

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning Policy](#)
Subject: Draft Local Plan 2040
Date: 25 March 2024 16:26:31

Caution: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I have a number of comments to make as follows:

Strategic Gap

It is good to see the Strategic Gap between Romsey and North Baddesley is largely being kept.

It is noted that the current gap between the Abbey Industrial Estate and North Baddesley is to be narrowed under the draft plan to allow for an extension to the Industrial Estate.

The remaining gap should be kept and the trees minimizing the visual gap should be protected for the people living on that edge of North Baddesley. If possible, more trees should be planted to thicken the visual screen between the edge of North Baddesley and the Industrial Estate. Hopefully, this would also reduce any noise and other pollution from the addition to the Industrial Estate.

General Points about the Impact of More Housing in Southern Test Valley

It is understood the housing required is calculated by a set methodology, taking into account current population trends within the borough and an estimate of those likely to move from outside the borough. Where the proposed housing is near a boundary with another borough, such as the proposed Velmore Farm Estate it makes sense to liaise with that other borough, in that case Eastleigh, as many individuals will not realise that by moving house a short distance they are moving from one borough to another.

Liaising with any adjacent borough should also include infrastructure, such as roads and sewers, where these may impact both boroughs.

Any increase in population requires the facilities to support that population, such as GP surgeries, schools and so on. While schools are often part of many large new Estates (it is noted there is no new junior school at Abbotswood) there does not appear to be any increase in GP surgeries in Romsey. Currently, a routine GP appointment has to be booked 4 weeks or more in advance, unless there is good reason for an earlier appointment, but this delay will only increase, to the detriment of current residents, if there are no new GP surgeries and all the proposed new housing is completed. It is appreciated that GPs are self-employed but under contract to the NHS and, therefore, it requires liaison with either a GP practice or the NHS to get anything done. I would suggest that no planning permission is granted for new housing in Romsey until such time as the position with the GPs in Romsey improves. This may also apply to Andover but I have no knowledge of the GP position in Andover.

The current GP surgeries in Romsey are in places where an extension to the existing buildings would have to be done on land that is currently used for parking, which would reduce the parking available. Not a good idea with an aging population that may have mobility problems. One solution may be for a surgery to be provided as part of the planning permission requirements and provided to the NHS for occupation by a GP practice in the same way that roads are built by the developers before being adopted by the local council. This is slightly different from the position that I understand (but possibly misunderstand) in Abbotswood when there was just a site for a new surgery not a building actually in place.

The Test and other chalk streams are already being polluted by discharge of untreated water. Any increase in population is likely to increase this problem unless new sewage treatment works are required as part of the conditions for planning permission being granted. I would suggest such new sewage treatment works have to be in place before the new houses are built. Developers have a nasty habit of promising things that somehow become too difficult or too expensive when they are expected to actually do anything. This would require liaising with

Southern Water but there would then at least be a chance that dumping untreated sewage would not get worse and the position might even improve if any new treatment works took some of the current waste water from existing treatment works.

Provision of water to these proposed new properties would also have to be considered. Will there be any new reservoirs or other storage facilities so that water is not drawn from the Test and other rivers and streams to provide water for the new housing? It may be possible for education to reduce some need for water, such as not washing clothes after only wearing them once, but an increase in population will result in an increase in demand for water. While it does fall from the sky it needs to be collected and treated before being provided to residents. Would it be possible for all new houses to have water collection tanks to take rainwater from house roofs that may then be use for watering gardens, flushing toilets, cleaning cars and other things where drinking standard water is not necessary? At the very least it should be possible to have water butts so some rainwater can be collected at each property for watering plants.

There will also be a need for the provision of water to any new industrial sites and the treatment of used water from industrial sites. Is this expected to fall on the current provision for clean water and dirty water treatment or will there be new facilities for this new building?

We are all being encouraged to use more electricity and less gas so any new building, whether industrial or residential, will need good electricity supplies. This will include the higher electricity supplies that may be required for car chargers, which may be greater than the current standard supply. What provision is being made for this greater electricity supply. In addition, will there be consideration given to the possible increase required for existing properties whose owners or occupiers wish to install a car charging facility? What about public car charging facilities for visitors or those who are unable to park near their residence but wish to drive an electric vehicle? Paragraph 5.17 refers to being ready for net zero but there is no reference to more detail further on in the Draft Plan as to how this will be achieved. Will the new housing have a gas supply or electricity only?

It is clear from other paragraphs in Chapter 5 that developers will have to have due regard in the design of any new buildings to minimize the use of power to heat or cool the buildings. This will be of benefit to the occupiers of the buildings because their fuel bills should be lower if large amounts of power are not required to heat or cool the buildings. However, this often means the buildings will initially be more expensive.

Developers prefer to build what will make the most profit for them rather than the buildings that are actually required. This includes reducing the amount of 'affordable' housing, for example. Might this be avoided by making it a condition of any planning permission for the affordable housing is built first? The need for new housing is likely to be greatest in that part of the population requiring affordable housing rather than those who can afford to purchase their own property.

The developers will complain bitterly about being required to do things of value to the community (about which they care not a jot even if they say they care greatly) before they make a profit but if they want the opportunity to make profits why should the associated costs fall elsewhere just to increase those profits. I am quite aware that many pensioners depend on dividends for all or part of their income, either directly or indirectly, but I consider that bonuses paid to the executives of development companies could be limited and these costs should primarily come from such bonuses. Clearly you have no control over such things but if you are negotiating this might be something to include in the mix.

Roads and Traffic

The proposed local plan includes traffic surveys and expected increases in traffic. Currently, roads are extremely busy at certain times of day and to increase the local population and thus increase the traffic will cause more congestion and pollution from traffic waiting at junctions. In an ideal world all measures to increase the use of public transport and non-motor transport will be taken up so the road traffic problems will not increase. However, the default for many people is that they have to use their car to get almost anywhere. Therefore, practically speaking, what will be done to:

1. Improve the current road layout so that traffic congestion is minimized not vastly increased?

2. Non-motor travel is encouraged, including, where possible, segregated cycle paths where cyclists are given priority not pedestrians (and, if possible, pedestrians are actively discouraged from using designated cycle paths instead of treating all cycle paths as shared paths)?

I would point out that if some parts of the M27 are closed the diverted traffic through Romsey means that town effectively comes to a standstill. This will only happen more if there is more local traffic.

Cycling and walking may be encouraged by having a decent infrastructure. This would include continuous segregated cycle paths. For example, the segregated cycle path in North Baddesley stops towards the centre of the village, where there is most need.

I cycle frequently and find that it is most dangerous, in terms of close passes and other inconsiderate driving, going through North Baddesley where there is no cycle path available (but residential roads can be used at the cost of going a long way round) and Ampfield, where there is no alternative. This tends to be worst where there is traffic both ways and drivers do not want to wait until it is safe to overtake. Again, it is partly a matter of driver education but proper cycle infrastructure would be a big step in the right direction.

Other Considerations

Every time green field sites are used to provide housing and industrial buildings there is less land for farming and the environment. Wonderful words about replacing green fields with better quality environment are meaningless. Less farmland to produce food means more food has to be imported, possibly with lower standards of production. Consideration needs to be given to these matters.

It is understood that more housing is required now. However, what will the situation be in 30-40 years' time when the majority of the "baby-boomer" generation have died? Will there be too many houses that then have to be removed to increase green spaces at great cost? Use of brown field sites, where at all possible, will reduce such current use of greenfield sites. In addition, to what extent could some of the housing required be provided in smaller numbers of new homes scattered in a larger number of areas rather than large estates? This may also help those brought up in villages who currently stand no chance of being able to live in the place they have grown up.

Finally, has any thought been given to providing plots with services to self-builders? This could be ideal for some of those requiring affordable housing or for whom housing in the village where they have grown up is otherwise unaffordable due to the exorbitant price of building land or houses in villages?

The mix of housing should be carefully considered. Smaller properties for older people wanting to downsize should not just be "retirement living" flats or housing in blocks with high service charges but bungalows, so stairs are not an issue, with gardens so that those who enjoy gardening may continue to do so without the concern that goes with a large garden. Retirement villages, for example Stanbridge Earls, are fine for those who are well off and can afford them but do not cater for everyone. In addition, not everyone wants to be in a community where everyone is over a certain age.

I have tried to be constructive in the points put forward and I hope that some, if not all, of these points are taken into consideration in revising the draft local plan 2040.

Alison Martin