

#253

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, April 01, 2024 11:29:32 AM
Last Modified: Monday, April 01, 2024 11:33:16 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:43
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

Title Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms/Dr/Other(please state)*

Mr

Q2

First Name*

Gregory

Q3

Surname*

Michalczyk

Q4

Organisation*(If responding on behalf of an organisation)

Kimpton Parish Council

Q5

Email address *

[REDACTED]

Q6

Postal address*

N/a

Q7

Insert any general comments that do not relate to a specific paragraph number or policy in the general comments box below.*If you are suggesting a change is needed to the draft Local Plan or supporting document, it would be helpful if you could include suggested revised wording. If you are commenting on a document supporting the draft Local Plan (such as a topic paper, or the Sustainability Appraisal), please indicate so.

Draft Local Plan 2040 Regulation 18 Stage 2 Public Consultation

This response from Kimpton Parish Council comments on two items, Northern Area Policy 7 (NA7): Land to the East of Ludgershall and Northern Area Policy 8 (NA8): Land to the South East of Ludgershall.

These policies propose the allocation of land for strategic housing of 1500 dwellings (350 dwellings (NA7) and 1150 dwellings (NA8)) on land within Kimpton Parish. The Parish Council do not understand how these policies have been proposed as they are in direct contradiction to Spatial Strategy Policy 1 (SS1): Settlement Hierarchy, which states that strategic allocations would be made in Tier 1 or 2 settlements and not in a Tier 4 settlement.

These proposed sites do not fit with the profile of a Tier 4 Open Countryside settlement such as Kimpton. We are concerned for the long term consequences on Kimpton village and the hamlets of Great Shoddesden and Little Shoddesden brought about by the change in population distribution within the Parish should this land be developed for housing. The 2021 census data indicates the Parish has a population of 370 people with 162 dwellings. The proposed land allocation would result in an increase of over 1000% in dwellings and nearly 1300% increase in population (assuming an average three person household in the proposed allocation).

We need an understanding of the demographics of expected residents of these developments, assessed on a site by site basis to help understand the proposed mix of housing and therefore the required health and community facilities and leisure and retail services to support these developments and the rest of the Parish.

We are concerned about the housing density of the developments, although acknowledge they are better than the proposed densities of allocations by Wiltshire CC at Ludgershall and at some of the current developments in Andover.

If these two sites are intended to be considered as part of the Kimpton Parish, it is possible that residents there may not consider they have a vested interest in the southern area of the Parish, both the settlement areas within Kimpton village and the open countryside around the village. This risks, over time, a change in the structure of the Parish Council with conflicting priorities between different areas of the Parish. A result could be a lack of appreciation/understanding of the broader Parish needs and this risks a gradual decline of the southern area of the Parish.

We have, in recent months, begun to discuss the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan for the village and the wider Parish. We are aware that part of the process to create such a plan would be to undertake a Housing Needs Survey. We are sure that if we held such a survey it would not identify a requirement to provide 1500 dwellings within the Parish. We will obviously work with the TVBC Neighbourhood Planning Team in the creation of any such plan and would look for guidance as to how the plan should be written in the context of these two proposed sites.

Items 4.85 and 4.86 in the Local Plan refer to these developments being situated alongside the proposed Wiltshire CC site allocation of approximately 1,220 dwellings at Land at Empress Way. This implies a great reliance on Wiltshire CC and the Ludgershall and Tidworth communities to provide health and community facilities and leisure and retail services to support these developments. Can TVBC confirm that Wiltshire CC does indeed plan to provide such supporting facilities and services for housing within the boundary of TVBC, as we have not been able to find reference to this in the Wiltshire CC Local Plan.

Based on the perceived reliance on Wiltshire CC to support the developments is there an argument for the developments to be formalised as part of Ludgershall? This could mean redrawing the boundary to include the developments within the Ludgershall Town Council boundary, and therefore also the Wiltshire boundary. Alternatively, would these developments sit better in their own parish within the TVBC boundary, leaving the remainder of Kimpton Parish as a true Tier 4 Settlement?

If implemented without addressing the comments we have made in this document, Kimpton Parish Council does not believe that these two policies will deliver the high quality sustainable developments envisioned by TVBC.

Q8

Insert any specific comments in the general comments box below, indicating which paragraph, policy or matter your comments relate to where possible.*If you are suggesting a change is needed to the draft Local Plan or supporting document, it would be helpful if you could include suggested revised wording.

1 - Northern Area Policy 7 (NA7): Land to the East of Ludgershall

We are concerned about any potential flood risk on the developments as identified in item 4.95 and any additional knock on risk to other areas

Kimpton is prone to flooding in parts and has had extensive work undertaken in recent months to protect the village from overflowing sewers brought about by extensive ground water. We would want assurance that any new developments have adequate drainage facilities and water treatment solutions in place so as not to compound existing issues.

We are concerned about any potential damage to the environment caused by the developments. There are specific ecology considerations that cause us concern.

Item 4.88 – Identifies the need to consider the impact of the development on the setting of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape

Item 4.91 - Identifies the need for appropriate mitigation to any impact on the Salisbury Plain Special Protection Area (SPA) and its significance for the conservation of bird species

Our expectation is that any mitigation to ecological concerns is not just the bare minimum of measures

We are concerned about the use of Kimpton village as a “short cut” to avoid traffic congestion on the A342 and that traffic from this site would exacerbate the issue

Some traffic already routinely uses Kimpton village as a cut through route to get to the A303 in both directions

We have seen previously that this issue is exacerbated during road closures

There is ongoing concern that the speed of traffic through the village is excessive and Kimpton Parish Council are already looking at measures to deter speeding.

Additional traffic is likely to compound the problem as people seek to get to work/school

The Local Plan 2040 Preliminary Transport Assessment January 2024, published as a supporting document to the Local Plan, focuses on Andover in the Northern Area of the borough and defines Wiltshire, therefore Ludgershall and Tidworth, as an area of less detailed modelling (AoLDM). Kimpton Parish Council believes that detailed modelling of traffic flows using the A342 from the site both eastbound towards Kimpton and Andover and westbound towards Ludgershall and Tidworth is essential to ensure that infrastructure to support potential traffic flows is identified and delivered

As previously noted, we believe the impacts to the A342 to be significant. Item 6.3.10 in the Transport Assessment identifies the A342 (Weyhill Road) is expected to have an increase in traffic flow of greater than 100 pcu.

Figure 5.4 in the Transport Assessment identifies in the 2019 base model volume that the centre of Tidworth as an area which at that time was over capacity

The A342 is already a very busy road and at peak hours it can be dangerous to access and/or cross the road

Draft Local Plan 2040 Regulation 18 Stage 2 Public Consultation

There is no mention of traffic calming/management anywhere in the plan

The assessment of this site in Appendix IV Housing Sites Appraisals (Ref 61) assigns a Positive or Strongly Positive rating to in the answers to questions 2B, 2D, 3H. This rating appears to be assigned based on the site being "Within 400m of a frequent bus route". Whilst the entrance to the site might be within 400m of a frequent bus route, the furthest part of the site is expected to be much further away. Surely the rating should be assessed against the furthest someone would have to walk from their property to reach the bus service. We therefore believe that these items should be reassessed and regraded accordingly.

There are major works required to support access to the site as described in item 4.92, which although noted in the Local Plan are unplanned and uncoded

There is reference to access via the layby on the A342. We believe there will be significant consequences to the flow of traffic and increased risk of accidents.

In addition we expect that increased traffic flows will cause traffic delays at peak times and a degradation of road surfaces.

Figure 4.8 identifies the proposed access point to the land and figure 4.9 identifies the proposed access to point to the Land to the South East of Ludgershall (NA8), neither diagram identifies the access point to the other site. In reality, the two access points will be opposite each other resulting in, we expect, the need for a major junction at this point, either a roundabout or crossroads with traffic light controls. We would expect that a major junction of this size would require extensive signage and lighting thus increasing the impact of light pollution in the area. We believe this should be highlighted as a consequence of the proposal.

There are major works required to support waste and water treatment for the sites, which although noted in the Local Plan are unplanned and uncoded

Southern Water are undertaking the creation of a 5 year plan at present, however this is not sufficiently progressed to know if it encompasses adequate measures to address the water needs for the existing community as well as any proposed new developments

We are concerned about any potential light pollution caused by the developments, in particular for residents of Great Shoddesden and Little Shoddesden but also including those on higher ground within the Parish. This is in addition to the light pollution caused by the junction to access the site referred to above

We are concerned that there is no statement about provision of charging facilities for electric vehicles in the Local Plan

Particularly with the ban on the sale of petrol and diesel powered vehicles from 2035 the need for sufficient charging facilities will increase dramatically over the period of the plan. We believe this should be specifically addressed by TVBC in the plan

This links back to the need to understand the potential demographic of residents within these sites and their needs

We are concerned that there is no reference to the demand on utilities and the capacity for power to these sites

We would want assurance that current supplies would not be jeopardised before/during or after housing is established

2 - Northern Area Policy 8 (NA8): Land to the South East of Ludgershall

We are concerned about any potential flood risk on the developments as identified in item 4.107 and any additional knock on risk to other areas

Draft Local Plan 2040 Regulation 18 Stage 2 Public Consultation

Kimpton is prone to flooding in parts and has had extensive work undertaken in recent months to protect the village from overflowing sewers brought about by extensive ground water. We would want assurance that any new developments have adequate drainage facilities and water treatment solutions in place so as not to compound existing issues.

We are concerned about any potential damage to the environment caused by the developments. There are specific ecology considerations that cause us concern.

Item 4.99 identifies the need to consider the impact of the development on the setting of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape

4.100 identifies that Willis Wood as an ancient woodland will require an

ecological buffer to protect it

Item 4.101 identifies the need for appropriate mitigation to any impact on the Salisbury Plain Special Protection Area (SPA) and its significance for the conservation of bird species

Our expectation is that any mitigation is not just the bare minimum of measures

We are concerned about the use of Kimpton village as a "short cut" to avoid traffic congestion on the A342 and that traffic from this site would exacerbate the issue

Some traffic already routinely uses Kimpton village as a cut through route to get to the A303 in both directions

We have seen previously that this issue is exacerbated during road closures

There is ongoing concern that the speed of traffic through the village is excessive and Kimpton Parish Council are already looking at measures to deter speeding.

Additional traffic is likely to compound the problem as people seek to get to work/school

The Local Plan 2040 Preliminary Transport Assessment January 2024, published as a supporting document to the Local Plan, focuses on Andover in the Northern Area of the borough and defines Wiltshire, therefore Ludgershall and Tidworth, as an area of less detailed modelling (AoLDM). Kimpton Parish Council believes that detailed modelling of traffic flows using the A342 from the site both eastbound towards Kimpton and Andover and westbound Ludgershall and Tidworth is essential to ensure that infrastructure to support potential traffic flows is identified and delivered

As previously noted, we believe the impacts to the A342 to be significant. Item 6.3.10 in the Transport Assessment identifies the A342 (Weyhill Road) is expected to have an increase in traffic flow of greater than 100 pcu.

Figure 5.4 in the Transport Assessment identifies in the 2019 base model volume that the centre of Tidworth as an area which at that time was over capacity

The A342 is already a very busy road and at peak hours it can be dangerous to access and/or cross the road

There is no mention of traffic calming/management anywhere in the plan

There are major works required to support access to the site as described in item 4.103, which although noted in the Local Plan are unplanned and un-costed. Item 4.103 states that the site is intended to be accessed via a bridge across the railway line used by the MOD. We understand that there would be significant cost and layers of approval required to get permissions to build such a bridge

Is this really a feasible solution to provide access to the site? What alternative access solutions have TVBC considered?

The Housing Trajectory (January 2024) supporting document Figure 1 suggest that the first houses could be delivered on this site in 2031/32. Presumably the bridge across the railway line will need to be built prior to any construction works taking place? Is it really feasible that the bridge will be constructed in time to meet this trajectory?

Figure 4.9 identifies the proposed access point to the land and figure 4.8 identifies the proposed access to point to the Land East of Ludgershall (NA7), neither diagram identifies the access point to the other site. In reality, the two access points will be opposite each other resulting in, we expect, the need for a major junction at this point, either a roundabout or crossroads with traffic light controls. We would expect that a major junction of this size would require extensive signage and lighting thus increasing the impact of light pollution in the area. We believe this should be highlighted as a consequence of the plan.

Item 4.103 also suggests that this site would be used to provide an access route for the proposed site at Empress Way on the Wiltshire side of the border

If the two sites are joined what mitigation will be put in place to stop the roads on both developments becoming "short cuts" to avoid traffic congestion on the A342?

The barrier between this site and the site at Empress is Shoddessden Lane, which runs from Great Shoddessden at the south end to Ludgershall at the north end. This is a single track road which is unsuitable to be widened to accommodate any access to either development.

What infrastructure are TVBC proposing to allow an access route to be created between the site and the Empress Way site?

Shoddessden Lane would also be entirely unsuitable as an access point to either site for any construction traffic. TVBC must ensure that Shoddessden Lane is protected from the impact of construction works

Any link between the two sites effectively joins Test Valley with Wiltshire and over time the developments are likely to be seen as one single site. This raises further questions as to how the sites will be managed in a consistent way by the councils in the future.

The assessment of this site in Appendix IV Housing Sites Appraisals (Ref 324) assigns a Positive or Strongly Positive rating to in the answers to questions 2B, 2D, 3H. This rating appears to be assigned based on the site being "Within 400m of a frequent bus route". Whilst the entrance to the site might be within 400m of a frequent bus route, the furthest part of the site is expected to be much further away. Surely the rating should be assessed against the furthest someone would have to walk from their property to reach the bus service. We therefore believe that these items should be reassessed and regraded accordingly.

There are major works required to support waste and water treatment for the sites, which although noted in the Local Plan are unplanned and uncoded

Southern Water are undertaking the creation of a 5 year plan at present, however this is not sufficiently progressed to know if it encompasses adequate measures to address the water needs for the existing community as well as any proposed new developments

Item 4.104 refers to the Public Rights of Way which cross the site and the need to enhance these routes should housing be developed on the site. Our expectation is that any enhancement is not just the bare minimum. We would expect that these routes will not just be a pathway between properties and through car parking spaces

We are concerned about any potential light pollution caused by the developments in particular for residents of Great Shoddessden and Little Shoddessden but including those on higher ground within the Parish. This is in addition to the light pollution caused by the junction to access the site referred to above

Draft Local Plan 2040 Regulation 18 Stage 2 Public Consultation

We are concerned that there is no statement about provision of charging facilities for electric vehicles in the Local Plan

Particularly with the ban on the sale of petrol and diesel powered vehicles from 2035 the need for sufficient charging facilities will increase dramatically over the period of the plan. We believe this should be specifically addressed by TVBC in the plan

This links back to the need to understand the potential demographic of residents within these sites and their needs

We are concerned that there is no reference to the demand on utilities and the capacity for power to these sites

We would want assurance that current supplies would not be jeopardised before/during or after housing is established

#254

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, April 01, 2024 11:39:43 AM
Last Modified: Monday, April 01, 2024 11:42:05 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:22
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

Title Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms/Dr/Other(please state)*

Mr

Q2

First Name*

Gregory

Q3

Surname*

Michalczyk

Q4

Organisation*(If responding on behalf of an organisation)

Kimpton Parish Council

Q5

Email address *

[REDACTED]

Q6

Postal address*

N/a

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

Insert any general comments that do not relate to a specific paragraph number or policy in the general comments box below.*If you are suggesting a change is needed to the draft Local Plan or supporting document, it would be helpful if you could include suggested revised wording. If you are commenting on a document supporting the draft Local Plan (such as a topic paper, or the Sustainability Appraisal), please indicate so.

Q8

Insert any specific comments in the general comments box below, indicating which paragraph, policy or matter your comments relate to where possible.*If you are suggesting a change is needed to the draft Local Plan or supporting document, it would be helpful if you could include suggested revised wording.

Removal of Settlement Boundary

This response from Kimpton Parish Council comments on item 3.43 of the Local Plan on the proposed removal of the settlement boundary from Tier 4 parishes. Kimpton parish is named as an affected parish.

We do not intend to explicitly confirm support or opposition to this proposal. We see potential positive and negative implications for both the retention and removal of the settlement boundaries. These are;

The removal of the settlement boundary effectively makes the whole of the parish 'open countryside'- we understand that this means there will be tighter criteria to be met on any proposed development in the parish. Can TVBC confirm that our understanding is correct?

The removal of the settlement boundary would we understand impact any proposed development within the existing boundaries. This may impact residents who either now or in the future wish to undertake development of their property eg an extension on the side of a house or a replacement garage, making such development more challenging than it would be if the settlement boundary remains in place. Can TVBC advise on the impact the removal of the settlement boundary would have on residents?

Kimpton Parish is considering the development of a Neighbourhood Plan. It is unclear whether the retention or removal of the settlement boundary would affect the way that the plan is written. Can TVBC confirm whether any content would be allowed or disallowed by the retention or removal of the settlement boundary?

As TVBC will be aware AI technology is rapidly evolving as a tool for analysing anything and everything. The removal of the settlement boundary would remove a piece of information from being available to AI tools and could lead to different decisions being made from those which would be made if the boundary is retained.

#255

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, April 01, 2024 11:55:28 AM
Last Modified: Monday, April 01, 2024 11:56:46 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:18
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

Title Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms/Dr/Other(please state)*

Mr

Q2

First Name*

Gregory

Q3

Surname*

Michalczyk

Q4

Organisation*(If responding on behalf of an organisation)

Kimpton Parish Council

Q5

Email address *

[REDACTED]

Q6

Postal address*

N/a

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

Insert any general comments that do not relate to a specific paragraph number or policy in the general comments box below.*If you are suggesting a change is needed to the draft Local Plan or supporting document, it would be helpful if you could include suggested revised wording. If you are commenting on a document supporting the draft Local Plan (such as a topic paper, or the Sustainability Appraisal), please indicate so.

Q8

Insert any specific comments in the general comments box below, indicating which paragraph, policy or matter your comments relate to where possible.*If you are suggesting a change is needed to the draft Local Plan or supporting document, it would be helpful if you could include suggested revised wording.

Strategic Employment Sites

Kimpton Parish Council notes Spatial Strategy Policy 8 (SS8): Meeting Employment Land Requirement and the inclusion of Land South of Thruxton Aerodrome, Thruxton as a proposed employment site

Not enough information is currently available to enable Kimpton Parish Council to opine on their support/opposition to the proposed employment sites at present, however there is an overarching concern about the increase in traffic that would be generated by this site.

We would be concerned about the use of Kimpton village as a "short cut" to access the site from the A342

Some traffic already routinely uses Kimpton village as a cut through route to get to the A303 in both directions, this development would likely exacerbate this issue

We have seen previously that this issue is exacerbated during road closures

There is ongoing concern that the speed of traffic through the village is excessive and Kimpton Parish Council are already looking at measures to deter speeding.

Additional traffic is likely to compound the problem as people seek to get to work

#265

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, April 01, 2024 3:13:11 PM
Last Modified: Monday, April 01, 2024 3:14:44 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:32
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

Title Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms/Dr/Other(please state)*

Mr

Q2

First Name*

Gregory

Q3

Surname*

Michalczyk

Q4

Organisation*(If responding on behalf of an organisation)

Kimpton Parish Council

Q5

Email address *

[REDACTED]

Q6

Postal address*

N/a

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

Insert any general comments that do not relate to a specific paragraph number or policy in the general comments box below.*If you are suggesting a change is needed to the draft Local Plan or supporting document, it would be helpful if you could include suggested revised wording. If you are commenting on a document supporting the draft Local Plan (such as a topic paper, or the Sustainability Appraisal), please indicate so.

Q8

Insert any specific comments in the general comments box below, indicating which paragraph, policy or matter your comments relate to where possible.*If you are suggesting a change is needed to the draft Local Plan or supporting document, it would be helpful if you could include suggested revised wording.

Strategic Employment Sites

Kimpton Parish Council notes Spatial Strategy Policy 8 (SS8): Meeting Employment Land Requirement and the inclusion of Land South of Thruxton Aerodrome, Thruxton as a proposed employment site

Not enough information is currently available to enable Kimpton Parish Council to opine on their support/opposition to the proposed employment sites at present, however there is an overarching concern about the increase in traffic that would be generated by this site.

We would be concerned about the use of Kimpton village as a “short cut” to access the site from the A342

- Some traffic already routinely uses Kimpton village as a cut through route to get to the A303 in both directions, this development would likely exacerbate this issue
 - We have seen previously that this issue is exacerbated during road closures
 - There is ongoing concern that the speed of traffic through the village is excessive and Kimpton Parish Council are already looking at measures to deter speeding.
 - Additional traffic is likely to compound the problem as people seek to get to work
-