

#233

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, March 29, 2024 6:59:11 PM
Last Modified: Friday, March 29, 2024 7:03:07 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:55
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1

Q1

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

Mrs

Q2

First Name*

Stephanie

Q3

Surname*

Constantinou

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

Organisation*(If responding on behalf of an organisation)

Q5

Email address *

[REDACTED]

Q6

Postal address*

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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.

Our comments relate specifically to the proposed development adjacent to Upton Lane in Nursling (SHELAA 385). Having lived in our house for 30 years, we are extremely upset by the plans and related proposals regarding the use of the land for an employment led development. The reasons are outlined below:

We are recently retired and have plans to sell our house to downsize in the next few years, thereby freeing up a family sized house, with space we no longer need, for a younger family in the area. The proposed plans and possible years of uncertainty as to the specific nature of the developments will seriously affect these plans. It will be extremely difficult if not impossible to sell with these plans hanging over the area. The inevitable decrease in value of our property will mean that we will be unable to afford to downsize.

The development of Adanac park has substantially changed the nature of the rural area around Hillyfields beyond recognition from a semi-rural locality to an industrialised and ugly suburb. Doing the same in Upton Lane will destroy the village completely. Placing either housing and/or employment here, within a small piece of land, will create another car-based suburb in an area ill served by public transport. It is a step backwards in planning strategy in an era where we should be creating new housing and employment opportunities in already developed areas which have access to good public transport and supporting infrastructure.

The most upsetting aspect of these plans and proposals is the intention to build industrial & employment units on farmland opposite our home. We have no guarantee that there will be anything other than industrial and employment usage, including class B8 warehousing and class B2 general industrial development adjacent to Upton Lane. It is inappropriate and damaging. It will cause the destruction of woodland, hedgerows, wildlife, and the green spaces essential to good mental health. The air, noise & light pollution will be catastrophic to the area and to us personally. The likelihood of 24-hour working would make living in our current house intolerable whilst rendering it unsaleable.

The construction of warehousing and distribution centres will provide predominantly low skilled, poorly paid employment which won't deliver salaries sufficient for workers to live locally. Hence there will be more traffic and cars on our already busy roads with no public transport. Already when there are diversions on the motorway via Romsey Road, we can feel our house shaking with the huge trucks thundering past from the industrial estate and the Lidl distribution centre. Having seen the utter destruction of the countryside and farmland around Hillyfields, the proposed plans will create a similar annihilation of our area and immediate home environment.

Whilst agreeing that affordable housing is needed overall, the proposed location is inappropriate for our local area and flies against your overall strategy to encourage sustainable communities and a carbon neutral future. Over the years we have seen a substantial increase in housing in the area, causing stress to local roads and infrastructure. Should housing be built, the area does not have the infrastructure to support the scale of housing planned. With a potential 320 extra residents (180 of these potentially being children), there doesn't appear to be any provision for a school or doctors' surgery. The two surgeries servicing the area (Abbeywell & Nightingale in Romsey) are already unable to provide an adequate service for the existing population.

Our house is one of those which will be most affected, being almost opposite the entrance to Upton Lane (the dividing line between the proposed housing and the industrial area). Access is a real concern; we live in dread of having a busy roundabout directly in front of the house. It would severely impact the right to the enjoyment in our own home and garden whilst trapping us in an unsaleable property. The increased air, noise and light pollution will be seriously detrimental to our physical and mental health.

There is no document to point us to any professional assessments as to the impact of the potential increased noise, air and light pollution to our present living environment should the potential developments go ahead. It is imperative that such an assessment is made available to us as soon as possible.

The land is of potential Archaeological importance. The site of Nursling monastery, one of the most important early medieval religious centres has never been found and there could be archaeological remains on the site. An archaeological survey needs to be conducted on the site before any planning applications are considered.

Our perception is that Nursling has been designated a 'doesn't matter', 'not quite Test Valley' area and so close to the Southampton boundary that we are being treated with less respect and consideration for our wellbeing and community than other areas of the borough.

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.

individual paragraphs Test Valley Local Plan 2040

1.21 – 1.23 - How the Local Plan fits with the Climate Emergency Action Plan – It doesn't – this proposed development will have the opposite effect, resulting in more road traffic. The largely low wage employment opportunities created will not be filled with residents from the immediate area. Commuting from affordable housing areas will create more road traffic. Cycling is not a viable alternative due to the busyness of the roads and the lack of realistically safe cycle lanes in the area.

1.27 – 1.28 - How the Local Plan Fits with the Statement of Community Involvement – particularly your statement that "Coronavirus has had an impact on how we consult and the ability of our communities and stakeholders to get involved". We received no direct targeted communication from TVBC. Only became aware due to survey activity on field opposite in January 24 and subsequent notification of the local exhibitions in March, in the parish magazine. We need to be provided with evidence of how TVBC communicated initial consultations, how they were publicised and what steps were taken to engage ordinary residents. Expecting people to wade through a 256-page document with countless technical additional referenced documents is undemocratic and unrealistic. This doesn't give residents a fair opportunity or sufficient time to absorb and make an informed response.

1.30 - Issues & Options doc, where was this available and how was it communicated to residents

1.31 - Refined Issues & Options – as above

1.32 - Regulation 18 Stage 1 doc- as above

1.35 - Consultation Statement – The only comments I can find in this document relating directly to Nursling are from the Commercial Estates Group, I propose this is not a representative or objective viewpoint. We need to know if any residents were approached and if so whether any comments were collected and recorded.

1.45 – Evidence Based appraisals have these appraisals covered existing residential areas in proximity to the proposed developments or do they just cover the areas set aside for development.

2.14 - The Environment Act 2021 – states the plan must accord with this act in relation to the protection and improvement of the natural environment including water resources, air quality, biodiversity, and nature recovery. The proposed plans go against the aims of the act by potentially further degrading our immediate environment.

2.55 - Health, Wellbeing & Recreation – the importance of access to open spaces and countryside is highlighted and states that it will encourage and facilitate healthy lifestyles. The proposed plans will do the opposite. Upton Lane is currently a country lane giving residents a pleasant place to walk down past the church with access to the Test Way at the bottom. Should this area be developed and subject to increased heavy traffic our access to this important area of recreation and natural habitat will be severely damaged.

2.57 – refers to the National Design Guide and Building Better, Building Beautiful – the warehousing and distribution centres proposed don't align with this objective.

2.65 - outlines that some areas have limited access to public transport. This is the case at the Upton Lane end of Romsey Road where the only buses are school buses. As you say most journeys in Test Valley are made by car which will be the case for anyone working or living in the proposed development. Again, you will be facilitating the increase in private car usage (indeed the carbon footprint involved in the manufacture of electric vehicles also must be taken into account) so negating your vision and objective of working with the community towards a carbon free future.

2.68 – states supporting a shift from planning for vehicles, towards planning for people and places, decarbonising the transport system, reducing reliance on private car travel ... As outlined several times above, the predominantly low wage employment resulting from distribution warehouses will do the opposite. Average house prices in Nursling are approximately £326,000 so out of reach for anyone on a low salary. Hence workers will be commuting into the area and anyone who can afford to buy a house here will be commuting out. Not the sustainable community you have in mind.

4.214 – Retention of the character of Nursling – the proposals will do the opposite and will compound the impact of the motorways and existing industrial estates on the area. The site at Upton Lane is one of the remaining rural spots in the locale and used for walking, blackberry picking, riding etc. It would be a travesty to destroy this patch of green space and the adjacent woodland.

4.215 - High quality mixed use – we like the usage as it is.

4.216 – Employment Led – As above this will create more traffic, noise air and light pollution denying us the right to enjoyment of our home and negating your carbon free future vision.

4.217 – Your document states that ‘The location of the site makes it suitable for all ranges of employment uses with being adjacent to the M27 attractive for B8 storage and distribution employment uses’. We cannot see how this reconciles with your objective theme for economy, prosperity, and skills. This states ‘support a skilled and diverse workforce so that local people can access learning, opportunities and jobs and benefit from greater prosperity’. The contention here is that distribution and logistics jobs are not necessarily compatible with highly skilled local jobs. Furthermore, there's no job diversity involved here as most jobs will relate to two types, warehousing, and logistics. Many of these jobs are low paid, possibly zero hours contracts so can lead to a downward spiral in prosperity. The facilities will most likely be operated and owned by national or multinational corporations who have little or no interest in our local community. Instead of encouraging small local businesses, you will be facilitating the increasing lack of agency local people have over their lives and work.

4.218 – There is no guarantee that development on the south-eastern parcel will be sensitive (we note the use of the term ‘more’ in your text). The disruption from any building work, the need for access for up to 160 more cars will not be sensitive.

4.219 – Land at Upton Lane Nursling – you state that the site is primarily appropriate for employment development and ancillary uses serving the main employment use, however subject to noise constraints a small residential development on the eastern site boundary may be permitted. Your document says this will be subject to a noise assessment. We expect a noise assessment to be done for existing residents before any development is considered. If it proves unsuitable for new housing, then it isn't suitable for existing housing.

4.221 – Site access – our house is directly opposite the entrance from Romsey Road into Upton Lane. The road has already become substantially busier over the years with the lack of public transport and subsequent reliance on private vehicles. You talk about the need for offsite junction improvements, this will not be an improvement for us, and we will need compensating for loss of value to our home and potential damage to our health.

5.170 – Possible site of archaeological importance – important potential archaeological remains relating to Nursling Monastery – satisfactory provision will need to be made for a programme of archaeological investigation, excavation and recording before or during development and for the subsequent publication of any findings. Also referred to in point 7 on page 164.

5.191 – 5.192 - Protection of existing residents from the effects of pollution ... You state that ‘Wherever possible proposals should seek to enhance the local environment and environmental conditions’. The proposed development will do the opposite. Your document explains that NPPF state that planning policies and decisions should prevent new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels due to soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Etc.

5.197 - Development which will generate noise and vibration – the increase in huge trucks going to and from distribution centres and warehouses will have an adverse impact on our health and quality of life.

Policy ENV5 page 171 – Pollution – this statement is in contradiction with the proposed plans for the area. Development will result in an unacceptable impact on human health, living conditions, the natural environment or general amenity, including through cumulative effects (please also see our reference to the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment).

5.204 – Light pollution – The proposed development will result in light pollution due to the likelihood of 24 hour working and increase in vehicle traffic in and out of the site.

5.212 – Protection of residents' amenities – our access to local countryside as an amenity will be removed thus affecting our quality of life.

ENV7 a P 173 - Amenity – the development will not allow for privacy or amenity of ourselves as occupants in neighbouring properties.

5.265 – Protection of Trees and hedgerows – substantial areas of hedgerow and woodland will have to be destroyed if the development goes ahead, contradicting your policy to protect and enhance trees, woodland, and hedgerows.

5.274 – Ensuring access, protection and enhancement of open spaces, the countryside, recreational and sports provisions. Your proposed plan will do the opposite and will result in the destruction of these natural assets.

5.29 - Access to countryside – our access to a rural walk along Upton Lane to join the Test Way at the bottom will be unavailable if the development goes ahead.

Comments on supplementary document Landscape Sensitivity Assessment: Nursling 1# Land West of 3057 by Stephenson Halliday (also known as land at Upton Lane, Upton triangle)

Para 1.1.386. - The assessment states that the land concerned was judged as moderate to low regarding susceptibility to change by virtue of the degraded character due to current detracting features i.e., pylons and the motorway. The fact we are already close to the M271 and M27 and have some pylons (as do many rural areas) does not mean the area is more conducive to high density industrial development. Indeed, it's the opposite as we should not be subjected to any further degradation of the remaining countryside (Please also see our note on Policy ENV5 page 171 – Pollution). If you go ahead with the proposed development at Upton Lane it means that

Draft Local Plan 2040 Regulation 18 Stage 2 Public Consultation

your objectives and challenges relating to our communities (Test Valley Local Plan 2040, Ch 2, Vision, Key Challenges & Objectives) are contradictory as this will most definitely not be in line with your statement" The character of our individual settlements will be maintained and their sense of place enhanced" (Red box at bottom of P18).
