept Examiners Modification |

| Consultee | Support / object / comment | Section / Policy / Paragraph. | Comments | Ref | Examiners Recommendation | Proposed Modification |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------|---|-------------------------------|
| Mr John Pybus | Comment | KS/ALL3 | Site ALL 3 now has planning permission for 18 dwellings and a relocation of the existing allotments, but with an area of 1 hectare this represents a fairly low density, and in some measure represents a wasted opportunity. Given that housing needs generally, whether from within the Parish or elsewhere, are predominantly for lower cost market housing as well as affordable housing, the NDP could be used to encourage a larger number of dwellings. I realise that the developer Shoreditch Homes specialises in the lower density end of the market and with permission granted may well want to build to that scheme. However, more houses here on a site which is within the settlement boundary would reduce needs elsewhere. | PM20 | Insert after paragraph 4.25 a new paragraph 4.26 (and accompanying footnote), to read: Test Valley Borough Council has granted outline planning permission on the site for 18 dwellings (with all matters other than access, to be reserved) and full permission for change of use of land from agricultural to allotments, with associated access, erection of a storage/toilet building and a car parking area.* * Application Ref: 22/01359/OUTS. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | KS/ALL3 | Delete from policy and move to new paragraph to read ' 4.26 This site has been given outline application for 18 dwellings (with all matters other than access to be reserved) and Full Permission application for change of use of land from agricultural to allotments with associated access, erection of a storage/toilet building and car parking area by Test Valley Borough Council (22/01359/OUTS) on the 18th of October 2022. ' However, as worded there is likely to be conflict between what has been granted planning permission and the conditions/legal agreement and the requirements of this policy. A | PM20 | Insert after paragraph 4.25 a new paragraph 4.26 (and accompanying footnote), to read: Test Valley Borough Council has granted outline planning permission on the site for 18 dwellings (with all matters other than access, to be reserved) and full permission for change of use of land from agricultural to allotments, with associated access, erection of a storage/toilet building and a car parking area.* * Application Ref: 22/01359/OUTS. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | KS/ALL3 | Add following text to beginning of policy ' 1 ha of land at the Allotments site is allocated for 18 dwellings, including affordable housing. The following will need to be addressed: This site is allocated for 18 dwellings | PM21 | Delete all the first paragraph in the policy. Delete: This site is allocated for 18 dwellings and insert: Land at the Allotments site is allocated for 18 dwellings, including affordable housing. The following will need to be addressed: | Accept Examiners Modification |
| BJC | Comment | KS/H8 | Paragraph 4.29 of the Neighbourhood Development Plan refers to Design Guidance. Design is a fundamental consideration for the proposals for the site. Plot passports must be prepared for the self build and custom build dwellings. They must cover the design including building heights; plot size and widths; building lines and boundary treatments; building orientation; landscaping and the public realm; building frontage and townscape features; car parking and cycle provision and recycling and storage. The affordable houses will be designed to reflect the guidance proposed for the self build and custom build dwellings so that there is an overall conformity. All of these matters can be discussed with the Parish and the Neighbourhood Development Plan Team. | PM22 | Modify the first bullet point to read: New development should demonstrate how it they conforms to with the King's Somborne Design Guidance in Appendix 4, and planning applications will be assessed against including the check list in the Design Guidance. | Accept Examiners Modification |

| Consultee | Support / object / comment | Section / Policy / Paragraph. | Comments | Ref | Examiners Recommendation | Proposed Modification |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|------|---|--|
| CB Morgan | Comment | KS/H8 | The Trust support the NP's intention to deliver high quality and well-designed development at the village. Further, the Design Guidance document prepared by Aecom provides a useful and simplified framework for applicants to follow. Nevertheless, the Policy wording appears to be too prescriptive, onerous and replicates some of the suggested approach in the Design Guidance. For clarity, we recommend that the wording of the Policy should be amended to: "Development in the Neighbourhood Area should be of a high quality and respect residential amenity and local character and should have regard to the King's Somborne Design Guidance". | PM22 | Modify the first bullet point to read: New development should demonstrate how it they conforms to with the King's Somborne Design Guidance in Appendix 4, and planning applications will be assessed against including the check list in the Design Guidance. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | KS/H8 | Amend bullet 1 to read: 1. New developments should demonstrate how they conform with the King's Somborne Design Guidance in Appendix 4 and planning applications will be assessed against including the Checklist in the Design Guidance.' And number the criteria in Bulets 2 and 3. | PM22 | Modify the first bullet point to read: New development should demonstrate how it they conforms to with the King's Somborne Design Guidance in Appendix 4, and planning applications will be assessed against including the check list in the Design Guidance. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| CB Morgan | Comment | KS/F1 | The current 'allotments' at Furzedown Road are identified as a as a 'Key Community Facility / Asset'. A plan should be included to identify the location of the 'community assets'. As noted at Section 3 regarding LGSS, at this stage of the NP it would be premature to identify the potential new allotment site – identified as Site Ref:KSLGS05 – as a community asset given that it is not currently been delivered and is reliant upon the housing development coming forward. | PM23 | Insert a plan identifying the community facilities listed under paragraph 5.9. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | KS/F2 | Amend bullet 1 ro read ' Services to all new developments shall be routed underground where possible so as not to perpetuate the adverse impact on the street scene and assist with reliability. | PM24 | In the first clause insert the word adverse before impact. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Examiners Modification | Modification | Plans | | PM25 | Make it clear which Figures (plans) form part of the Policies Map. | Accept Examiners Modification |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | Para 3.2 | A map showing the Landscape Character areas could be helpful here | | | Minor modification by paragraph 12(6)(e) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | KS/E2 | It would help the reader and the flow of the document of the policy followed the supporting text. | | | Minor modification by paragraph 12(6)(e) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | Figure 3 | The first map should be labelled 3a and second map should be labelled 3b | | | Minor modification by paragraph 12(6)(e) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | Para 3.30 | It would aid the flow of the document if figure 5 was inserted here. | | | Minor modification by paragraph 12(6)(e) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. |

| Consultee | Support / object / comment | Section / Policy / Paragraph. | Comments | Ref | Examiners Recommendation | Proposed Modification |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----|--------------------------|--|
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | Figure 6 | The different shades of green do not show well in the printed document, and so should be amended to make them clearer. TVBC can help with this mapping. | | | Minor modification by paragraph 12(6)(e) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. |
| Test Valley Borough Council | Comment | Page 34 Photo | This map is confusing, as it doesn't show the site boundaries, and therefore should be deleted | | | Minor modification by paragraph 12(6)(e) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. |