

Statement of Consultation

Appendix 3:

Regulation 18, Stage 2 consultation for the Draft
Local Plan 2040

Schedule of Comments

Overview of Document

This document provides a summary schedule of the comments received to the Local Plan Regulation 18, Stage 2 consultation held between Tuesday 6 February and noon on Tuesday 2 April 2024.

Comments made at Regulation 18 Stage 2 on those matters within the scope of the Revised Regulation 18 document have been taken into account and include an officer response (within Appendix 3). Where comments were made on matters not in the Revised Regulation 18 local plan, these comments will be taken into account on preparing the Regulation 19 document, which will be a full final draft local plan. Officers have provided responses to matters not addressed in the Revised Regulation 18 document (except the Development Management Policies), however, these are provided at a point time and are subject to change as plan preparation continues to Regulation 19. The comments and responses have been organised in plan order.

Please note that these responses are officer views only, providing thoughts in light of the comments on the potential direction of travel going forward, as preparation of the next Local Plan progresses. The responses are not a formal position of the Council, as they have not been approved by the Council or Cabinet.

Further details of the consultation and our latest position are available on our website - [Draft Local Plan 2040 | Test Valley Borough Council](#)

Schedule of Respondents

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10004	Valley Park Parish Council
10006	Charlton Parish Council
10020	Glasspool
10022	Southern Water
10025	North Baddesley Parish Council
10027	Theatres Trust
10028	New Forest District Council
10033	Timsbury Holdings Ltd
10036	Thruxton Parish Council
10037	English Rural Housing Association
10042	Whiting
10047	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust
10049	Historic England
10052	Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee
10058	Abbotts Ann Parish Council
10067	Hampshire Swifts
10068	Environment Agency
10069	Bartholomew
10072	Melchet Park & Plaitford Parish Council
10074	Upper Clatford Parish Council
10080	Mr Lyell Fairlie (MMA) Settlement Trust
10082	BJC Planning
10083	Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council
10091	The Trinley Estate
10094	CEG
10096	Barratt David Wilson Homes
10098	Southampton City Council
10099	Hampshire County Council
10101	Broadlands Estate
10105	Ampfield parish council
10106	Michelmersham & Timsbury Parish Council
10110	Stockbridge Parish Council
10112	Faberstown Trust
10113	Leckford Estate
10114	Ashfield Partnership
10115	Alfred Homes Ltd
10116	Rowles
10119	Bellway Homes
10120	Gladmans
10121	Secretary of State for Defence, c/o Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)
10124	Andover Town Council
10125	Hallam Land Management
10126	Bloor Homes
10129	University of Southampton Science Park
10133	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
10137	Peel L&P Investments Ltd
10139	CPRE Hampshire
10140	Natural England

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10147	Gleadow
10148	Dowden
10152	National Grid
10155	Dunkley
10156	Treadwell
10157	Delbury Limited
10163	Tydemann
10166	Barton Stacey Parish Council
10170	Houghton Parish Council
10175	Leighton
10177	Dorsett
10181	Highwood
10182	Crest Nicholson Partnerships and Strategic Land
10191	Save our Stockbridge (SOS)
10192	Napier
10194	Inspired Villages
10197	Goodworth Clatford Parish Council
10199	Beckett
10201	Home Builders Federation
10202	Wiltshire Council
10204	Chilbolton Parish Council
10210	Winchester City Council
10213	Mr C Grimsdale
10219	Allsopp
10223	Woodland Trust
10230	L&Q Estates
10235	Smannell Parish Council
10242	Marine Management Organisation (MMO)
10243	Go South Coast and Stagecoach
10268	Scard
10269	Evans
10275	Heslop
10279	Romsey & District Society Planning Committee
10291	National Highways Limited
10314	Boyle
10320	Southern Strategic Land
10323	Romsey Ltd
10342	Awbury Holdings Limited
10343	Belfield Homes (Ampfield) Ltd
10352	Stratland Estates Limited
10362	Eastleigh Local Plan Team
10364	Moon River Ltd (Mr A Morris)
10366	Lumsden
10373	Draper Tools Ltd
10374	Foreman Homes Limited
10376	McCarthy Stone
10378	Raymond Farming Ltd
10384	Painter
10386	Moon
10389	Lawrence

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10391	Pooley
10393	Abbott
10394	Parker
10395	Lynch
10397	Chilworth Parish Council
10405	North Wessex Downs National Landscape (AONB)
10416	Franklin
10420	Davies
10421	Blue
10422	Jerome
10423	Foster
10424	Adams
10425	Hatherell
10426	Wooler
10427	Dacer
10428	Page
10429	Conrad
10430	Frazer
10431	Felton
10432	Swift
10433	Lane
10434	Vorechovsky
10435	Wheeler
10436	Harper
10437	Drust
10438	Newell
10439	Sibley
10440	Dorman
10441	Cardwell
10442	Rodbourn
10443	Anderson
10444	Devine
10445	Sadler
10446	Smith
10447	Armstrong
10448	Lees
10449	Hobbs
10450	Perress
10451	Rogers
10452	White
10453	Pragnell
10454	Kail
10455	Naylor
10456	Harrison / Turner
10457	Brooker-Corcoran
10458	Tatnall
10459	Stannard
10460	Barton Stacey Fly Fishing Club (BSFFC)
10461	Grubb
10462	Brooker

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10463	Ilchester Estates
10464	Brooker
10465	French
10466	Harrison
10467	Gunner
10468	Wade
10469	King
10470	Conway
10471	Owen
10472	Sherbourne
10473	Johnston
10474	Ball
10475	Bigg
10476	O'Brien
10477	Charkham
10478	Bendall
10479	Taylor
10480	Taylor
10481	Bartlett
10482	Davis
10483	Comper
10484	Cook
10485	Ilott
10486	Mears
10487	Brereton
10488	Jones
10489	Duggan
10490	Hicks
10491	Gibbons
10492	Thornton
10493	Nesbitt
10494	Carrington
10495	Breckenridge
10496	Rose
10497	Harris
10498	Davis-Waldman
10499	Tilston
10500	Bracken
10501	Slawson
10502	Hayward
10503	Hurley
10504	Essery
10505	Gilbert
10506	Forrest
10507	Pickup
10508	Parker
10509	Setterington
10510	Holdbrook
10511	Maddick
10512	Clark

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10513	Lane
10514	Young
10515	Mackintosh
10516	Morgan
10517	Woodman
10518	Wade
10519	Mcquaide
10520	Chandy
10521	Brown
10522	Tanner
10523	Turner
10524	Smith
10525	Nugent
10526	Leach
10527	Belas
10528	Evans
10529	Poate
10530	Kennedy
10531	Gregory
10532	Wade
10533	Dick
10534	Mudd
10535	Hewitt
10536	Oliver
10537	Oliver
10538	Cordell
10539	Waterhouse
10540	Dix
10541	Watkins
10542	Park
10543	Ryan
10544	Cole
10545	Webb
10546	Colley
10547	Bates
10548	Timms
10549	Knight
10550	Wilkinson
10551	Austin
10552	Maclean
10553	Weedon
10554	Dibb
10555	Silvanus
10556	Lambert
10557	Whitton
10558	Moody
10559	Harris
10560	King
10561	Reed
10562	Parker

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10563	Bhatnagar
10564	Wiltshire Swifts
10565	Tanna
10566	Atefi
10567	Curtis
10568	Gaudreau
10569	Roberts
10570	Weber
10571	Heppleston
10572	Young
10573	McGarry
10574	Millward
10575	Chesterman
10576	Bishop
10577	Mckie
10578	Thorns
10579	West
10580	Willis
10581	Latham
10582	Taylor
10583	Davis
10584	Brown
10585	Airey
10586	Airey
10587	Cartwright
10588	Siddle
10589	Savage
10590	Perry
10591	Intech
10592	Roszkowiak
10593	Bock
10594	Bushueva
10595	Bayshev
10596	Sampson
10597	Elliott
10598	Fairbairn
10599	Woods
10600	Hendricks
10601	Grove and Coupar
10602	Pragnell
10603	Craig
10604	Kowalewski
10605	Jupe
10606	Everard
10607	Cooper
10608	Bray
10609	Deshays
10610	Dowling
10611	Moneley
10612	Dowden

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10613	Woods
10614	Deshays
10615	Fresson
10616	Anderson
10617	Course
10618	Callaway
10619	Wakley
10620	Miles
10621	Beaton
10622	Coomer
10623	Rowe
10624	Bryan
10625	Gurr
10626	Hearn
10627	Parker
10628	Moxham
10629	Reeves
10630	Afzal
10631	Dedmen
10632	Butler
10633	Beveridge
10634	Phillips
10635	Howard
10636	Le Pen
10637	Kirby
10638	Wealleans
10639	Williams
10640	Fitzgerald
10641	Jager
10642	Price
10643	Page
10644	Green
10645	Bannister
10646	Attrill
10647	Penney
10648	Finnegan
10649	Wright
10650	Preston
10651	Bendall
10652	Selby
10653	Nahal
10654	Ray
10655	Gray
10656	Overton
10657	Ahmed
10658	Ahmed
10659	Dorsett
10660	Brown
10661	Orchard (Highwood Lane) Ltd
10662	Nugent

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10663	Rawlings
10664	Burton
10665	Furlong
10666	Berridge
10667	Garrod
10668	Webb
10669	Hookings
10670	Kostek
10671	Tubby
10672	Owen and Perriment
10673	Bugg
10674	Shaw
10675	Durham
10676	Howarth
10677	Roche
10678	Hensford
10679	Musson
10680	Kelly
10681	Abbotts Ann Village Shop Association
10682	Davis
10683	Hallam
10684	Marron
10685	Williams
10686	McKean
10687	Warren
10688	Watts
10689	McMullen
10690	Buckley
10691	Loader
10692	Marchant
10693	Pelling
10694	Elliott
10695	Baker
10696	New Forest National Park Authority
10697	Hankins
10698	Bull
10699	Wealleans
10700	Hill
10701	Hill
10702	Shires
10703	Jenkins
10704	Edwards
10705	White
10706	Hughes
10707	Moth
10708	Jerram
10709	Young
10710	Ashford
10711	Hillier
10712	Greenfield

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10713	Leighton
10714	James
10715	Lea
10716	Power
10717	O'Flynn Group
10718	Bailey
10719	Patterson
10720	Dillon
10721	Atkins
10722	Martin
10723	Unwin
10724	Siney
10725	Lowe
10726	Shires
10727	HISP Multi Academy Trust
10728	Brewer
10729	Victoria Land
10730	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire Integrated Care Board
10731	Enham Alamein Parish Council
10732	NHS Property Services
10733	Harris
10734	Summers
10735	Marchant and Bailey
10736	Giles
10737	Knight
10738	Floyd
10739	Pratt
10740	Clarke
10741	Wilson
10742	Ford
10743	Lines
10744	Patey
10745	Palk
10746	Palk
10747	Higgs
10748	Gollop
10749	Metcalfe
10750	Wortley
10751	Budzynski
10752	Lewis
10753	Powell
10754	Ransom
10755	King Edward Park Residents' Association
10756	Robinson
10757	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
10758	Joynson
10759	Amport Parish Council
10760	Test Valley Friends of the Earth
10761	The Castle Practice
10762	Andover C of E Parish

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10763	NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight Integrated Care Board (HIOW ICB)
10764	Ludgershall Town Council
10765	Old Nursling Residents Association (ONRA)
10766	Smith
10767	Whitchurch Town Council
10768	Bargate Homes Limited and Vivid Housing Limited
10769	Smith
10770	Payne
10771	Ritchie
10772	Hunt
10773	Clarke
10774	Bartram
10775	J Squared Property Ltd
10776	Valiauga
10777	Test Development Company
10778	Browning
10779	Bailey
10780	Bonathan
10781	Crossland
10782	Crossland
10783	Attew
10784	O'Donnell
10785	Perkins
10786	Shortman
10787	Hull
10788	Claxton
10789	Chamberlain
10790	Rogers
10791	Bayley and Kitching
10792	Williams
10793	Price
10794	Wates Developments Limited
10795	Haxforth
10796	Metis Homes Ltd
10797	Star Energy Group PLC
10798	Barratt David Wilson Homes
10799	BJC Planning
10800	Willmont
10801	Hills
10802	Moon
10803	Persimmon Homes
10804	Smith
10805	Smith
10806	English
10807	Hanley
10808	Ames
10809	Archer
10810	Butcher
10811	Maclot
10812	Romsey Town Council

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10813	The Four Horseshoes Ltd
10814	Westcoast Developments Ltd
10815	Oxlade
10816	Elivia Homes
10817	Ludgershall Homes Ltd
10818	Halford
10819	Pavey
10820	Clayton
10821	Vine
10822	Hill
10823	Reeves
10824	Nash
10825	Gage
10826	Biddesden House Farm Partnership
10827	Guertin
10828	Brett
10829	Dawkins and Lott
10830	Law
10831	Lock
10832	Goodswen
10833	Swift
10834	Hughes
10835	Coe
10836	Halfacre
10837	Fish
10838	Fisher
10839	Moret
10840	Revell
10841	Antonius
10842	Network Rail and South Western Railway
10843	Murdock
10844	Drake
10845	Hall
10846	Hughes
10847	King
10848	Reeves
10849	Hunt
10850	Holloway
10851	Carr
10852	Moore
10853	Forder
10854	Christie
10855	Ferguson
10856	Windsor
10857	Williams
10858	Goddard
10859	Anon
10860	Boys
10861	Cross
10862	Beckett

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10863	Holloway
10864	Fisher and Henley
10865	Johnson
10866	Ashford
10867	Holloway
10868	Brazier
10869	McGuire
10870	Harding
10871	Woodbury
10872	Roberts
10873	Edwards
10874	Wheeler
10875	Wood
10876	Southwell
10877	Skelton
10878	Gundry
10879	Rowe
10880	Adams
10881	Loveridge
10882	Butcher
10883	Gibson
10884	Feltham
10885	Chafer
10886	Cumper
10887	Holloway
10888	Parker
10889	Jenkins
10890	Edwards
10891	Steel
10892	Williams
10893	Akester
10894	Young
10895	Ling
10896	Aplin
10897	Ottaway
10898	Poller
10899	Fielding
10900	Hartwell
10901	Davies
10902	Faria
10903	Richards
10904	Greasley
10905	M Vossier, P Elsdon, S & C Marchment (Landowners) Clayfield Southern Limited (Development Partner)
10906	Rakic
10907	Webb
10908	Barlow
10909	Sebrell
10910	Wiid
10911	Prestidge
10912	Norris

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10913	Buckett
10914	Falla
10915	James
10916	Nursling and Rownhams Community Band
10917	De Bono
10918	Rai
10919	Frost
10920	Smyth
10921	Essery
10922	Platford
10923	Platford
10924	Easterbrook
10925	Benson
10926	Stephens
10927	Hobbs
10928	Marris
10929	Howarth
10930	Boddeke
10931	Deane
10932	Kasper
10933	Toombs
10934	Berry
10935	Jones
10936	Lineker
10937	Curtis
10938	Gooding
10939	Hales
10940	Nethercott
10941	Betteridge
10942	Vint
10943	Teanby
10944	Benbow
10945	Vint
10946	Benbow
10947	Philp
10948	Best
10949	Neary
10950	Slack
10951	Olivey
10952	Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group
10953	Bachmann
10954	Neate
10955	Russell
10956	Maxey
10957	Brown
10958	Byrne
10959	Chapman
10960	Burtenshaw
10961	Friar
10962	Wareham

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
10963	Harris
10964	Czapp
10965	Whittle
10966	Merrick
10967	Braddick
10968	Braddick
10969	Prestidge
10970	Barnett
10971	Barnett
10972	Hilton
10973	Kazemi
10974	Jones
10975	Jeroboams Trade Ltd
10976	Cox
10977	Whitlock
10978	Poller
10979	Arunachalam
10980	Holt
10981	Tennant
10982	Fry
10983	Noble
10984	Hale
10985	Warren
10986	Robinson
10987	Czapp
10988	Borwick
10989	Lambert
10990	Owen
10991	Johnson
10992	Crafford
10993	Mead
10994	Marlow
10995	Lucas
10996	Wooldridge
10997	Goodyear
10998	Matharu
10999	Michalczyk
11000	Killick
11001	Kimpton Parish Council
11002	Pradhan
11003	Robinson
11004	Kozlowski
11005	Skelton
11006	Bruce
11007	Djann
11008	Bishop
11009	Keel
11010	Holdsworth
11011	Hicks
11012	Vaughan

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
11013	Westbrook
11014	Stop Chilbolton Overdevelopment (SCO)
11015	Patwardhan
11016	Patwardhan
11017	Clark
11018	Kilford
11019	Smith
11020	Emmett
11021	Dyer
11022	Hutchins
11023	Holdsworth
11024	Hemming
11025	Norstedt-Girling
11026	Paddick
11027	Constantinou
11028	Probert
11029	Harris
11030	Warren
11031	Stuart
11032	Gasser
11033	Cousins
11034	Roberts
11035	Amiss
11036	Bateman
11037	Roberts
11038	Legg
11039	Dollery
11040	Orriss
11041	Awbridge Neighbourhood Development Plan Committee
11042	Burtenshaw
11043	Palmer
11044	Barton
11045	Slack
11046	Godfroy
11047	Hall-Cooper
11048	Davies
11049	Penrose
11050	Kilford
11051	Dear
11052	Parkinson
11053	Lovett
11054	Murdock
11055	Dixon
11056	Chandler's Ford Parish Council
11057	Johnson
11058	Hughes
11059	Levéé
11060	Joyce
11061	Jones
11062	Sidoli

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
11063	Baker
11064	Tout
11065	Balghan
11066	Shawley
11067	Bundy
11068	Scott
11069	Lawson
11070	Van Den Berghe
11071	Richardson
11072	Khaira
11073	Freedom Church
11074	Barons
11075	Yelspa Ltd
11076	Busk
11077	Vistry Group
11078	Cambium Developments Ltd
11079	Knox-Johnston
11080	Capon
11081	Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit Ltd
11082	Penton Grafton Parish Council
11083	He
11084	Harding
11085	Hales
11086	Green
11087	Brown
11088	Tomkins
11089	Gage
11090	Nicholas
11091	Macken
11092	Jackson
11093	Warrener
11094	Drysdale Planning Limited
11095	The Trustees of the Barker-Mill Estates
11096	Pigeon
11097	Prestidge
11098	Malpiedi and McAleer
11099	Town
11100	Jackson
11101	Goetsch
11102	Arney
11103	The Trustees of CB Morgan Will Trust
11104	Francis
11105	Shepherd
11106	Francis
11107	Property and Assest Management
11108	Woolsington One Ltd
11109	Orchard Homes and Development Ltd
11110	Sharp
11111	Test and Itchen Association Ltd
11112	Souch

Respondent Number	Respondent (Surname or Organisation Name)
11113	Boella
11114	Appleby
11115	Marshall Family
11116	Philp
11117	Persimmon Homes South Coast Limited
11118	Bailey
11119	St Modwen Strategic Land Limited
11120	Hillier and Highwood
11121	Stratland Estates Limited
11122	Stratland Estates Limited
11123	ORCHARD (HIGHWOOD LANE) LTD
11124	West Coast Developments Ltd
11125	Green
11126	Lawman
11127	Lawman
11128	Anonymous
11129	Liddell Farms Limited
11130	Ace Liftaway Ltd
11132	Chahal
11133	Williams
11134	Keown-Boyd
11135	Gooding
11136	Fletcher
11137	Burwood
11138	Batchelor
11139	Waters
11140	Mitchell and Parker
11141	Will Hawkings-Bypass
11142	East Dean Parish Council
11143	Angela
11144	Owner of Land South of Hoe Lane
11145	Akerman
11146	HC Marshall Trust
11147	Towerview Property Group
11148	Rubix Land Ltd
11149	Owners of the Land at Church Lane
11150	Prior-Palmer
11151	Highwood Group
11152	Foreman Homes
11153	Watton
11154	Anonymous comment
11155	Bentall
11156	Dabell
11157	Evans
11158	Anonymous
11159	National Gas
11160	Dalby
11161	Barratt David Wilson Homes
11162	Stratland Estates Limited

Chapter 1: Introduction

Paragraphs 1.1 - 1.56

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The some of the matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Flooding - sequential test	Development would be subject to a FRA, as required. Flood risk was included within the site selection process as set out in the Site Assessment Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal.
Evidence Base	The evidence base will be updated as relevant to inform future stages of the draft local plan.
Duty to Co-Operate	The Council will continue to engage within our neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Co-Operate, including on strategic planning for housing and employment needs, and on environmental mitigation measures for internationally protected sites under the Habitats Regulations. This would include any potential future arising unmet housing needs.
Plan Period	The Council will review the plan period in light of changes in national planning policy, updating of the evidence base and to seek to achieve a 15-year period on adoption. The Government's changes to the NPPF and increase in housing need to be plan for, has led to a delay in the local plan timetable and consequent impact on the plan period.
Local Development Scheme - Draft Local Plan timetable	The timetable for preparing the draft Local Plan within the LDS has been reviewed in light of the Government's revised NPPF and changes to the standard method for calculating local housing need which has led to a significant increase in the number of homes to be planned for.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Flooding - sequential test	Environment Agency 10068	Whilst acknowledge a level one SFRA has been undertaken, it is not evident how this has been used to inform and undertake the sequential test to determine which sites should come forward, taking account of NPPF paragraph 167.
Evidence Base	10779	Why is the evidence base for the DLP 2020, does this present an accurate picture of the needs of the borough for 2029-2040?
Infrastructure - health	10763	HIAs rarely consider primary care capacity within an area and its capacity to manage additional patients from additional housing
	10763	Request that ICB are consulted on proforma of the HIA and have opportunity to contribute to its development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Further advice	Natural England 10140	Please see further advice from Natural England on aspects such as water quality, air pollution, protected landscapes and climate change adaptation, as appended to the comments.
Public Transport	10243	Limited direct transport-related evidence is provided to support this draft of the plan only including a Transport Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and assessment methodology within the SA. An attempt was made in the Settlement Hierarchy reappraisal, but this was abandoned.
Site location	11027	Questions whether the appraisals completed have taken into account the existing residential areas in proximity to the proposed developments or just the areas set aside for development.
Duty to Cooperate	10091 (2nd response)	There is no information within the evidence base to enable consultees to make an informed assessment as to whether TVBC's neighbouring authorities have an unmet need-the relevant documentation from PfSH is not included and only summaries are included in the DtC topic paper.
Fragmented	10052	The Local Plan is fragmented. The theme-based policies, evidence, associated documents and topic papers overlap with other chapters, making it harder to construct a cohesive response.
General	10681	We are grateful for the support that TVBC has given us since our inception and trust that this will continue through this planning process
General - formatting	10036	Formatting the document in two columns is not helpful for reading the document electronically as it requires continual scrolling. To avoid printed copies as far as possible a single column formatted version for online reading is suggested
General - No comment	10235	Following much discussion and debate, members felt they could not formulate or commit to any view on the draft Local Plan 2040 at this stage and therefore return no comment, please record this accordingly in the name of EAPC
General - Support	10235	Following discussion and debate, members resolved to support the draft Local Plan 2040, please record this accordingly in the name of SPC
	10006	The Plan is very comprehensive, with excellent aspirations, policies and plans
	10204	Generally, Chilbolton support the draft Local Plan although there are several issues we would like to see changed in the next draft. Welcome greater influence on policies aimed towards net zero, flood risk, reduced energy and water use, low carbon energy, infrastructure, conservation, landscape, biodiversity, green infrastructure and open space
General - Wording	10812	A considerable amount of the language in policies is vague and needs to be more precise. Is also must relate to HMG regulations and what is actually possible
LDS	10243	Suggest that the Council will struggle to see submission even by the end of 2025. Commencement of EiP within a couple of months of submission is entirely unrealistic. If plan is in fact submitted close to the LDS timetable in late summer 2025, we are sceptical that EiP would start commencing much

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		before September 2026. With a straightforward EiP, the earliest adoption would be likely to take place in mid-late 2027
Recognition of New Forest	New Forest National Park Authority 10696	Welcome the clear statement on New Forest National Park being responsible for the New Forest National Park area in the Borough
Objection	10532	I do not support the draft plan
Plan Period	11096	With regard to the development needs it is also the case that the standard method should be based on the period 2024 to 2034 with the affordability ratio relating to income and house prices in 2023
River Test	10139	The plan contains little reference to the River Test and the role it has to all inhabitants and their environment
Rural	10139	The plan contains little reference to Test Valley's villages and rural communities
Rural Area	10366	It is encouraging to see that the rural environment is being given due strategic priority
Support	10101	Support Council is preparation of emerging local plan
Timetable	10137	Earlier consultation of the Regulation 19 LP may assist in making sure that the LP can continue to progress under the current plan-making system. Concern that any slippage in the current timeframes could present significant risk to the preparation of the LP.
Urban centric	10139	The plan is too urban centric to Romsey and Andover
Welcome	11108	W1 welcomes the acknowledgement of an evolving context, shaped by ongoing behavioural changes, economic changes and legislative changes.
	11108	W1 welcome the suggestion that the evidence base will need to evolve alongside the LP.
	11108	W1 welcome the text which provides transparency and ensures that the document is accessible to a broad audience.
Endorse	11108	W1 endorses the explanation as to the potential links between the Action Plan and the LP
public transport climate	10243	Understandable, most of the decisions about the impact of future new buildings on emissions, and their resilience to climate change, have already been made and are immutably set. This includes national legally binding Building Regulations as well as urban design, where national expectations are set out clearly in the National Model Design Code. Even where there is scope for local policy to be applied, this has little or no spatial component. Most of the effectiveness of these technical strategies would be applicable wherever the development was located. Transport now represents the largest component of domestic emissions, by far the biggest influence the plan can now have on locally generated carbon emissions, is on the way that location of development can radically reduce distances of interaction, and thus travel demand; and at the same time, ensure that trips are as far as

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		possible achievable such that active travel and public transport represent “the natural first choice” for these trips.
Traffic	11027	Low wage employment will mean employees travel from affordable housing areas, increasing the traffic on roads as cycling is not a viable option.
Welcome	11108	W1 welcome the explanation as to the links between the Corporate Strategy and the LP as this is a simplistic approach that provides clarity.
Community involvement	11027	Residents received no targeted communication from TVBC and would like evidence of what steps were taken to do so. Further consultation required which allows residents fair opportunity to give an informed response.
Keep Informed	10767	Thanks for being kept informed
Masterplans	10842	The on-going implementation of the Andover and Romsey masterplans remains an important factor in identifying regeneration opportunities to better link development with access to the rail network
Housing Land Supply	11147	suggest that a contingency plan is implemented to ensure development will take place and, crucially, maintains a sufficient housing land supply to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply upon adoption of the plan. To this end, we would recommend TVBC consider an interim policy for the early release of land ahead of the conclusion on the local plan.
Plan period	10101	Plan period should be extended to 2042 to provide a more realistic adoption timescale and allow for any unexpected delays to adoption and sustain NPPF policy requirement for 15 year plan period Extend plan period to 2042
	10101	If adopted in late 2026, only 14 years (April 2026-March 2040) following adoption. If not adopted until later in 2026 or 2027 potentially only 13 years of plan period remaining. Plan period should be extended to at least 2042. Extend plan period to at least 2042
	10201	Local Development Scheme expects adoption of local plan in Q2 2026. This means local plan will look forward under 15 years which is inconsistent with NPPF para.22 of minimum period of 15 years from adoption
	10201	Extend plan period by one year to ensure on adoption consistent with national policy Extend plan period by one year
	10201	Question necessity of plan period to start from 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10201	Given plan will be adopted 2026, deliver during first three years will have little to do with remaining plan period as therefore unnecessary
	10201	Standard method for calculating housing need is based upon period 2024 to 2034 with affordability ratio relating to income and house prices in 2023. This suggests most appropriate date for start of plan period 2023/24 Amend start date of plan period to 2023/24
	10201	Recommend current plan period is unsound and inconsistent with national policy and should be amended to 2023/24 to 2041/42 Amend plan period to 2023/24 to 2040/41
	11150	The plan period (2020-2040) needs to be extended to at least 2041 and additional housing supply identified to meet this
	11150	The Local Development Scheme (LDS), last updated in November 2023 would see the regulation 19 consultation conducted in Q1 of 2025, submission in Q2, examination in Q3 and adoption by Q2 of 2026. The Housing Trajectory which has been produced (Jan 2024) only sets out a trajectory up until 2039/40 and needs to be extended to at least 2041 (assuming adoption in 2026) and potential longer as the LDS programme could well see some slippage should the examination process take longer than anticipated
	11095	Due to substantial backlog of Local Plans working their way through the process, they expect the TVBC Local Plan timetable to slip. Therefore, they propose the plan period be to 2042 or 2045 to ensure it meets the 15 year requirements of the NPPF.
	11148	given that adoption of the Local Plan is not programmed until mid-2026, the Plan Period should be extended to 2041 so that it meets the 15-year requirement
	11147	support the plan period 2020-2040 which allows for a minimum 15-year time horizon following the adoption of the plan
	11147	indicative timeline for the production of the local plan is overly ambitious, as it does not account for any consultation period on proposed modifications, nor the inevitable lead-in time for Council approval of the consultation material. Furthermore, nor does it account for the cooling-off period after the Council has decided (if) to adopt it. We are aware of several stalled examinations in the south of England with a much longer timeframe,

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11151	It would be a more prudent and robust approach to extend the plan's timeframe as a precautionary principle to ensure that paragraph 22 of the NPPF is complied with. Suggest the plan's timescale be extended by at least an additional 2 years concluding in 2042.
	11120	The end date for the plan is 2040. This is contrary to paragraph 22 of the NPPF. It would be a prudent and more robust approach to extend the plans time frame by at least an additional two years concluding in 2042.
	10796	On adoption the plan will cover less than 15 years, this is inconsistent with para 22 of the NPPF which requires plans to look ahead for a minimum of 15 years from adoption. The Council should therefore extend the plan period by a year to ensure that on adoption, the plan period is consistent with the requirements of national policy
	10219	LDS states that the Council expect to adopt the Local Plan in Q2 of 2026. This means that on adoption the plan will cover less than 15 years. This is inconsistent with paragraph 22 of the NPPF which requires plans to look ahead for a minimum of 15 years from adoption. The Council should therefore extend the plan period by a year to ensure that on adoption, the plan period is consistent with the requirements of national policy
	10314	The plan period (2020-2040) needs to be extended to at least 2041 and additional housing supply identified to meet this
	11078	Council's LDS published in November 2023 envisages that Adoption of the plan will be Q2 of 2026. Therefore, as currently prepared, the Regulation 18 eLP fails to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework at Paragraph 22. We consider the Plan Period should be revised to at least 2041 to ensure the minimum 15-year requirement is met in line with the Framework. Without this amendment, the eLP cannot be deemed "positively prepared" as required by Paragraph 35 of the Framework
	11077	Consider that the plan period should be extended to 2042 to provide a more realistic adoption timescale and allow for any unexpected delays to adoption and sustain the policy requirement for a 15-year plan period as required by the NPPF
	11096	Council would need to extend the plan period by at least a year to ensure that when the Local Plan is adopted it is consistent with the requirements of the NPPF.
	10181	plan period is contrary to Paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which requires strategic policies to look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption – not the date of submission for examination

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10181	due to prolonged duration of time, it has taken the council to reach this current stage of plan formulation it would be prudent and more robust an approach to extend the plan's timeframe as a precautionary principle to ensure that paragraph 22 of the NPPF is complied with
	10181	suggest the plan's timescale be extended by at least an additional two years, concluding in 2042
	10181	If plan period extends Strategic policies (including housing supply policies) need to be reviewed accordingly - the housing requirement will need to be recalculated and additional housing allocations set out within the Local Plan to meet the need arising from an extended period
	10181	a two year extension to plan period would result in an uplift of 1,100 new homes needed using 550 dpa
	10181	important to consider plan period at this stage (rather than later which could lead to further delays ahead of adoption) to ensure sufficient homes are planned for in the next Reg. 19 stage of the plan sufficient to provide for a minimum 15-year period from adoption
	10091 (2nd response)	Suggest the plan period is extended by at least 1-2 years in line with p.22 of the NPPF to provide a minimum 15 year supply from adoption
	10091 (2nd response)	Extending the plan to 2041 at the suggested 730dpa would bring the total need to 15,3330 units -an increase of 4,330 units.
	10091 (2nd response)	Extending the plan period by 2 years to 2042 at the suggested 730dpaminimum would bring the total need to 16.060 units, an increase of 5,060 units.
	10091 (2nd response)	Isn't it necessary to extend the plan period further to accommodate the significant allocations currently within the draft LP or make additional allocations to plan for shortfalls in delivery arising from the major allocations.
	11108	W1 support the plan period 2020-2040, the LDS effective period will be 2025-2040 which allows for a 15 year time horizon. Suggest that this is reflected at Reg 19 stage.
	10125	The plan period should be extended to 2041 as a minimum or to 2042/43 to consider potential delays. The current plan period up to 2040 does not meet the minimum requirement of 15 years according to the NPPF
	10137	Adoption anticipated in 2026. The end of the LP may need to be kept under review and extend beyond 2040. Commend the approach to seeking to get LP adopted earlier than set out in LDS. Request that details are provided as to how the Council hope to achieve an earlier adoption date.
	10120	At the point of adoption, the plan will be looking forward fewer than 15 years, so inconsistent with paragraph 22 of the NPPF. The plan period must be extended to be consistent with the NPPF.
	10243	The plan should certainly have an end date of 2042, and it may be prudent to look forward to 2043.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10243	There is no credible route to advance the plan to adoption by 2025 but 2026 looks optimistic. The capacity of HM Planning Inspectorate to deal with the surge in demand for examinations over the next three years is something the Council ought to prudently anticipate. The plan should look ahead to at least 2041 or 2042 would be entirely justifiable, this would require the housing requirement to incorporate at least one and better, two years of supply.
Change plan period	10120	Recommend the plan period to be 2023/24 to 2040/41.
Start of plan period	10120	The start date for the plan need not be 2020/21 but rather should start at 2023 in line with the most up to date affordability ratio relating to income and house prices.
	10120	Unnecessary for a Local Plan to consider the delivery in the first three years of the plan period as this will have little to do with the remaining plan period and the required development needs looking forwards.
Approach	11108	W1 commend the Council on their staged approach and commitment to engagement
Community involvement	11027	Questions where this document was available and how it was communicated to residents
	11027	Questions where this document was available and how it was communicated to residents
	11027	Questions where this document was available and how it was communicated to residents
	11027	Commercial Estates Group do not give a representative or objective viewpoint for the residents of Nursling.
Previous comments	Natural England 10140	Have regard to previous comments provided on draft site allocations prior to the consultation - they include additional context on potential environmental impacts.
Preparation of Plan	New Forest National Park Authority 10696	A significant amount of work has clearly gone into the preparation of the Regulation 18 (Stage 2) draft Plan for Test Valley. We commend the Borough Council's decision to publish a full draft Plan, prior to the future consultation on the Regulation 19 Submission draft.
Officer-led plan	10612	Plan has been produced almost entirely by officers, with little active involvement of the councillors.
plan period	10181	LP has an optimistic projected adoption date of Q2 2026
	10125	Figure 1.2 of the draft LP demonstrates that the plan will be adopted in Q2 2026-this does not plan for unexpected delays and should be assigned later date due to planning delays.
Planned growth	10101	Adoption of local plan in due course will allow for well-planned and proportionate growth in Borough

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Progress	10133	Welcome progress made in advancing new local plan and support as matter of principle, continued recognition that Andover is a focus for development
Local Plan Document	10389	The Local Plan should be consistent with the Neighbourhood Development Plans and Vision Documents and other supplementary planning documents. As Longstock is creating a NDP, how can TVBC have a document which directly contradicts another planning document?
LP review	10243	There is an urgent need to progress the review and we welcome the Council is committed to bringing an up-to-date plan forward. 10 years on from the genesis of the adopted plan, this plan will become policy no earlier than 2026 and as such, a very substantial period of time has elapsed since the last formal plan-making process.
Support for preparing new plan	Southampton City Council 10098	Confirm continued support for development of new and up to date local plan for Test Valley

Chapter 2: Vision and Objectives

Vision

Paragraphs 2.24 – 2.26

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Sustainable transport and modes.	The Local Plan provides a framework for delivering sustainable development to meet our identified economic and housing needs at sustainable locations, and in doing this, the plan seeks to deliver and enable improved and sustainable transport options. This is reflected in the Vision. However, the role of the local plan in delivering sustainable transport modes and infrastructure is limited. Other key stakeholders, including HCC, the Department of Transport and Network Rail are more directly involved in delivering sustainable transport services and infrastructure. TVBC works with and alongside these key stakeholders in preparing the Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
Detailed proposals in plan not aligned with Vision.	The overarching vision is appropriately positive and ambitious and provides a succinct framework for the more detailed policies within the plan.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Detailed proposals in Plan not aligned with Vision	10864	The visionary statement is contradicted by proposed development in the Plan, as it proposes to devastate an area, including the site of an ancient woodland, adjacent to Upton Lane/Romsey Rd, and a part of a former ancient orchard to the rear of Grove Lodge - a priority 1 habitat.
Vision contradicted By proposals in plan	10864	The statement in the plan that "our diverse natural, built and cultural resources will be safeguarded for future generations to enjoy including access to our outstanding countryside" Is contradicted by the urbanisation and development of an industrial site at the Upton Lane site.
Rail transport infrastructure	Network Rail 10842	Network Rail supports the Council's vision which identifies the need to deliver supporting infrastructure to meet development needs.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Natural resources and climate change	Natural England	Welcome emphasis placed on safeguarding the diverse natural resources within the borough, conserving and enhancing biodiversity, and the positive approach outlined to mitigate and adapt to climate change.
Fails to address need for sustainable transport and movement	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Despite the Climate Emergency and policy set out in the National Transport Decarbonisation Plan the vision fails to grasp the significance for achieving more sustainable patterns of movement and supporting a radical shift in transport and connectivity towards more sustainable modes. It is concerning there is nothing that clearly steers the plan towards this or the requirements of the NPPF (chapter 9). It is entirely appropriate to signal that by the end of the plan period, the district will have secured a step change in the provision and use of active travel and public transport.
Support	11081	Support Vision particularly the need to deliver sufficient, homes, employment and infrastructure required to meet community's requirements and support economic growth
Support	10101	Supportive of the Vision in terms of recognising issues facing the Borough and it priorities: good quality homes, employment and supporting infrastructure, inclusive communities in sustainable locations, developing thriving town centres, and safeguarding diverse natural built and cultural resources, whilst tackling climate change
Support	10120	Support the proposed vision.
Support	10120	Support the proactive approach to ensuring the borough's economy will be thriving.
Support	11108	Support the vision
Support	10113	Leckford Estate supports the overarching vision of the Draft Local Plan and it is considered that the Leckford Estate can assist in achieving aspects of the vision. Support is also given to the 'health, wellbeing, culture, leisure and recreation' objective
Support	11076	Supportive of the draft Local Plan's vision which, by 2040, seeks to provide access to good quality homes that will meet a range of needs and aspirations, including affordable housing
Support	11077	Supportive of the vision in the LP40 in terms of recognising the key issues facing the District and its prioritisation of providing access to good quality homes for all, delivering employment and supporting infrastructure, encouraging inclusive communities in sustainable locations, developing thriving town centres, and safeguarding the diverse natural built and cultural resources, whilst tackling climate change
Support	10182	Support for all aspects of the proposed vision.
Support	Historic England	support

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10049	

Objective – Climate Change Paragraphs 2.30 – 2.34

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Energy efficiency of existing buildings and new development.	Accept HE recommendation to amend the local plan objective, to recognise that existing development can adapt and contribute towards achieving carbon neutrality through sensitive works and alterations. Delete 'new' from first sentence.
Policies do not sufficiently address climate change	The objective on climate change is both realistic and ambitious.
Focus development at the most sustainable locations	Through the plan policies and site allocations, the plan seeks to direct development to the most sustainable locations, including with regard to constraints, access to infrastructure, facilities and services, and with regard to site capacity, in line with the overarching Climate Change objective.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Focus development at the most sustainable locations	11077	Agree with objective, but urge TVBC in addressing the challenge, to take a nuanced and proactive approach – focusing development at locations with: (a) the fewest constraints; (b) the best 'hard' infrastructure; (c) the greatest capacity to grow sustainably in the long term
Energy efficiency of existing buildings should be sought by this objective as	Historic England 10049	delete word "new" as later content in the draft plan makes clear, the local plan can support increased energy efficiency of existing buildings as well as in new development. Not all related measures will require planning permission (though some will); and the plan can set out its broad support for energy efficiency, including ways in which communities can respond effectively.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
well as in new development.		
Achieving net zero	10760	One of the main purposes of the Local Plan is to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050 in line with the Climate Change Act, by reducing current and future greenhouse gas emissions and increasing energy production from renewable sources.
Support embedding best practice and CEAP goals at heart of Local Plan	Natural England 10140	Local Plan should make the most of the opportunity to embed actions, best practice, and goals from ongoing work on climate change (including Climate Emergency Action Plan) into the overarching Local Plan framework. Climate emergency should sit at the heart of the Local Plan, strengthening and providing further context for actions in the Climate Emergency Action Plan. Measures to tackle climate change and increase resilience should recognise the important role of the natural environment to reduce effects of climate change and enable nature recovery.
Support	Natural England 10140	Welcome that tackling climate change is a key objective.
Support	11108	W1 support the wording and intent of this spatial objective.
Support	10182	Fully support the climate change objective
Policies do not sufficiently address climate change	10082	The Plan fails to properly address the issue of Climate Change through its policies.
Support	11147	supportive of measures to reduce carbon emissions and improve biodiversity within the Borough.
Support	10230	Promoter states Bere Hill can be developed to support climate change due to its sustainable accessible and well-connected location and will achieve high standards of sustainable construction with energy efficiency in mind.

Objective – Our Communities Paragraphs 2.32 – 2.36

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future

	Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Rural communities – and access to infrastructure, public transport, facilities services	Test Valley Borough is primarily rural. It is very challenging for the local plan to support the retention and enhancement of key facilities, services and infrastructure for our many rural communities. Some growth and new development at the most sustainable communities in the rural areas can help to sustain the viability of services and enhance infrastructure. This is reflected in the objective. Amend new paragraph 2.32-2.36 to reflect the fact that more village/lower tier allocations are being introduced at the next stage of the plan.
Primary Healthcare and GP services	Access to GP services and primary healthcare is a concern for communities and important to health and wellbeing. Delivering local improvements to GP services and infrastructure, particularly in rural areas, is a significant challenge. The Local Plan can play a role in this and the Council works with the ICBs to help deliver improvements to primary healthcare infrastructure and GP services, including through developer contributions. Add reference to to maintaining or increasing access to primary healthcare and GP services at paragraphs 2.32-2.36, through working with ICBs and through securing s106 contributions in line with IDP.
Sustainability of rural communities, new development and infrastructure	The sustainability and future of the many rural communities across the Borough and their infrastructure and services, is a concern for consultees. The next consultation stage of the draft local plan will include more rural village allocations which may help to deliver some infrastructure improvements and help to support the viability of rural services.
Rural communities and transport infrastructure	Improving and maintaining rural sustainable rural transport options is a significant challenge and the Local Plan can play a limited role in this. The allocation of sites in rural areas can help to support the viability of rural bus services, where they exist, and can lead to improvements in our cycling and walking networks and links. The next stage of the draft local plan includes more rural village/lower tier housing allocations.
Local infrastructure provision and capacity	Consultees are concerned about infrastructure and whether it can adequately provide for growth at our existing and for new communities. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) identifies and supports the enhancement and delivery of infrastructure provisions to meet the needs of communities as our settlements grow. The IDP is being prepared and updated alongside the Local Plan and TVBC works with neighbouring authorities, HCC and a range of other key stakeholders on planning for infrastructure provision.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Communities and access to Local infrastructure/services	11014, 10937	The sustainability of our communities is linked to their ability to have easy and safe access to facilities, services and amenities to serve economic and social needs. Access for rural communities should be a priority for TVBC
Local infrastructure and capacity	10925	The local infrastructure is already struggling will not be able to cope with the proposed developments.
Primary health care	NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB	this paragraph doesn't refer to primary care
Role of GP services	NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB	GPs have a role in a community and this should be recognised
Education	10925	The proposed development will put further strain on education systems which are already struggling.
Leadership	Andover C of E Parish 10762	How will good leadership be offered to create a welcoming and inclusive culture for new residents?
Andover - Community and sense of place	Andover C of E Parish 10762	What thinking is going into this to ensure the town continues to grow it's overall sense of community cohesion and retain it's sense of place?
Grateley - potential for future development	11077	Proposals at Grateley precisely align with this objective, involving development at one of the most accessible locations in the Borough, whilst providing for those facilities not currently available in the village
Leckford – potential for future development	10113	Leckford has suffered from decline in recent years due to the lack of investment. Through a carefully considered, long-term strategy the Estate wishes to invest in the village of Leckford to ensure its longevity for the longer term, whilst also contributing towards meeting local housing and employment needs, including the provision of affordable housing
Leckford – potential for future development	10113	Leckford Estate has reviewed opportunities for additional development within the village and engaged with the community assessing future needs. The Estate would deliver quality, well designed housing, including affordable housing, which would support and sustain access to facilities and services required to facilitate healthy lifestyles
Leckford – potential for future development	10113	Future plans would appreciate Leckford's location on the River Test and development would provide links to the existing walking routes which would encourage active lifestyles

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Leckford – potential for future development	10113	The objective of 'Our Communities' sits closely with our client's aspirations for Leckford, in particular the aim that an increase in population can help to sustain the vibrancy of rural communities through helping to keep existing facilities and services
Lack of infrastructure to accommodate growth	10954	Residents are not against further development, though object to the lack of extended infrastructure and local services to new developments.
Rural communities	10082	Rural communities are treated unfairly in ensuring that existing facilities and services remain.
Support role of villages and rural communities as well as towns	11108	Support the wording and intent of this spatial objective, in particular the emphasis on the role of villages as well as towns, although the extent to which the draft policies will be realised practically has yet to be affirmed.
Access to public transport in rural areas	10082	There are insufficient proposals within the LP to rectify the problem of access to public transport in rural areas. Private cars have good road links between Andover and Romsey though this is detrimental to the rural areas.
Development supports viability of services	10082	The only way to support the viability of local village centres is to increase the local population, in Kings Somborne, the decision to allocate 41 dwellings in the NP was too late to save the village shop for example
Support needed for shops and services.	10082	The support for shops and local services is established in policies but this is not accompanied with action to assist all of the communities.
Rural communities	10082	Rural areas are not treated equally when it comes to keeping existing facilities and services viable.as only certain communities are supported
Lack of rural public transport infrastructure	10082	There are no proposals to rectify the fact that some rural areas have limited access to public transport.
Rural communities	10139	There is one reference to rural communities however, the plan does not propose any housing allocations in the rural villages leaving the issue to communities to address such as, neighbourhood plans
Support	10101	Support ambitions to deliver and strengthen sustainable, cohesive and healthy communities in Borough's towns and villages.
Bere Hill	10230	Promoter states Bere Hill can be developed to support our communities as development has the ability to secure lasting benefits for Andover including enhancements to social infrastructure and provision of high quality attractive green infrastructure.

Objective – Town Centres Paragraphs 2.37 – 2.41

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Town centre and evidence on retail and leisure uses	The evidence base on town centres and future retail, leisure and hotel needs will be updated to take account of recent trends, including the impacts of Covid 19. This will inform the future Regulation 19 draft local plan.
Town centres can be supported by new housing and population growth	The draft plan proposes strategic housing allocations at and around our two key market towns of Andover and Romsey, as well as at other more sustainable settlements in the Borough. The draft plan, and the masterplans prepared for Andover and Romsey, recognise that town centre regeneration (including a mix of uses and homes) can help to sustain the vibrancy and vitality of our town centres.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Support	11108	Support the wording and intent of this spatial objective.
Town centres – retail/recreation evidence base	10938	Retail capacity and recreational use evidence should be updated to understand changes to this landscape post-Covid 19.
Support for new housing at/near town centres	10139	It is an aim of the plan to bring more vitality to town centres, increasing the population close to town centres would be integral to this and is enabled by the plan policies and draft allocations.
Bere Hill development	10230	Promoter states Bere Hill can be developed to support town centres as allocation will support the vitality of the nearby Andover town centre utilising the town centre for services jobs and retail.

Objective – Built, Historic and Natural Environment Paragraphs 2.42 – 2.43

Key Issue	Officer Response
-----------	------------------

	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Locally important heritage assets	It is recognised that many buildings, landscapes and features in Test Valley Borough are not designated, but still have local and heritage interest and contribute to sense of place. The objective highlights the importance of local character and identity, and the supporting text highlights the importance of the built and natural environment, including its features and landscapes. There are no plans to introduce 'local lists' or designations in Test Valley at the present time.
Heritage and place making	Agree that heritage is a significant resource and opportunity for placemaking as well as being a constraint. Heritage can play a positive role in maintaining and enhancing local distinctiveness and in regeneration. Amend supporting text to reflect this.
Improving the natural environment	This objective recognises the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural environment and biodiversity.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Locally important heritage assets	Historic England 10049	Support objective but recommend adding a short paragraph in supporting text about what is not designated nationally and the contribution of locally important assets to the character of Test Valley.
Positive role of heritage in place-making	Historic England 10049	Support objective but supporting text could pick up on scope for place-shaping being enhanced by local context, not automatically seeing heritage as a constraint, but also as an opportunity, bringing historic buildings into new use, tackling heritage at risk and drawing from or better revealing existing character in support of distinctive places.
Improving the natural environment	Natural England 10140	Plan should have a clear aim to significantly and demonstrably improve the natural environment to ensure housing and infrastructure needs are met sustainably, in line with legislation and national policy.
Support	11108	Support the wording and intent of this spatial objective.
Support	10139	The stated aim (preceding paragraph 2.42) is one we would endorse however the plan should do more towards fulfilling this ambition
The built environment should not stifle development at	10778	Within the Built, Historic and Natural Environment objective, we support the recognition of varied and diverse characteristics in the environment within the Borough. This should not stifle development in sustainable locations

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
sustainable locations		
Bere Hill promotion	10230	Promoter states Bere Hill can be developed sensitively to conserve and enhance the existing built historic and natural environment.
Grateley promotion - potential for future development	11077	Note that Grateley, and particularly Grateley Station, is one of the least constrained settlements in the Borough, when factoring in the full array of planning considerations, and considerably less constrained than many of the settlements at Tier 2 and Tier 3. Grateley should therefore be a highly favoured candidate for future development

Objective – Ecology and Biodiversity Paragraphs 2.44 – 2.49

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Biodiversity and wildlife	Protecting and enhancing the biodiversity, habitat, natural resources and wildlife of the Borough is a key objective of the plan which underpins many of the draft plan policies. This is in line with the NPPF and Biodiversity Net Gain requirements for new development, other environmental regulations and law and also reflects the importance of our precious natural environment and the rich biodiversity of the Borough, our communities, residents and businesses.
Nature restoration	The Local Plan plays a positive role in enabling nature restoration projects, as well as in securing biodiversity net gain and the preservation and enhancement of ecological networks, through its various policies and site allocations. However, TVBC does not propose to set specific targets for nature restoration within the draft plan.
Loss of green spaces	The Draft Local Plan places a high value on our biodiversity, landscapes, and green or blue spaces. It includes policies that seek to retain, enhance and increase our green infrastructure, including with new development. However, many of the draft housing and employment site allocations are proposed within areas of the Borough that are not built up around existing settlements. This is necessary in order to meet our identified housing and economic needs, given that there is limited

	brownfield capacity within the Borough. It is recognised that this is a difficult balance, and the plan seeks to direct development towards the most sustainable locations, in terms of environmental, economic and social sustainability, including through site assessments and sustainability appraisal.
--	---

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Support	11108	Support the wording and intent of this spatial objective.
Support	10366	Support the need to maintain and enhance the countryside landscape and avoid loss of habitats
Support	10052	Support for recognition of groundwater flooding problems.
Support	10113	The 'ecology and biodiversity' objective is supported as the Leckford Estate seeks to enhance biodiversity opportunities through its agricultural activities
Protection of biodiversity/wildlife	10937	Biodiversity and wildlife should be protected before any development is progressed.
Nature restoration	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust 10047	The Wildlife Trusts are calling for at least 30% of land and sea to be restored for nature and climate by 2030, in line with national and international commitments. Would welcome Test Valley Borough Council joining this ambition and putting in place a clear target for nature's recovery by 2030, backed by mapping and appropriate policy mechanisms.
Nature restoration	Test Valley Friends of the Earth Test Valley Friends of the Earth 10760	One of the main goals of the Local Plan must be to ensure nature restoration goals are high level in all planning.
Green space	10925	The loss of green space will impact the wildlife in the area.
Green space	10937	Green spaces should be protected before any development is progressed.
Green Infrastructure	10101	Need to consider best ways to conserve and where possible enhance the Borough's Green Infrastructure
Protection and improvement of wildlife	Test Valley Friends of the Earth Test Valley Friends of the Earth	The natural environment and the protection and improvement of habitat for our dwindling wildlife is one of the main purposes of the Local Plan.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10760	
Biodiversity enhancement	10939	Paragraph 2 does not specifically highlight where additional nature and increased biodiversity will take place.
Plan lacks ambition and policy clarity on nature recovery	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust 10047	While pleased to see the environment as a key issue, consider that the Local Plan suffers from a lack of development of key policies; does not represent best practice in policy clarity and ambition to put nature into recovery across the borough. Also, lack of ambition to contribute to nature's recovery through the proposed strategic developments.
Support reference to Building With Nature	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust 10047	Welcome reference to the Building with Nature accreditation in the supporting text.
Agriculture and land based industry	10101	Agriculture and land based industries have key impact on character of area and how Borough's landscapes are managed
Catchment approach	CPRE Hampshire 10139	A catchment approach to the paragraph preceding paragraph 2.44 would better underpin the stated aim
Broadlands	10101	Broadlands Estate owns and manages large tracts of land in south of Borough. Engage with Council to discuss
Bere Hill	10230	Promoter states Bere Hill can be developed to support ecology and biodiversity as the site can enhance the connectivity quantity and quality of ecological and green infrastructure networks.
Grateley	11077	Rightly identify the protection of the numerous ecological assets of the Borough as a 'pressing need'. Several points should be noted in respect of Grateley: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grateley is entirely free of ecological designations - The closest ecological designation (Porton Down SSSI/SPA), is not accessible to the public - Grateley is outside of the 13.79km 'zone of influence' around the New Forest SPA - The two sites offer ample potential to secure ecological enhancement and BNG
Grateley	11077	Streetway Road site is under an intensive agricultural use (the growth of turf), meaning that cessation of this use in favour of housing may entail a reduction of nutrient impacts on the relevant catchment, enabling neutrality to be attained more readily than it would otherwise
Grateley	11077	Virtually every settlement in Test Valley is affected by this flood risk, except Grateley, where no flood risk is identified. This is on account of the historic pattern of development, whereby most settlements in the area tended to grow along chalk stream valleys and at spring lines. Grateley is a rare exception to this, being situated in the centre of one of the largest areas of open chalk plateau in the Borough

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Romsey Barge Canal and Fishlake Meadows	11032	Any proposals should avoid a negative impact on Romsey Barge Canal and Fishlake Meadows.
West Down Nature Reserve	10937	West Down Nature Reserve should be designated with SINC status as it backs onto the TVF.

Objective – Health, Wellbeing and Recreation Paragraphs 2.50 – 2.55

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Active Travel	Designing development to encourage active travel and enhance active travel infrastructure is a key theme within the plan and its policies. However, it would also be appropriate to refer to these themes in the supporting text to this objective. Update supporting text to refer to active travel.
Allotments and access to garden space/green space and recreation	The Local Plan policies recognise that access to green space and private or shared gardens, outside spaces and allotments can support healthy eating and lifestyles. However, this can also be brought out further in the supporting text to this objective.
Health and Wellbeing strategic policy	NHS property services, Southampton City Council and Hampshire County Council recommend the inclusion of specific policies on health, equity and wellbeing in the Local Plan, to support healthy living, designing for health and equity and to priorities health outcomes in development. Health and wellbeing is a key objective of the plan and an integral theme throughout the draft plan policies, including those on active travel, design, public open space, housing, communities and community facilities, climate change, biodiversity, heritage, town centres, access to the countryside and green infrastructure. A stand alone strategic policy on health impacts, outcomes and wellbeing is not considered necessary.

Infrastructure and health	The plan recognises the access to healthcare provision and infrastructure is key to health and wellbeing and this can be supported through the plan objectives and policies. Supporting text to be amended to reflect the role of 'developers' in delivering health infrastructure (para 2.55).
Pollution	The plan policies recognise the importance of avoiding, minimising and mitigation pollution and protecting amenities in our homes, workplaces and public spaces, including through good design. This theme should be brought out in the supporting text to this objective, given that there are clear implications for health and wellbeing.
Public open space	The supporting text recognises the role that access to recreational opportunities, sports provisions, public open space, culture, the arts and the countryside can play in supporting health and wellbeing. Add reference to the benefits for 'social interaction' and health and wellbeing, reflecting NPPF guidance and representations.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Active Travel	NHS Property Services 10732	Design of schemes should encourage active travel - link to healthy development
Affordable Housing	NHS Property Services 10732	Healthy development should provide the necessary mix of housing types and affordable housing reflecting local needs
Allotments	NHS Property Services 10732	Healthy development should provide access to healthy foods, such as allotments and/providing sufficient garden space
Climate change	NHS Property Services 10732	Healthy development should be designed to be resilient and adaptable to climate change, such as SuDs, rainwater collection and efficient design
Green space	10925	The loss of green space will be detrimental to the health and wellbeing of local residents.
Health	NHS Property Services 10732	Encourage Council to discuss a health and wellbeing policy with NHS prior to Reg 19
Health	NHS Property Services 10732	Healthy developments could include requirement for proposals to consider local health outcomes and where appropriate to local context and/ or scheme size include a HIA

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Health	NHS Property Services 10732	recommend a standalone comprehensive policy on health and wellbeing in the Local Plan
Health, Wellbeing and Recreation	11077	Agree with these principles, and is aiming to deliver a significant gain to these aims through its proposals at Grateley. Including significant community facilities, sport and recreational facilities, and footpath links in addition to housing
Heritage	NHS Property Services 10732	Healthy development should ensure development embrace and respects context and heritage of area
Infrastructure - health	NHS Property Services 10732	Health provision integral component of sustainable development - access to healthcare services promotes good health outcomes and supports overall social and economic wellbeing of an area
Infrastructure - health	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB 10763	Health provision integral component of sustainable development - access to healthcare services promotes good health outcomes and supports overall social and economic wellbeing of an area
Infrastructure - health	NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB 10763	Developers should also be referred to here
Local Plan Objectives	10778	The Health, Wellbeing and Recreation objective encourages opportunities for recreational and community activities through the provision of accessible open spaces, access to the countryside, sports, leisure and other community facilities and services. There are opportunities to support this through development at various scales across communities in the Borough, for example at Kings Somborne which is proposed as a Tier 3 settlement and so certain types of development will be accepted.
Pollution	NHS Property Services 10732	Healthy development should consider impact of pollution and microclimates, using design to minimise negative outcomes
Public Open Space	NHS Property Services	Healthy developments should design schemes in way that encourages social interaction such as front gardens, informal meeting spaces, neighbourhood squares and green spaces

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10732	
Public Open Space	NHS Property Services 10732	Healthy development should provide sufficient high quality green and blue spaces within new developments
Southampton City Council: Health and wellbeing policy	Southampton City Council 10098	Impacts and linkages to health could be made more explicit plan itself, through supporting text or even better in strategic health and wellbeing policy. Southampton happy to discuss learnings in this field
Biodiversity	11027	The area being developed would damage access to areas of recreation and natural habit, notably Upton Lane.
Hampshire County Council: Joint strategic needs assessment	Hampshire County Council 10099	The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) provides useful evidence to further strengthen and support your policy ambitions and outcomes. Sections on Healthy Places and Healthy Settings are of relevance within the Local Plan.
Hampshire County Council: Objectives	Hampshire County Council 10099	A health and wellbeing policy framework that flows through all policies and links together various place-based ambitions, would demonstrate a positive drive for all new development and planning proposals to consider health and wellbeing as a key outcome. Local Plan could usefully include a headline priority policy or vision around health and equity. Examples of local plans which include such strategic policies could be provided if this would be helpful.
Health, wellbeing and Recreation	11108	Support the wording and intent of this spatial objective.
Support	10230	Promoter states Bere Hill can be developed to support health, wellbeing and recreation to provide opportunities for recreational and community activities through the provision of a Country Park a network of accessible open spaces and access to the countryside.
Traffic	10875	Increased traffic from the proposed development will ruin the use of Upton Lane as a country lane for recreation and natural habitat.

Objective – Design Paragraphs 2.56 – 2.57

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future

	Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Heritage and Design	Vision and supporting text amended to emphasise the contribution that heritage makes to character and context and that heritage contributes positively to design.
National Model Design Code - Parts 1 and 2	Comments noted and supporting text to be amended accordingly to support reference to the detailed guidance in part 2 of the National Model Design Code.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Design	11108	W1 support the wording and intent of this spatial objective.
Green space	11027	The proposed developments of warehouse and distribution centres do not align with the objective.
Heritage and Design	Historic England 10049	Support objective but supporting text should emphasise the contribution of heritage to character and the context of development. This should be made explicit in the text.
Landscape Character	10875	The proposed housing development is not consistent with the National Design Guide and Building Better, Building Beautiful.
Local Plan Objectives	10778	Support the Design objective to deliver safe, attractive, integrated and well-designed environments. This can come forward in a variety of ways and should be applied as a site-specific consideration
National Model Design Code Parts 1 and 2	Wiltshire Swifts 10564	Should also reference National Model Design Code part 2 guidance as this provides much needed detail. Amended wording suggested.
Rural Housing Requirement	11014	There is an increasing need for downsizing by older residents, the LP should provide a range of homes fit for purpose and designed to meet the needs and aspirations of different groups within the community including a range of affordable housing and homes that meet the needs of an ageing population
Support	10230	Promoter states Bere Hill can be developed to support design to provide a safe attractive integrated and well designed environment that responds to the local context and character.
Design, Grateley	11077	Fully support these aims to bring forward high quality developments that respond positively to the local character and context of Grateley, as well as delivering significant new facilities to the village of Grateley in highly accessible locations, aiming to improve the overall quality of life in the village

Objective – Housing

Paragraphs 2.58 – 2.60

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Housing Numbers	The housing requirement set out in the draft local plan is set by National Government (through the 'standard method') and reflects identified minimum housing needs. It is informed by the affordability of the housing stock in the Borough. The Plan therefore seeks to meet this housing need.
Housing objective	Local housing need is based upon the Government's 'standard method'. A mix of housing by size, type and tenure will be sought to reflect the needs of our communities based upon the evidence base, which will be updated.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing	11108	Support the wording and intent of this spatial objective.
Housing	11038	Strongly oppose the Draft Local Plan, as the high number of houses being constructed will have a negative impact on the area.
Housing	10817	Objective is currently narrowly focussed on "meeting the needs of our communities" instead of understanding how unmet needs can be accommodated. Objective should be amended to "meeting the needs of the wider community" in recognition of the strategic context.
Housing mix	10101	Providing range of housing to meet needs of our communities key challenge for the local plan
Proposed Sites Broadlands Estate	10101	Development sites within Broadlands Estates ownership can help to address challenge of sustainably located and proportionately sized residential development in Romsey and surrounding villages to meet local need
Support	10101	Strongly support providing a range of homes fit for purpose and designed to meet needs and aspirations of different groups including range of affordable housing and needs of ageing population
Support	10230	Promoter states Bere Hill can be developed to support housing to deliver good quality and well designed affordable and market homes in varying sizes styles and tenures providing for local needs.
Affordable Housing	CPRE Hampshire 10139	The issue of affordability is mentioned however, the plan relies on the NPPF thresholds for affordable housing which has delivered very few homes since 2011

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Local Plan Objectives	10778	Emphasise that the local need figure should be treated as a minimum. Paragraph 2.58 notes the requirement to identify a “continuous” supply of land for new homes to meet the need. We agree this is an important factor and as such the policies in the Plan should support the continuous supply of homes
Support	10120	In principle, support the housing objective.

Objective – Economy, Prosperity and Skills Paragraphs 2.61 – 2.64

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Employment land supply	The plan proposes a number of employment sites across the Borough as well as the continuation of existing strategic employment sites. Development management policies are also set out that support employment development at appropriate locations. The proposals seek to meet the employment needs of the Borough, based on our evidence base and projections.
Rural economy	The draft plan and policies within it recognise the importance of the rural economy and employment in Test Valley Borough, including through diversification, tourism, homeworking and the re-use of rural buildings to help support a sustainable economy.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Support	11108	Support the wording and intent of this spatial objective.
Economy, Prosperity and Skills	11077	Note that alongside housing, proposing to deliver flexible space capable of an employment-generating role. This will contribute to local economic vitality. By positioning new homes at Grateley close to a mainline railway station, residents will be able to access a diverse range of skilled jobs across the region without the need for private car journeys
Economy, Prosperity and Skills	11077	Grateley has been host to significant employment sites, including the Grateley Business Park and the Stevens Yard premises on Old Stockbridge Road. Given the accessibility of the village, particularly by rail but also by the strategic road network. There is potential for such established

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		sites to grow their employment role further, particularly if stimulated with new housebuilding and investment in the community
Employment land	10101	Delivery of employment land is crucial to success of emerging local plan to meet employment needs and support level of proposed housing
Employment land	10101	Provision of sufficient employment space helps minimise travel distances residents must travel to obtain employment
Employment land	10101	Provision of sufficient employment space helps boost investment potential of Borough
Employment land supply	11119	The actual employment land requirement figure is higher than the Plan proposes to take forward, and that additional sites need to be allocated for employment land in order to meet this need. This would be positive and proactive approach in accordance with national policy.
Employment land supply - concerns	11119	Support that the importance of the economy is recognised in the Council's vision and through a dedicated economic objective. Raise significant concerns that the Council are only seeking to allocate one new employment development in Northern Test Valley and the Plan is using employment land requirement figures that are the lowest option presented in the evidence base.
Rural economy	10101	Rural economy is significant component of Test Valley's economic prosperity
Rural economy	10101	Businesses located in rural area provide significant contribution towards economic success of Test Valley and homes to large number of companies and jobs
Small Businesses	10101	Number of small businesses operating in Borough continues to grow significantly
Smaller employment sites	10101	Allocation of smaller employment sites, flexible in use and capable of meeting needs of variety of different businesses through flexible workspaces is important and perhaps even more so post Covid 19
Support	11081	Support Objective
Support	10101	Supportive of strategic priorities, particularly highlight importance of 'prosperity' and need to demonstrate economic growth and positive outcomes for local communities
Support	10101	Support objective in strongest possible terms
Support	10101	Agree with allocating sufficient land for employment use through emerging local plan, supported by evidence base
Support	10230	Promoter states Bere Hill can be developed to support economy, prosperity and skills to create temporary construction jobs under permanent increase in council tax revenue. The homes in a sustainable location with excellent connections to major local employment.
Support	10183	Supportive of the Council's strategic priorities and particularly the importance of Prosperity.

Objective – Transport and Movement

Paragraphs 2.65 – 2.69

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Cumulative impact of growth	The proposed allocations within the draft Regulation 18, Stage 2, local plan have been tested through highways modelling, and this is set out in the evidence base. However, further work would be appropriate, in consultation with Hampshire County Council and National Highways to establish any implications for the network, road junctions and transport infrastructure, given the additional sites set out within the revised draft plan. This work will continue towards the preparation of a Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan.
Public transport and sustainable transport options	The Local Plan objective encourages active and sustainable transport modes and the enhancement of transport infrastructure, including access to sustainable transport options. It seeks to ensure that development supports active travel and is sustainable. The policies seek to enhance access to sustainable transport options, including active modes, rail and bus networks, and the Council will work with key stakeholders to help deliver improvements, including Network Rail, HCC and South Western Railway services. Development is proposed through the plan at the most sustainable locations, which can help to reduce the need to travel, particularly by private car. TVBC recognise that HCC budgets are under pressure and that rural bus networks can be challenging to sustain. Car dependency may be higher in rural locations than in the larger settlements. However, the objective is considered to be sound and appropriately ambitious.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
National Highways: Cumulative impact of growth	National Highways 100291	Proposed new growth will need to be considered in context of cumulative impact from already proposed development on the strategic road network
National Highways: Increase on strategic road network or junctions	National Highways 100291	Concerned if any material increase in traffic in strategic road network or at junctions without careful consideration of mitigation measures

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - Transport	Network Rail and South Western Railway	It is vital that the transport infrastructure required to support the level of growth that Test Valley are required to meet is fully considered and is identified as a key priority for the Plan.
Local Plan Objectives	10778	Support that the Transport and Movement objective encourages active and sustainable modes of transport, seeks to reduce the impact of travel and ensure new development facilitates improvements to accessibility, safety and connectivity in our transport infrastructure
Network Rail	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	As a provider of infrastructure that supports modal shift to more sustainable forms of travel, Network Rail is keen to work with the Council and other third parties to ensure this is embedded within current and future development.
Preferred Pool of sites	10133	30-minute cycle from sites at Ludgershall only reaches outskirts of Andover, whereas entirety of Andover, including rail station, are well within a 30-minute cycle of Finkley Down Farm
Public Transport	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	Supporting growth through enhanced public transport provision is an essential part of this process and there are significant opportunities that could be pursued within Test Valley.
Public Transport	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	Network Rail supports paragraph which notes Test Valley's access to a good rail network. From stations within Test Valley, rail users can access Salisbury, Reading, Basingstoke, Southampton, Woking and London Waterloo within relatively short timeframes. This presents significant commuting and leisure opportunities for residents and would be a key factor in making Test Valley an attractive place to locate
Public Transport	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	Improving access to public transport should be a significant focus of the Plan.
Rail Station	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	It is important to understand where people will access each of the stations in TV by cycle and ensure sufficient cycle storage and safe access routes to the station with a focus on designated cycle paths, signage and traffic.
Railway	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	It is important that opportunities to promote the use of the railway as a more sustainable modes of transport are identified and taken forward.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Railway	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	The railway network is a vital element of the country's economy and a key component in the drive to deliver the Government's sustainable agenda.
Spatial Strategy	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	Development will be focussed in the most sustainable locations using the 20 minute neighbourhood principles to reduce the need for travel and therefore its impacts, helping to make places more attractive for places to live in amounts to cramming more development and people into places where there is already high development density and stress on existing local services and infrastructure
Support	10120	Support the transport objective.
Transport and Movement	11077	Grateley is close to Porton Down, which is one of the largest single employment campuses in the sub region. The site is developing further with a new Innovation Centre. Although Porton Down is not within Test Valley, Grateley is one of the nearest villages, and Grateley Station is the closest point of railway access to the campus. Test Valley must consider formal housing-led site allocations at Grateley
active travel	11147	settlement extensions are typically able to provide bespoke solutions and onsite cycle/footpaths that provide improved connections with existing networks.
Andover bus network	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	It is becoming hard to sustain small urban bus networks such as in Andover. While the network has a comprehensive appearance, many routes have limited frequencies, poor or unsuitable hours of operation and provide limited appeal to anything but 'last resort' patronage. This limited network is under threat from the County Council's SP25 budget Savings Plan, many of the less frequent routes and links on the margins of the town may well be lost.
bus strategy	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	A strategy that has the fullest possible regard for the potential role of bus is also at the same time, likely to catalyse wider improvements in bus service connectivity and frequency that benefit a far larger number of existing residents and journey demands, with commensurate positive outcomes for carbon mitigation, socio-economic inclusion and public health; all of which are reflected in the Strategic Objectives of the draft plan
Infrastructure - Public Transport	10875	The proposed development contradicts the aim for a carbon free future as the only buses available are school buses, meaning there will be increased private car usage as a result of the proposed development.
Infrastructure - Transport	10789	The draft LP needs to reflect TVBC's commitment to transport policies and provide safe and sustainable transport links for cars, bikes and pedestrians

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Language and outcomes	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	We acknowledge and welcome the transport objectives however, the language makes no commitments and has no clearly defined outcomes. The Council is looking to show it has addressed the matter, while being quite equivocal about what it actually wants to achieve, the plan is likely to be ineffective and inadequately evidenced, and thus, unsound.
Mode shift	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The draft objective should be restated with a clear and explicit focus on securing a substantial change in wider travel behaviour, including through mode shift to active travel and public transport. The NPPF expects sustainable modes to offer a 'genuine choice' that compete effectively with personal car use. With the declared climate emergency in view, the plan should seek to ensure it is directed at making them 'the natural first choice' as expressed in the National Decarbonisation Plan for Transport.
National Highways: Vision - carbon and travel	National Highways 10291	Welcome Vision to promote sustainable development with focus on reducing carbon emissions whilst promoting active travel and public transport use to limit car journeys and congestion locally, and on wider network
Public Transport	10082	The policy to assist access to public transport is seemingly reliant on the idea that it will not work.
Public Transport	10938	The plan should seek to improve public transport links from Romsey to Science Park.
Public Transport	CPRE Hampshire 10139	The issue of public transport is highlighted but is an understatement regarding reality and makes no additional provision for rural communities who are inevitably forced back on car dependency
Public transport baseline position	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	We welcome the recognition of the importance of transport and mobility but as far as it refers to public transport we fear it leads the reader to conclude that the baseline position is better and more comprehensive than it actually is
Public Transport Use	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	If the plan is to meet its transport and connectivity objectives it will have to make efforts to promote public transport. The plan methodology, strategy and IDP makes no attempt. 'Encouraging' public transport use is an almost meaningless phrase and in reality leads to specious activity, if any takes place at all. By contrast, where development is directly served by high frequency, direct and reliable public transport, little encouragement is needed: residents make use of it.
Railway	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	As a matter of course, proponents of sites which are close to the railway boundary or sites which could affect the railway asset directly are required to engage with our Asset Protection and Optimisation team (ASPRO).

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Romsey bus network	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	In Romsey, the town is dependent almost entirely on bus links to Southampton, Chandlers Ford/Eastleigh, and Winchester. While these are regular, frequencies are no more than every 30 minutes and many run hourly through the suburbs. There are opportunities to consolidate and reinforce these links including frequency uplifts to make these services more relevant for a broader range of journey purposes.
Rural Communities	10082	There should be feeder links from the rural areas to the strategic road network.
Rural Communities	10082	It is unclear what paragraph 2.66 means, it is not proactive.
Rural Communities	10082	Although the policy facilitates access to public transport, it seems to be postulated on the acceptance that this will fail.
Rural Communities	10082	The principle in this paragraph precludes development in rural areas and its main application is for new housing developments.
Rural development	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	We concur strongly and agree with the conclusion, the plan strategy will be the key that most effectively unlocks this aspiration. It will require a clear focus on a limited number of key rural bus corridors where there may be scope to secure hourly services where sufficient and substantial population and services are allocated on them. Such an approach would be a 'long shot' as various constraints as well as political acceptability of development on a sufficient scale may make this unachievable.
Rural public transport	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Some services are dependent on County Council support which under the proposals set out in SP25 might be withdrawn by Summer 2025 meaning, few rural settlements have a meaningful public transport offer. This includes Stockbridge which despite being a tier 2 settlement only has 2/3 off-peak departures per day to Winchester and Andover and Kings Somborne, where allocations are proposed, that has even less provision.
Support	10230	Promoter states Bere Hill can be developed to support transport and movement as the site is in a sustainable location and will be designed to ensure active and sustainable modes of transport that are accessible safe and attractive.
sustainable transport	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	As the National Transport Decarbonisation Plan makes plain, these emissions are accounting for a rising proportion of the whole, while the broad trajectory is already proving to be especially challenging to achieve. A spatial strategy that will be effective in addressing this through a clear focus on pursuing a spatial strategy that facilitates sustainable transport, will need to pursue the principles set out in NPPF paragraphs 108-110 with clear focus and singular determination; while, naturally, keeping the other themes and constraints to which the plan must have regard, in view. It is thus concerning and highly regrettable that this is given neither clear focus nor the necessary weight in the assessment of issues facing the plan at the outset of this draft.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Traffic	11027	Poor public transport links in the area, most of Test Valley travel by car (which will be true of those living and working in the new developments). Facilitates an increase in private car usage and negates the aim of a carbon free future.
Traffic	11027	Low wage employment makes reducing reliance on private car travel difficult as the house prices in Nursling are unaffordable to anyone on a low wage in warehouses or distribution centres.
Transport	10082	The principle suggested in para 2.68 would prevent development in rural areas.
Transport and mobility collaboration	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	We welcome that the Council recognises the key role of collaboration in securing the plans transport and mobility objectives however, partnership working will not change the fundamental realities of supply and demand of public transport services. The plan must be informed by a realistic appraisal of what is possible, rather than mere aspiration as the NPPF expects all aspects to be demonstrably deliverable.
Transport and Movement	11108	Support the wording and intent of this spatial objective.
Transport and Movement	11147	Support the strategy to encourage active and sustainable modes of transport and reduce the impact of travel by private car. This can be achieved through allocating land on the edges of settlements, which can then support the facilities and services of those settlements
Transport carbon mitigation	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The plan acknowledges its vital potential impact in the area of transport carbon mitigation however, the objective does not follow through to ensure that it does in fact achieve this goal or align clearly and unequivocally with draft Hampshire Local Transport Plan 4.

General and other comments on Chapter 2 – Vision, Key Challenges and Objectives and on the introductory text to this chapter

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Duty to Co-Operate and housing numbers	The Council will continue to engage within our neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Co-Operate, including on strategic planning for housing and employment needs, and on environmental mitigation

	measures for internationally protected sites under the Habitats Regulations. This would include any potential future arising unmet housing needs.
Plan Period	The Council will review the plan period in light of changes in national planning policy, updating of the evidence base and to seek to achieve a 15 year period on adoption. The Government's changes to the NPPF and increase in housing need to be plan for, has lead to a delay in the local plan timetable and consequent impact on the plan period.
Environment Act 2021	The draft local plan is being prepared in light of the duties under the Environment Act 2021 with regard to water resources, air quality and biodiversity, and nature recovery.
Sustainable Travel	The provision of sustainable transport modes and accessibility will be taken into account as part of the site assessment process, and the potential to enhance and maximise opportunities for sustainable travel by active modes and public transport will be prioritised, whilst reflecting the predominantly rural nature of the Borough.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
General	10182	Critical that Plan timescales/adoption are not delayed beyond 2026 as current plan would then be 10 years old with only three years remaining. The context for planning has evolved significantly over the recent period.
General	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The objectives ought to relate directly to the requirements set out in NPPF, be locally specific and in the southern part of the borough be very closely tied back to the principles articulated in the SPS
General	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	If the Council is serious about mitigating carbon it should tie the spatial strategy and allocations tightly to mode shift to active travel and public transport. This will have a greater impact than attempting to squeeze returns out of the specifications of new buildings, that from February 2024 all need to be net-zero. The plan does not reflect this strongly enough in its objectives which are weakly expressed and will fail to justify and secure a strategy that achieves meaningfully different outcomes
General	11108	Welcome the text which provides transparency and ensures that the document is accessible to a broad audience.
General	11115	Support for the vision for Romsey Land north of Sandy Lane could contribute towards achieving this vision.
General	10230	the promoter supports the proposed vision and considers that the proposed allocation of the site will be able to directly contribute to achieving its vision by providing a wide range of good quality

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		homes on a well located well connected and sustainable site which will result in the creation of a new and inclusive neighbourhood of Andover.
General	10230	the proposed objectives and challenges are set out in chapter 2 of the draft plan. The promoter supports these spatial objectives and considers the proposed allocation of the site facilitates achieving these.
General	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	There needs to be greater emphasis on the role of transport and sustainable mobility pointing back to a modified plan vision and objectives, pursuant to the NPPF, SPS and the National Transport Decarbonisation Plan.
General	11147	Broadly supportive towards the local plan's overall proposed vision and objectives although would like to highlight the difficulties in bringing forward town centre regeneration sites
National Planning Policy and Guidance	11027	The proposed developments are degrading to the immediate environment.
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	We are quite unclear what effects are envisaged still to emerge by the Council, as far as matters that the Local Plan would be influenced by
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Of all the impacts of repeated "lockdowns" it was transport and mobility that saw the biggest changes. Of all modes, public transport saw the most devastating impacts, as national and local government intentionally sought to portray public transport use as dangerously irresponsible.
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Bus passenger boardings, on a like-for-like basis, have rebounded in most cases to well over 90% of pre-COVID peaks.
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The segment of use that has seen the most permanent loss is those over 67 travelling free of charge on concessionary passes, where boardings are at about 80-87% of fare-paying levels.
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The effect of the government's £2 fare cap per single journey has had a particularly beneficial impact on boardings on longer-distance inter-urban services. Some services are now seeing patronage at significantly above 2019 levels.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10243	
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	There is now clear evidence of greater journey to work travel in the office market across our business in Hampshire and more broadly. This is more heavily focused on Tuesday-Thursday. This is also clearly reflected in road traffic levels, where lesser pressure is experienced on Mondays and Fridays. Traffic congestion is at least as serious a challenge to the efficiency, attractiveness and reliability of bus journeys as it was in 2019.
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	While use of bus for shopping has declined, to about 20% of bus journeys, it has significantly increased for leisure and social purposes. Travel at weekends, including Sundays, and in the evenings, has recovered more quickly than the traditional weekday peaks.
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Recruitment and retention of staff remains a serious issue in South Hampshire and adjoining areas – including South Wiltshire. Where timetables have not been yet been fully restored to pre-COVID levels this largely reflects difficulties in recruiting sufficient establishment to deliver a higher timetable frequency. However, our Bluestar business is continuing to succeed in meeting this challenge, allowing us to continue to improve timetables.
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The published December 2023 NPPF made no large-scale changes, and on a large number of technical areas, national government has failed to issue any of its promised guidance. Given that an election will take place within months, the statements made in paragraph 2.6, that are those of the current administration, look quite likely not to be borne out.
National Planning Policy and Guidance	10875	The proposed developments contradict the Environment Act 2021 as they degrade the immediate environment.
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Test Valley Friends of the Earth 10760	The Environment Act 2021 and NPPF are key for designing landscaping on developments, open spaces, and leisure facilities as well as in nature reserves and protected areas of countryside. It is also key to all the streams, rivers and lakes and surrounding areas.
National Planning Policy and Guidance	National Highways 10291	Important that evidence and strategy informed by national policy, including DfT Circular 1/2022 and updated NPPF (December 2023)
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	the prior NPPF requirement on the evidential test of soundness remains entirely unchanged. Meeting the requirements of NPPF, including Chapter 9 in particular, demands that the spatial strategy is properly informed by transport evidence, among many other things, if it is to be credibly fund sound.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
National Planning Policy and Guidance	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	it is certainly the case that many LPAs have advanced plans with spatial strategies that have had little if any regard to transport evidence at “the earliest possible stage” as NPPF para 108 requires. This is the same language as every previous version of NPPF has included since 2012. For most of the last 12 years, most such plans have, ultimately, been accepted as sound by PINS, often following Inspector Reports that have clearly exposed serious concerns and discomfort about the transport impacts of development and the mitigation strategies proposed. This reflected, until about 2019, a recognition that having suitably ambitious up-to-date plans in place was the more important matter.
National Planning Policy and Guidance	11079	The local plan will need to be amended/revised in order to take advantage of the changes to the NPPF from 2023
National Planning Policy and Guidance	10803	Consider the draft plan is at risk of being found unsound under the relevant tests, as set out at Paragraph 35 of the NPPF (December 2023):
Objectives and Challenges	10082	The policies in the LP do not do enough to support the local services in all of the communities.
Objectives and Challenges	10082	Shops in rural areas and local village centres are only supported by an increase in local population and the policies do not go far enough to ensure this support.
Objectives and Challenges	11077	Fully support the approach to climate change. The proposals at Grateley would contribute by reducing the need to travel by private car, by clustering the development at a public transport hub, and providing new facilities for the use of the whole village
Objectives and Challenges	10120	In principle, support the proposed plan objectives.
Overview	Southampton CC 10098	Draft local plan responds appropriately to needs of Borough and highlights Council's understanding of up to date local issues both in Test Valley and wider South Hampshire region
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11108	The text on the Duty to Cooperate is helpful and the presence of the PfSH Spatial Position Statement (SPS) to 2026 is encouraging
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11108	The publication of a Duty to Co-operate topic paper is commended, particularly when considering cumulative impacts upon sensitive international habitats such as the River Avon and the availability of strategic mitigation-the extent to which the DTC has been realised in practice has yet to be affirmed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Basingstoke and Deane BC 10757	Opportunity to engage and collaborate on strategic planning matters, policies and cross boundary issues is welcomed.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Basingstoke and Deane BC 10757	Look forward to continuing engagement on emerging local plans.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10817	Inclusion of a reference to Wiltshire Council and their emerging proposals for Policy 40 'Land South East of Empress Way, Ludgershall' would helpfully describe the context of the future cross-boundary urban extension at Ludgershall.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	Suggests the Local Plan identifies more sustainable sites, including on land around Nursling and Rownhams, to help meet unmet housing needs.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	Local Plan wishes to defer meeting unmet housing needs to a point in the future and does not propose to address this unmet need at all. This lack of positivity is at odds with the NPPF and Policy SPS8 of the PfSH Spatial Position Statement.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	Local Plan fails to acknowledge the level of unmet housing needs in South Hampshire is significant.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	The Local Plan fails to recognise the positive strategic approach set out in SPS8 in the SPS as TVBC is making no positive movement to implement this approach.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10182	Risk that the identified unmet needs in the region will not be addressed, especially if a LP review does not take place for five yrs post adoption.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Home Builders Federation 10201	Need to ensure engage effectively with neighbouring areas with regard to housing needs
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11147	Publication of a Duty to Cooperate Topic Paper is welcomed and the presence of the PfSH Spatial Position Statement (SPS) to 2026 is encouraging. Clear efforts have been made to engage with external organisations and stakeholders, including statutory consultees, and with neighbouring authorities to accommodate any unmet needs that will be a key feature of a positively prepared, and therefore sound plan
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	Lack of allocation to address identified PFSH need risks the plan being found not legally compliant in terms of not fulfilling the duty to co-operate, but is also potentially an unsound approach to setting of a housing requirement and housing supply
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	The PfSH shortfall is only calculated to 2036 (where the TVBC plan period is 2040 and should be longer), meaning strategic policies (15 year minimum from date of adoption) should likely plan for an even greater level of unmet need.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	Councils have a Duty to Cooperate (see our comments above) and there is at this time insufficient evidence that TVBC have seriously engaged and collaborated with its neighbours on how to address the pressing cross-boundary strategic matter of housing need
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	Support the Council in their desire to work positively and collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities and other bodies to identify and seek to address any strategic, cross-boundary matters.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Eastleigh BC 10362	Note that PfSH Spatial Position Statement identified East of Romsey and South West of Chandler's Ford as two broad areas of search in Test Valley. Intention of these is to help deliver identified and potentially unmet housing needs within the wider housing market area.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Eastleigh BC 10362	Continue to recognise importance of collaborative working through Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH), which is reflected through PfSH Spatial Position Statement (December 2023) and deals with cross-boundary strategic planning issues such as unmet housing and employment needs.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Eastleigh BC 10362	Continued dialogue between both Councils along with engagement with its neighbouring authorities across South Hampshire is strongly welcomed.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Eastleigh BC 10362	Welcome ongoing dialogue on matters as progress local plans.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	Council has have failed in its duty to cooperate and thus the plan is not effective.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	TVBC should be meeting some of the significant unmet housing needs arising from their neighbouring authorities
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	National Highways 10291	Happy to engage collaboratively to ensure transport evidence provides robust and proportionate assessment of impacts on strategic road network to help positively prepared and justified development strategy
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	National Highways 10291	Welcome further dialogue on potential growth options
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	National Highways 10291	Look forward to discussions to ensure impact on the strategic road network from proposals are fully considered and appropriate package of mitigation measures are identified
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	National Highways 10291	Look forward to working with all parties to identify and produce a robust transport strategy to inform size and scale of development that is deliverable

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	it is not acceptable that TVBC as part of PfSH does not seek to make a contribution towards making up the identified shortfall, particularly in the south of the borough – and especially as East of Romsey is identified in the Position Statement as a ‘Broad area of Search for Growth’ by PfSH.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	East Hampshire District Council, doesn’t make any contribution towards meeting the identified unmet need either. If every authority across PfSH takes this approach, the shortfall will never be addressed
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	It is true that LPA’s in the PfSH area are at different stages of plan making, but this is an inevitable function of the disparate plan making system in England and is not an excuse for delaying meeting unmet needs that adversely affects the affordability of housing in all areas. The PfSH December 2023 Position Statement still reports a shortfall in housing of nearing 12,000 units (based on a period only up to 2036) and it is not clear how a point where a ‘definitive unmet need’ is ever going to be identified without a proper process for sub-regional co-operation.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	The biggest deficit arises from New Forest District which has a shortfall of 5,652. Given the New Forest District plan was adopted relatively recently (July 2020) and given the constrained nature of the district, it is unlikely that this need is going to be met within New Forest District any time soon, but Test Valley has an opportunity to help address some of this need, being an adjoining authority with no such national constraints in play.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	They are pleased the PfSH SPS identifies broad areas of search to help meet unmet housing needs.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	Concerns over the pace of PfSH work and the lengthy timescales it has taken to get to this point, that the PfSH work provides a partial evidence base and they have no confidence that PfSH will identify actual development sites within the next five years.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	PfSH work is being endorsed by at examinations of local plans. We feel it is right that PfSH’s work is used to help inform the development of the local plan which includes the Spatial Position Statement.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	The Local Plan and evidence show the Council has not seriously considered the potential contribution that could be made by the broad areas for growth in meeting unmet need especially as TV is less constrained than other authorities.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	The explanation in para 3.63 is an admission by the Council that the PfSH SPS is not working and will not deliver unmet housing needs.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10137	Spatial Position Paper for South Hampshire identifies a shortfall in meeting housing need. Important for matter to continue to be considered through Duty to Cooperate.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Southampton CC 10098	Recognise importance of working together to maintain and enhance interconnectivity of South Hampshire region as reflected in shared commitment to Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH)
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Southampton CC 10098	Keen to share knowledge and understanding with neighbouring authorities and wider South Hampshire region and not limited to areas of cross-boundary issues under Duty to Cooperate, but extend to other areas of expertise
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	Suggests the Local Plan contributes to helping to meet some of South Hampshire's unmet housing needs. Suggest this could be 10% of the current shortfall (1,200 dws) as this would make a meaningful contribution without delivering homes above what other Local Plans will contribute.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	There is no mention of transport and mobility factors in this discussion, despite the fact the NPPF is explicit that transport and infrastructure issues are among those themes that cross-boundary collaboration is likely to need to have regard (NPPF paragraph 108)
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	To demonstrate legal compliance ahead of Reg. 19, the council should positively review whether any contribution can be made to unmet need arising from within the PfSH area and consequently allocate additional sites in the southern part of the Borough, to conclusively show that a credible process of co-operation has been undertaken and strategic issues arising from that co-operation have been properly addressed within the plan.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	Test Valley is arguably being the least constrained of all of the PfSH authorities. Its suitability for accommodating unmet needs is demonstrated by the PfSH Statement of Common Ground (December 2023) - identifies two potential greenfield 'Broad Areas for Growth' within Test Valley at Romsey and Chandlers Ford, out of a total of only five identified areas in South Hampshire. This demonstrates that Test Valley is the most suitable and sustainable location for meeting a reasonable proportion of South Hampshire's unmet need.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	TVBC has a significant opportunity to help meet as yet unmet needs within their boundaries within the STV HMA.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	There surely must be a significant possibility that TVBC, being a relatively unconstrained authority area will need to accommodate unmet needs of the wider sub-region. It is noted that this position has not been considered in the SHMA (2022).
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	TVBC should not wait for several 'requests' to meet unmet need from other local authorities through SoCGs, given the level of unmet in the area is already well understood and acknowledged through PfSH, but instead should be proactively planning to meet the already identified shortfall. Failure to do this will undermine the soundness of the plan
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	10181	The council must proactively explore with their neighbours now how TVBC can help meet the unmet needs of the sub-region. Failure to do so risks further embedding the shortage of housing in the area, reducing the affordability of housing both in Test Valley and regionally and as suggested in earlier sections, risks a plan being progressed that is not legally compliant or sound
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	There is no clear direction in how the Local Plan or any other Local Plan being prepared in the PfSH area will actually, tangibly meet the unmet and chronic housing need
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	11095	Previous consultation comments on the Local Plan raised the issue of unmet housing needs including Southampton City Council who suggested testing a higher housing needs figure. This has not been done.
Regional Context and the	11095	PfSH SPS demonstrates substantial shortfall of 11.711 homes across South Hampshire with significant shortfall in new Forest District and Eastleigh Borough with Southampton unable to meet their own needs including urban uplift. Local Plan is not positive to this and has not responded

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Duty to Cooperate		therefore cannot be considered effective joint working on cross boundary matters or positively prepared.
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Wiltshire C 10202	Welcome opportunity to provide comment at this stage, alongside ongoing commitment to collaborative working with Council on cross boundary and strategic planning matters that are of relevance to both authorities' emerging local plans
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Wiltshire C 10202	Wish to continue to engage on plans for Ludgershall with focus on phasing and delivery of development, delivery of infrastructure and community facilities and ecological mitigation
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Wiltshire C 10202	Look forward to further engagement and cooperation on proposals for Ludgershall and any other planning policy matters as appropriate as plan progresses
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Wiltshire C 10202	Wiltshire's emerging local plan 2020-2038 includes proposed allocation on land south east of Empress Way, Ludgershall which adjoins Test Valley
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Wiltshire C 10202	Should be noted that the proposed Wiltshire local plan level of housing at Ludgershall and its associated allocation form a key part of the spatial strategy for the Wiltshire HMA
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Wiltshire C 10202	Timely delivery of the site (proposed allocation in draft Wiltshire local plan) at Ludgershall is important for meeting Wiltshire's housing requirement
Regional Context and the Duty to Cooperate	Winchester City Council 10210	Winchester City Council welcomes the ongoing collaborative working with TVBC on strategic planning matters
Regional Context and the	11079	It is not clear from the draft LP how the abolishing of Duty to Cooperate and replacement by alignment test will affect housing numbers in Test Valley

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Duty to Cooperate		

Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy: Sustainable Spatial Strategy
Paragraphs 3.1-3.18

Key Issue	Officer Response
Brownfield sites should be prioritised. Some respondents raised issues of viability with brownfield sites.	The plan recognises that development in Andover and Romsey will need to maximise the use of redeveloping brownfield land. Outside of the town centres brownfield redevelopment would be supported in line with national policy where in accordance with other relevant policies in the local plan.
Housing should be distributed to areas other than Andover and Romsey/ more equal distribution across borough, including tier 3 settlements	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably. This includes additional allocations including in tier 3 settlements. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.
Over reliance on large sites	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably. This includes additional allocations including smaller scale growth in rural settlements. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.
Should be informed by Local Nature Recovery Strategy	A draft Local Nature Recovery strategy for Hampshire is currently out for consultation (18 May to 23 June 2025). The final version is expected to be published by the end of 2025 and will feed into the next version of the plan (Regulation 19).
Rise in ageing population should be addressed	An update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment will be undertaken to support Regulation 19. This will include evidence on need for specialist accommodation.
There should be clearer integration of the historic	Additional wording has been added to the spatial strategy to add clarity on the importance of the historic environment.

environment within the spatial strategy – HISTORIC ENGLAND	
Concern over lack of infrastructure to support new housing	The draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been updated to support the Revised Regulation 18 Local Plan. This identifies infrastructure requirements to support the delivery of the Local Plan. The site specific policies, general requirements and IDP should be read alongside each other. Ongoing engagement on the IDP and delivery of the draft Local Plan is being undertaken including with infrastructure providers and developers.
Concerns raised over allocation at Ludgershall and fit with spatial strategy as relates to Wiltshire	Ludgershall is immediately adjacent to the borough boundary and although located in Wiltshire, has functional links with Andover. We are proposing to allocate two sites at Ludgershall that provide an opportunity to deliver housing at a sustainable location.
Strategy should include provision for unmet needs	At the time of publishing the Regulation 28 stage 2 draft Local Plan the evidence and confirmed level of unmet need had not been produced by the relevant neighbouring authorities, so we were unable to consider it. The revised NPPF has significantly impacted the progress of Local Plans, and the level of housing needs we are all planning for. Given the significant increase in need for homes, the pressure from our neighbours will continue to increase. However, their respective local plans are not at a stage of evidencing the scale of unmet needs yet. At present, we do not have any current requests to help meet unmet housing needs from our neighbouring authorities.
Spatial strategy/housing distribution should be more focussed on public transport opportunities. It is over reliant on car use.	The site selection process factored in a range of considerations including accessibility. Where possible sites enable the prioritisation of active travel to reduce car dependency. However it is recognised that Test valley is a rural borough and a degree of car dependency is expected. Opportunities to reduce this especially for shorter trips have been considered.

Should be more support for development in rural villages to grow and thrive	The plan supports villages in the Borough to undertake NDPs to bring forward new homes to meet their needs and to help sustain these settlements and support their existing services and facilities. In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, additional allocations including in tier 3 settlements are proposed. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.
---	---

Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy: Settlement Hierarchy

Policy SS1: Settlement Hierarchy and SS2: Development in the Countryside

Paragraphs 3.19-3.49

Key Issue	Officer Response
Decision to exclude any housing allocations outside of Tiers 1 and 2 is not justified	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably. This includes additional allocations including in tier 3 settlements. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.
Approach of combining Tier 4 settlements with the open countryside restricts the potential growth of those settlements	Tier 4 settlements are the least sustainable settlements within Test Valley and therefore would not be suitable locations for major development; this does not entirely rule out the potential for development in these settlements, for example replacement dwellings and community led development could still come forward.
The settlement hierarchy methodology has been inconsistently applied	There is no established methodology for determining settlement hierarchy within a Local Plan, the methodology used in this plan is similar to previous approaches taken previously in Test Valley
Question whether the limited nature of the four key facilities determines the sustainability of a settlement	The number of key facilities have been changed to provide a clearer distinction between the role and sustainability of settlements, all other facilities which are found in settlements are also counted, however these are not considered to be key facilities which are necessary for a settlement to be thought of as sustainable
There is risk in attaching weight to the presence of facilities at a point in time when used for a 15 year plan period	The assessment is a snapshot in time and an update will be undertaken to confirm the accuracy of the number of community facilities within the settlements prior to Regulation 19
Certain facilities and services provide more day to day needs	Primary schools have been given more weight in the updated assessment, as villages with primary schools are usually served by the other key facilities and possibly other facilities.

than others – not adequately reflected	There may be some settlements where shared facilities exist, and this has been considered accordingly
Proximity to higher order settlements is not consistently applied	Access to facilities in adjacent settlement including those in adjacent parishes and neighbouring authorities has been taken into consideration as part of the assessment where appropriate, the outcomes are reliant on the proximity of those facilities to the built-up area of the settlement being assessed and each facility is only counted once
Pairing of settlements (shared facilities) has not been consistently applied	The methodology will be reviewed alongside the outcomes to the assessment to determine whether any opportunities for settlements to use neighbouring facilities can be included and increase the number of paired settlements or whether the pairings which have already been identified remain relevant and should remain, or whether these sites can/should be assessed separately
Object to an approach that defaults to the existing settlement boundaries as this would prevent sustainable growth of rural villages	Existing settlement boundaries require updating as there are certain land uses that have been identified as no longer being suitable for inclusion within the built-up area of settlement boundaries due to the fact that they relate better to the countryside than the built form. We are not proposing any changes to the settlement boundaries that were consulted on as part of the Regulation 18 Stage 2 document. These will be reviewed following consultation on this document and set out in the final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage).
Approach set out of drawing settlement boundaries around existing identifiable boundaries on the ground, rather than more loosely around the edge of the built-up area, is questioned	The approach to settlement boundaries which uses physical features such as roads and property boundaries is considered the most logical approach to defining between the built-up area and the countryside. We are not proposing any changes to the settlement boundaries that were consulted on as part of the Regulation 18 Stage 2 document. These will be reviewed following consultation on this document and set out in the final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage).
Object to removal of settlement boundaries for tier 4 settlements	We are not proposing any changes to the settlement boundaries that were consulted on as part of the Regulation 18 Stage 2 document. These will be reviewed following consultation on this document and set out in the final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage).

Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy: Meeting our Housing Needs
Policy SS3 – Housing requirement
Paragraphs 3.50-3.70

Key Issue	Officer Response
Housing Market Areas – borough wide approach should be taken rather than splitting north and south. Some respondents supported the split and HMA boundaries.	To reflect the revised NPPF which requires local authorities to measure housing needs on a boroughwide basis the local plan proposes to remove the 2 HMAs and take forward monitoring of housing need and calculating our five year housing land supply on a boroughwide basis.
North/South split – concern with how the split is determined and what factors influence it	To reflect the revised NPPF which requires local authorities to measure housing needs on a boroughwide basis the local plan proposes to remove the 2 HMAs and take forward monitoring of housing need and calculating our five year housing land supply on a boroughwide basis.
Housing requirement should reflect environmental constraints, with particular concerns raised over the impact on the River Test and River Itchen	Since the public consultation on the Regulation 18 Stage 2 document, Natural England notified the Council that parts of the River Test and some of its tributaries are providing compensatory measures for the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation. In line with national policy, the sites providing compensation measures need to be given the same protection as the Special Areas of Conservation. At present, additional guidance is awaited from Natural England on the approach to considering potential impacts on the compensation measures. The Habitat Regulations Assessment supporting the draft Local Plan has been prepared based on best available information at present and will be updated prior to the final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage). Environmental constraints have been considered in

	the site assessment process to determine the sustainability of sites, to meet the housing requirement.
Housing requirement should be higher to address i) Affordability ii) Specialist housing iii) Unmet need	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably. This includes additional allocations. An update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment will be undertaken to support Regulation 19. This will include evidence on need for affordable and specialist housing. At present, we do not have any current requests to help meet unmet housing needs from our neighbouring authorities. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.
Housing supply reliant on large sites – delivery concerns	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably. This includes additional allocations including smaller scale growth in rural settlements. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.
Plan period requires update/increase to housing requirement	National planning policy is clear that the Council needs to look ahead over a minimum of 15 years from the date of adoption of the plan. The change in timescale for preparing the draft Local Plan means we need to change the plan period to 2025 to 2042. The housing requirement has been updated to reflect the updated plan period and revised standard method calculation.
Support use of Standard Method to calculate housing need	The housing requirement for the draft Local Plan continues to be based on the (now amended) Standard Method calculation.

Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy: Meeting or Housing Needs
Policy SS4: Rural Housing Requirement
Paragraphs 3.71-3.79

Key Issue	Officer Response
Uncertainty over whether the rural housing requirements can be delivered if relying on NDPs	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably. This includes additional allocations including in tier 3 settlements. Where there is no site allocation proposed the draft Local Plan will consider and identify housing requirements for designated neighbourhood plan areas. The Revised Regulation 18 plan does not therefore include a rural housing requirement.
Rural housing requirement should be increased to address affordability and allow communities to grow and thrive	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably. This includes additional allocations including in tier 3 settlements. The Revised Regulation 18 plan does not therefore include a rural housing requirement.
Development in rural areas should focus on bus corridors	The site selection process factored in a range of considerations including accessibility. Where possible sites enable the prioritisation of active travel to reduce car dependency. However it is recognised that Test valley is a rural borough and a degree of car dependency is expected. Opportunities to reduce this especially for shorter trips have been considered.
TV is a rural borough, villages should take more homes	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably. This includes additional allocations including in tier 3 settlements. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.

Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy: Meeting our Housing Needs
Policy SS5: Neighbourhood Development Plan Housing Requirements
Paragraphs 3.80-3.91

Key Issue	Officer Response
Villages that have already taken development prior to designation should not be given a housing requirement	The NPPF states that newly designated neighbourhood planning areas should be provided with a number showing the housing requirement to be met over the plan period. Where there is no site allocation proposed the draft Local Plan will consider and identify housing requirements for designated neighbourhood plan areas. The reason for providing a number is to ensure that there is a sufficient housing provision to meet the needs of future residents to cover the plan period, it does not consider past delivery as the needs of those residents have already been met and the purpose of the plan is to look forward. In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably, and our evidence demonstrates that some distribution of sites to villages is appropriate.
Housing requirement is too low and many villages could accommodate higher growth. It is unlikely to deliver much affordable housing.	The figure of a minimum of 10 is a starting figure, it is expected that the groups preparing each NDP will commission a housing needs survey which will either confirm a local need for 10 or show an increased requirement for housing within the designated area which the NDP can then allocate the land for.
Settlements that do not have a designated area or choose not to produce NDPs have no specific minimum housing requirement – not a proactive approach to delivering housing in the rural area	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably. This includes additional allocations including in tier 3 settlements. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.

<p>The Council setting out a housing target for villages is not a community-led approach.</p>	<p>The NPPF states that newly designated neighbourhood planning areas should be provided with a number showing the housing requirement to be met over the plan period. The figure of a minimum of 10 is a starting figure, it is expected that the groups preparing each NDP will commission a housing needs survey which will either confirm the local need for 10 provided through the Local Plan or show an increased requirement for housing within the designated area which the NDP can then allocate the land for. In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably. This includes additional allocations including in tier 3 settlements. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.</p>
<p>Several comments were made in relation to specific settlements and their suitability to deliver housing</p>	<p>The Site Selection Topic Paper summarises why sites have or haven't been taken forward for allocation at this stage. Although there is a planning justification of why sites have been taken forward, the difference in sustainability between some of these sites can be marginal.</p>

Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy: Meeting or Housing Needs
Policy SS6: Meeting the Housing Requirement
Paragraphs 3.92-3.102

Key Issue	Officer Response
There is a significant shortfall of supply to meet the demand for care accommodation	An update to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment will be undertaken to support Regulation 19. This will include evidence on need for specialist accommodation.
The Council should also allocate small and medium sized sites to assist delivery	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the spatial strategy has been reviewed to enable this increase to be delivered sustainably. This includes additional allocations including smaller scale growth in rural settlements. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.
A larger buffer should be applied	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the draft plan's housing requirement and supply has been updated. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.
A surplus in supply is provided – why allocate more than needed?	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the draft plan's housing requirement and supply has been updated. See the Revised Regulation 18 plan for details.

Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy: Meeting our Employment Needs

Policy SS7: Employment Land Requirement and Policy SS8: Meeting the Employment Land Requirement

Paragraphs 3.103-3.120

Key Issue	Officer Response
Assessment constrains economic growth. Higher growth or more surplus should be identified	The significant increase in our housing need means we need to reassess whether the amount of employment land we proposed is still appropriate. The final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage) will include employment land requirements.
More employment land should be allocated in the north	The significant increase in our housing need means we need to reassess whether the amount of employment land we proposed is still appropriate. The final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage) will include employment land requirements.
Requirement should be borough-wide and not split	The significant increase in our housing need means we need to reassess whether the amount of employment land we proposed is still appropriate. The final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage) will include employment land requirements.
No commentary on how sub-regional employment needs are being addressed	The significant increase in our housing need means we need to reassess whether the amount of employment land we proposed is still appropriate. The final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage) will include employment land requirements.
Imbalance between employment and housing – higher housing requirement in the north but higher employment requirement in the south	The significant increase in our housing need means we need to reassess whether the amount of employment land we proposed is still appropriate. The final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage) will include employment land requirements.

Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy: Delivery, Contingency and Monitoring

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial Strategy	10661	The limiting of development at Romsey to existing commitments and two proposed allocations has not been justified.
Omission site	10661	The Local Plan should be amended to include land south of Highwood Lane for housing. The site has been subject of pre-application discussions and submission for inclusion in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA Ref 41). In response to the Council's site assessment a revised plan has been prepared which demonstrates that approximately 100 dwellings could be achieved whilst retaining and enhancing ecologically important areas on the lower parts of the site.
	10661	The land north of Highwood Lane could deliver 100 dwellings in a relatively short period and in the early years of the Local Plan.
	10661	Land at Highwood Lane had an application for residential development for part of the site which was dismissed at appeal in 2011. However, circumstances have changed significantly and the appeal decision is of limited relevance to the current consideration of the requirement to allocate land for housing.
	10661	The Sustainability Appraisal and site selection process has resulted in the non-allocation of land south of Highwood Lane and land north of Highwood Lane, both sites adjoining a Tier 1 settlement with no overriding constraints. The principal reason is the preference for Ganger Farm and having made that decision the Council has applied a capacity constraint to justify no further allocations
	10661	The site at land south of Highwood Lane is capable of delivering sustainable development at a Tier 1 settlement and is preferable to Ganger Farm.
	10661	Development at land south of Highwood Lane would be consistent with the sustainable spatial strategy of focusing development at Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10661	The Local Plan should be amended to include land south of Highwood Lane for housing.
	10766	The resident has previously had planning permission to build a house on the land of elderly father and disabled sister denied as the land is classified as countryside. There is room to build 1 or 2 houses in the natural infill area along the lane, which is only classed as countryside halfway down the lane on the right hand side. Therefore TVBC should agree to changing the classification of the site from Countryside to Residential so the resident can support her family. (Floor and site plans are attached to this response).
	10776	Acknowledged that the site is located outside of a settlement boundary and therefore in the countryside where residential development is usually resisted, should be noted that the site is a logical extension to the existing residential development along the west of Newtown Road
	10655	site put forward at Land North and South of Ox Drove - north (7-8 dwellings within settlement boundary) and south (50-60 dwellings in countryside)
	10655	south of Ox Drove should be included in settlement boundary
Settlement Boundary	10514	Formal request to change village settlement boundary to reflect the plot boundary at "Bramley Lodge" (see attached documents). Bramley Lodge sits on the edge of the settlement boundary, though the current inset map 56 does not reflect our plot - the settlement boundary line has been drawn across the middle of our plot.
	10778	Support the decision by the Council to extend the settlement boundary to include this area of land (otherwise known as Land at Ferndale Paddock), which is within our client's ownership
	10416	Propose the redrawing of the settlement boundary to include the whole property of Lower Farmhouse including the outbuildings, garage and the garden which has been cut in half in the proposal.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Omission site	10768	Our client's position is that SHELAA Site 64 (land at Barrow Hill) and 115 (Land west and east of Braishfield Road) are available, suitable and deliverable location for new housing, these homes can be delivered within the first 5 years of the plan
	10768	It is the role of the Local Plan to understand what these are and then to set an aspirational but achievable framework to ensure these are addressed over the plan period
	10768	Site represents an available, suitable and deliverable location for new homes which should be released for housing development in response to the important matters previously identified
	10768	Had the Council positively prepared a justified approach to Policies SS4 and SS5 that were effective and consistent with national policy, then no strategic factor would exist to exclude SHELAA 64
Housing Requirement	10605	LPDF the standard method of assessing housing need (April 2022) indicates that TV should be delivering 553 dpa
	10655	LPDF the standard method of assessing housing need (April 2022) indicates that TV should be delivering 553 dpa
	10611	LPDF the standard method of assessing housing need (April 2022) indicates that TV should be delivering 553 dpa
Housing Market Area	10605	borough wide assessment for 5YHLS necessary to ensure consistency and compliance with planning policy frameworks as HDT performance and buffer calculation based on LA overall performance
Omission site	11108	The reliance on such a limited number of large-scale allocations fails to reflect the desired 'tailored' approach to enabling housing in the rural areas, as conveyed at p.3.14-3.15 of the LP and in the case of Ludgershall is predicated on assumptions about the feasibility of infrastructure delivery.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Update Table 3.3 and Policy 6 (SS6) to include 60 homes on land east of Duck Street, Abbots Ann (SHELAA REF 300)
	11108	Land East of Duck Street, Abbots Ann (SHELAA REF 300) Should be included in the allocations for 60 homes as it will result in an uplift in housing supply at a scale that supports SME housebuilders and affordable housing delivery in a sustainable location.
Settlement Hierarchy	11108	Having regard to the overall scores set out in Table 7, Abbots Ann is comparable to Charlton and better than Chilworth, both of which are tier 2 settlements.
	11108	It appears that the classification of site adjoining Abbots Ann (SHELAA ref 300) in the hierarchy is a point of contention with opportunities and constraints capable of being designed in/out.
	11108	Abbots Ann should be a tier 2 settlement as insufficient weight has been given to Abbots Anns functional relationship with Andover. Make Abbots Ann a tier 2 settlement on Figure 3.1 the settlement hierarchy map.
	10920	The classification of Abbots Ann and Anna Valley as countryside should remain and the gap between these settlements and Andover is crucial to the protection of rural identity and the countryside.
Omission site	11108	The land east of Duck street, Abbots Ann should be allocated or be identified as a reserve site.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Employment Sites	10291 National Highways	Adjacent to M27 Junction 3
Settlement Boundary	10182	Policy SS1 should consider locations outside settlement boundaries to allow development, in particular logistics, to come forward in suitable locations ie close to strategic road network and areas of population (workforce)
Settlement Hierarchy	10113	This would allow services, facilities, and housing to be delivered in a sustainable manner and would ensure that settlements are not prejudiced by the tiered settlement hierarchy
Spatial Strategy	10181	support the identification of Romsey as a Tier 1 settlement, suitable for strategic allocations, windfalls and strategic/small scale employment
Rural housing requirement	11150	Housing affordability is a particular problem in the rural area, and the Local Plan 2040 needs to make greater provision for delivery of housing in the rural area to address this.
Housing Requirement	11095	Not a convincing argument that there are market limitations in meeting the affordable housing target in particular as there is no market delivery evidence presented. Question mark remains unanswered over true capacity of the market to absorb market homes above 550 dpa.
	11147	affordability is clearly worse in Test Valley in comparison to England as a whole that has an affordability ratio of 8.21F2. When considering at a linear forecast we can see that the projections suggest an increasing affordability gap in future years. These matters will need to be fully considered and accommodated where practical in order for the plan to be sound pursuant to paragraph 35 of the NPPF
Affordable housing	10139	We would suggest finance and construct some council affordable housing to boost supply.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Rural housing requirement	Barton Stacey Parish Council 10166	A focus of social rent, affordable rent and shared ownership would be welcomed
NDP Housing Requirements	10856	The minimum housing requirement, if suggesting that TVBC will impose a housing requirement to allocate a certain number of dwellings, contradicts the ethos of neighbourhood planning and current central government thinking on the issue of housing allocation.
Settlement Hierarchy	11108	Consideration should be given to how strategic allocations commensurate with the size of the settlement particularly where these would i) enhance the range of facilities on offer and (ii) are well connected to the main towns or neighbouring urban areas.
Unmet Need	11115	The Plan should make a positive contribution to meeting unmet needs by allocating sites for housing
Historic Environment	10775	The land is within the village conservation area (policy ENV1-2), but this is a matter that can be addressed by ensuring that a suitable scheme comes forward that preserves the character of the conservation area
Omission site	10343	Object to strategy for southern Test Valley as it fails to allocate land at Redburn Farm, Ampfield, for between 40 and 70 dwellings and to help ensure a sufficient supply and a mix of sites to meet the Borough's housing requirement and to direct development to the most sustainable locations.
Settlement Boundary	10105 Ampfield Parish Council	Sleepy Hollow Business Park, we object to the inclusion of the land north of A3090 from The Chase to Wingham Lane, there is no reason for changing this and should be left as existing

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10775	The defined settlement boundary for Ampfield(west) is illustrated on Inset Map 9. Ampfield is a Tier 3 settlement where windfall development is permitted
	10775	The realignment of the settlement boundary to include land on the south side of Knapp Lane, such that the land between Chapel Hill and Knapp Hill Barn is within the settlement boundary is proposed
	10775	Realignment of the settlement boundary in this manner would not compromise the defined Local gap (Policy ENV4) between Ampfield and Chandlers Ford and involves land that is not designated as a SINC for its local ecological importance (Policy BI01)
Settlement Hierarchy	10194	The settlement hierarchy should reflect the fact that the easternmost part of Ampfield which has a Settlement Boundary has access to the same level of services and facilities in Chadler's Ford / Eastleigh as the Tier 1 settlements in Test Valley Borough.
Omission site	10775	Land on the south side of Knapp Lane, Ampfield between Chapel Hill and Knapp Hill Barn is suitable and available for development.
	10775	The site extends to circa 0.7ha and is defined on the Site Location Plan that accompanies these representations
	10775	The site could accommodate a suitable scale of development restricted to no more than 4-5 houses (including the potential for self-build plots) whilst respecting the character of the Ampfield Conservation Area
	10775	Development of this scale would allow for detached houses within large, landscaped plots enabling views between the houses to the wooded backdrop of the land further to the south
	10775	The realignment of the settlement boundary in this manner would not result in the encroachment of housing any further to the south-east than already occurs from existing housing on the south side of Knapp Lane

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10775	The land in question is not only suitable and available but could come forward to accommodate a viable housing scheme to meet an identified local need within this part of Southern Test Valley
	10775	The site is likely to be subject to a planning application, but in accordance with best practice the Draft Local Plan should provide added certainty to the outcome of any planning application by realigning the settlement boundary in the manner proposed
	10463	Representation states only that the agent, Hallam Land Management, will consider the long term strategy of land at Little Park Farm, Andover.
	10126	Proposals for land east of Smannell Road, Andover (SHELAA site 234) have evolved in light of technical assessments and ongoing engagement with representatives of the Council throughout 2023. The outcome of this process demonstrates that this site can be developed without compromising the integrity of the local gap, presents an opportunity to deliver a modest level of growth (c. 200 homes) in a logical and sustainable location, a short walk from local facilities, and a wide range in Andover via public transport. Assessment indicates that the proposal is capable of targeting a c. 56% biodiversity net gain and c. 161 kg nitrate reduction. Site is a logical and sustainable opportunity for growth, and at a scale capable of being delivered within the first five years of the plan period, which is particularly important given the reliance on larger more complex sites. Will help meet acute affordable housing need in NTV. Would welcome the opportunity for further discussion.
Housing Requirement	10230	The site could provide up to 450 homes as part of Policy NA6. This is a significant proportion of the Northern Test Valley HMAs annual requirement. The wider draft allocation could provide approximately 1400 homes equating to almost 4.5 years of the Northern Test Valley HMAs annual requirement. The promoter therefore considers the proposed allocation that includes the site would make his significant contribution to the borough's identified housing needs over the plan in a sustainable location.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Distribution of development	10803	Greater reliance should be placed on sites at Andover to deliver an increased quantum of development as the most sustainable settlement in the Borough to deliver a suitable development strategy, with a reduced reliance on apparent lower order and less sustainable locations
Spatial Strategy	11119	Andover is a Tier 1 settlement and will be appropriate for Strategic Employment sites. However, the Plan does not allocate any employment sites in Andover. There are, therefore, inconsistencies between the spatial strategy approach and provision of employment land policies which should be addressed.
Settlement Boundary	10124 Andover Town Council	Town council felt that settlement boundaries were relatively elastic in the areas around Andover which facilitated additional housing development especially around the new estates around Picket Twenty and Augusta Park leading to over development
	10124 Andover Town Council	Areas to the West of Andover where the position set on the boundaries was leading to the inability of villages and settlements to grow organically
	10124 Andover Town Council	Boundaries where reliant on a single physical feature such as a road, for example in between Charlton and Saxon Fields whilst in other places that there was a continuous of green space
Settlement Hierarchy	10125	The position of Andover as a tier 1 settlement is supported and development should be focused on the higher tiered settlements to ensure sustainable development is delivered

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10230	The promoter considers the settlement hierarchy identified in policy SS1 is logical and justified in the context of the overarching vision and objectives. Promoter considers the proposed allocation of the site supports the spatial strategy add sustainable approach of providing new housing services and facilities to existing higher order settlements where possible.
Site Allocation	10803	Allocation of this site (land east of Middleway) for housing in the draft Local Plan could assist in bolstering the housing supply to deliver a range of housing types, sizes and tenures, including affordable housing, in the early part of the plan period and provide greater flexibility. This would help address many of the issues identified to improve the soundness of the strategy to allocate large strategic sites and address likely delays to delivery likely to be experienced with this strategy
Omission site	10777	The site proposed for development is not ancient woodland and an appropriate buffer can be provided to the existing woodland to the east
	10777	The site is not located in a sensitive landscape area and is contained to the north by existing development at Picket Twenty, the A303 to the south, the A3093 to the west and woodland to the east
	10777	Suitable access can be provided from the A3093, and surface water can be addressed as part of a development proposal
	10777	The approach to the assessment of land south of Forest Lane raises questions as to the soundness of the site selection process and in particular, the way in which this site is appraised relative to other potential development locations
	10777	Points towards the need to allocate significant levels of development at Andover rather than the nearly 40% of housing for the NTV area being proposed at Ludgershall

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10374	Appendix IV Site Appraisal for Site 202 has incorrectly resulted in the site not being identified as a candidate in Table 7. This has then resulted in the site not being taken forward as a 'Reasonable Growth Scenario' under ISA paragraphs 5.121 to 5.135 and Table 8
	10374	Shadow Site Appraisal illustrating how SHELAA 202 compares against the seven 'Preferred Pool of Sites' at Andover. While the ISA does not involve numerical scoring, it is apparent that SHELAA 202 performs comparably, if not stronger against these alternative sites. Of particular interest is how the Land at Manor Farm which is proposed for allocation under Policy NA5 proceeds despite two significant adverse impacts
	10374	SHELAA Site References 202 and 14 are an available, suitable and deliverable location for housing in accordance with paragraphs 69 and 70 of the NPPF. The site should therefore be reconsidered and allocated for residential development in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan 2040
Settlement Boundary	10219	Given that the Council has resolved to grant planning permission on the Site and for the reasons set out in the Settlement Boundary Assessment it is proposed that land at Valley View Business Park should be included within the Settlement Boundary as part of the Draft Local Plan. Macra supports this modification to the Settlement Boundary
Omission site	10803	Recommend include the land east of The Middleway, Picket Twenty site as a draft allocation as this is a highly sustainable location, has been assessed in the SHELAA as an achievable site that has no significant development constraints and is owned by a developer, to confirm it is an available, achievable and deliverable site
	10803	Additional and smaller housing sites such as the land east of The Middleway, Picket Twenty should be added to the strategy to bolster, provide greater flexibility and help maintain a supply of deliverable housing sites, especially in the shorter term, while the larger allocations are coming forward

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10803	Promotor says land east of the middle way site's location in principle accords with the Plan's strategy to locate development in the most sustainable settlements
	10803	Site has been assessed by the Council in the SHELAA (January 2024) and confirmed this to be an achievable housing site without any significant development constraints and as the site owned by Persimmon Homes it represents a deliverable site
	10803	Picket Twenty has accommodated growth in previous Local Plans, including the current adopted and draft Plans. The site (land east of the Middleway) relates well to the wider Picket Twenty area, with existing sustainable routes connecting between The Middleway and Longden Close to ensure the site is accessible by walking and cycling to a wide range of facilities and services, including primary school, convenience store, children's nursery and community centre. The site is well located in terms of accessibility to public transport, with bus routes operating both along London Road and Picket Twenty Way providing access to Andover town centre and rail station.
	10777	Land south of Forest Lane is not identified as a proposed allocation in the current draft Local Plan. Site is available now, deliverable, developable and forms a logical and sustainable location for future growth in the Tier 1 settlement of Andover and should be allocated for development
	10777	Site forms a logical sustainable extension to existing Picket Twenty development. It could deliver a significant number of new homes and associated infrastructure and support the role of Andover as a top tier settlement
	10777	Site is well contained being located adjoining existing Picket Twenty development, A3093 to the west, A303 to the south and woodland to the east
	10777	Major Centres are settlements with the widest range of facilities and services in the Borough and are more accessible due to better public transport

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10777	Development of the site would provide a sustainable and logical location for future growth being close to existing facilities and services accessible by foot, bicycle and public transport
	10978	Promoting land for housing between the settlement edge of Andover and the existing commercial site for c.200 homes. Land at Harewood Farm should be allocated instead of Land at Bere Hill Farm as the site is more sustainable and scores better in the SA
	10978	Harewood Farm should be an allocated employment site. It is home to over 11 business and 75 staff. Demand outstrips supply for premises on the site. The site needs expanding. Land has been promoted to the west and north of the existing employment site.
	10978	This site could assist in the identified shortfall of employment land in STV and should be allocated. It should not be treated as a rural site given its proximity to Andover settlement.
	10905	Proposed site allocation in Charlton for approx. 60 homes, should be assessed at stage 5
	11153	Put forward new site at Andover Lane Farm which is adjacent to site Policy NA8
	11153	Development of Policy NA8 and Wiltshire site would be facilitated by the inclusion of the land parcel now promoted. No logical reason why Andover Lane Farm should be excluded from any allocated area, which surrounds it. If sites 61 and 324 are considered appropriate to promote for development, no planning/environmental reasons why Andover Lane Farm should be excluded - there are no material landscape or other features that separate site 324 from our clients' ownership, and no sound reasons why it, too, could not be allocated
	11153	Landowners of Andover Lane Farm would not pursue a concept of maximum financial gain from development on their land if it led to significant harm
	11153	Would expect any development at Andover Lane Farm to meet high environmental and design standards, taking into account climate change
	11153	We have suggested 15% of the developable land at Andover Lane Farm to be allocated to Class E uses. While it may be appropriate to locate those adjacent to the existing similar

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		uses on the developed land at the farm, we retain a flexible approach to location, as part of a comprehensive scheme of development across the potential allocated land
	11153	There is an existing access to the proposed land at Andover Lane Farm in addition to the sub-standard bridge under the railway that serves our office and other existing development. There is an existing “at grade” crossing of the military railway at the northern end of the family’s ownership. We believe it would be possible to agree an enhanced form of access with MOD to enable more development to cross the railway in safety. This access could be achieved independent of any proposals to provide access to the SHELAA 324 site. Thus, we are not constrained by a ransom strip
	11153	We are keen to work with the Borough Council (and Wiltshire CC) in a spirit of constructive dialogue, especially as we are local residents as well as planning consultants, so we can present an informed picture with constructive ideas on layout, landscape impact, sustainable drainage and other issues
	10091 (2nd response)	Information submitted previously on land south of Finkley Farm (sheela 231) and Land North of Finkley Farm (shelaa 305) has not been fully or correctly taken into consideration in the preparation of reg 18 stage 2 LP and the Sustainability appraisal
Spatial Strategy	10374	While it is recognised that the SHMA proposes a change to the geography of the Northern Test Valley area, this continues to contain Andover and the new growth point at Ludgershall, indicating past trends can continue
Employment Sites	10291 National Highways	Adjacent to A303 junction with A342

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Northern HMA	10133	Identified residual requirement for NTV of 3,752 homes (including 10% supply buffer). Majority of requirement proposed to be met at Andover, alongside allocations at Ludgershall
Settlement Boundary	11150	support the proposal to amend the settlement boundary at Appleshaw, to include Appleshaw House and Mead House
	11150	Conservation Area Guidance itself identified Appleshaw House and Mead House as “amongst the most distinguished of the larger buildings in the village”, positioned at the southern extent of the historic settlement, extending from Appleshaw House and Mead House north to Redenham so it is appropriate that these two properties be included in the settlement boundary
	11150	The recreation ground should stay inside the settlement boundary. There is already strong policy protection in place to prevent open spaces being built on.
	11150	Functionally, a sports field (and indeed the allotments) clearly have a closer functional link with the settlement than with the agricultural fields beyond so they should be within the settlement boundary
	11150	The settlement Boundary should be further extended, to accurately reflect the extent of built form at Appleshaw House and Mead House
	11150	The menage (riding school) area, to the east of the dwellings at Appleshaw House and Mead House, should also be included in the settlement boundary, to more accurately reflect the extent of built form on the ground
	11150	In general there appears to be an inconsistent approach to assessment of the character of the site, versus the function of a site, when assessing whether it should be inside or outside the boundary. The menage is functionally linked to the dwelling and has a built character rather than open undeveloped character. There is no clear reason why it has been excluded

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	11150	Support Appleshaw in tier 3 of settlement hierarchy
Omission site	11150	Call for Sites. parcel is identified in yellow has an area of 5,815m ² (0.58ha) excluding the narrower access area which provides access on to the main road. At a density of 30dph this could deliver 17 dwellings within easy walking/cycling distance of St Peter's CofE Primary School (5 min cycle ride via the PRow network), St Peter in the Wood Church, The Walnut Tree Public House, the recreation ground, and children's play area
NDP Housing Requirements	10750	The need for housing in the area should not develop over space that is ancient and historic to the local area.
	11093	Awbridge has insufficient infrastructure to support a new development, such as no effective public transport.
	11093	Awbridge has insufficient infrastructure to support a new development, such as no community shop.
	11093	Awbridge has had an unprecedented increase in housing, with the motives behind these developments are profit rather than the needs of the community.
	11093	Any further development on Awbridge is damaging to the rural community and is above any quota for development. Awbridge should not carry the burden of further development in the forthcoming plan.
	11093	Changes in Parish boundaries means that the new housing in the extensive Stanbridge Earls development are also in Awbridge.
	11093	Awbridge has been allocated 10 houses for development on the basis of a rather simplistic classification of it as a Tier 3 settlement, and should not be allocated more housing than a Tier 4 settlement.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Employment Land Requirement	10098 Southampton CC	For Class B8 development, highly built up nature of Southampton makes it exceedingly difficult to identify new large format warehouse sites within the city
Settlement Hierarchy	10815	Tier 3 settlements, such as Barton Stacey, need small allocations to sustain services and facilities
Omission site	10815	The site is 0.44 hectares and, based on promoters assessment of local character and density, could accommodate 5 homes within close proximity to the village centre
NDP Housing Requirements	10750	The proposal of ten dwellings on this land in Grateley will have negative effects on the environment.
	10750	There will be a significant impact on wildlife as a result of development in Grateley.
Site Allocation	10776	With regards to proposed site allocations note the impact which the recent mandatory BNG will have on capacity of sites. The requirement for BNG onsite may have a significant impact on the ability for the sites to deliver the number of homes they are allocated for
Housing Requirement	10606	unclear if BNG requirements will affect overall number of houses to be delivered on strategic sites
	10660	The impact of BNG on proposed site allocations should be considered and will impact the capacity of the sites. The Council needs to ensure the housing numbers are realistic and achievable and should look to smaller and medium sized sites to deliver the shortfall of homes that may be generated through the BNG requirement. Smaller sites may be more flexible and responsive.
	10801	The total number of homes to be delivered on strategic allocations should be adjusted to reflect the mandatory requirement for BNG, particularly on sites providing on-site BNG.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10605	NPPF and PPG emphasize importance of 5YHLS based on adopted housing requirement or local housing need figure which is calculated on borough wide basis
	10655	NPPF and PPG emphasize importance of 5YHLS based on adopted housing requirement or local housing need figure which is calculated on borough wide basis
	10611	NPPF and PPG emphasize importance of 5YHLS based on adopted housing requirement or local housing need figure which is calculated on borough wide basis
Housing Market Area	10655	instead of separate assessments for Housing Land supply it is argued that a borough-wide assessment is warranted
	10655	borough wide assessment for 5YHLS necessary to ensure consistency and compliance with planning policy frameworks as HDT performance and buffer calculation based on LA overall performance
	10611	instead of separate assessments for Housing Land supply it is argued that a borough-wide assessment is warranted
	10611	borough wide assessment for 5YHLS necessary to ensure consistency and compliance with planning policy frameworks as HDT performance and buffer calculation based on LA overall performance
	10606	two HMAs goes against inspector feedback on adopted Local Plan on page 48 of report states that there's no reason why borough wide approach shouldn't be considered later in plan period
	10606	tilted balance and housing delivery test apply to entire LPA and no mechanism to distinguish between different parts of the borough
	10606	strong view - borough wide approach should be taken and this would be more consistent with NPPF and PPG

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10605	adopted local plan inspector suggested that borough wide approach could be considered later in plan period (para 27 and 48 of report)
	10605	tilted balance and housing delivery test apply to entire LPA and no mechanism to distinguish between different parts of the borough
	10655	adopted local plan inspector suggested that borough wide approach could be considered later in plan period (para 27 and 48 of report)
	10655	tilted balance and housing delivery test apply to entire LPA and no mechanism to distinguish between different parts of the borough
	10611	adopted local plan inspector suggested that borough wide approach could be considered later in plan period (para 27 and 48 of report)
	10611	tilted balance and housing delivery test apply to entire LPA and no mechanism to distinguish between different parts of the borough
	10768	Disagreed that the HMAs would be used as distinct areas for the purpose of calculating and apportioning the five-year HLS in Test Valley, this does not accord with the NPPF that requires supply and deliver to be managed, for NPPF purposes, at the LPA-wide level.
	10768	Any HMA defined in the Local Plan must be for indicative purposes only and does not guide housing land supply and delivery, which must be managed for NPPF purposes at the LPA-level, not by reference to the HMAs
	10374	Disagree that the HMAs would be used as distinct areas for the purpose of calculating and apportioning the five-year housing land supply (HLS) in Test Valley, this does not accord with the NPPF that requires supply and deliver to be managed, for NPPF purposes, at the LPA-wide level
	11076	Draft Local Plan should be more wide-ranging in its assessment, seeking to facilitate improvements in the Borough as opposed to following the existing trend. Houghton sits near

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		the boundary between the two HMAs and so development in Houghton would be able to serve both HMA areas
	10094	Moving the HMA boundary further north means it no longer has the same relationship with the PfSH area.
	10094	There should only be a single HMA in the borough, in line with para 67 NPPF. Housing need is calculated on a borough wide basis, as well as measurements to inform the HDT.
	10094	It is not necessary to split the borough into two areas, and is not necessary to achieve a sustainable distribution of development. The spatial strategy can still be progressed and significant development is still required in the southern part of the borough
	10201	<p>Whilst reasonable to prepare spatial strategy that seeks to allocate sites and deliver new development in most appropriate locations, do not consider it appropriate to then split housing requirement for a single local authority area into two</p> <p>One single Borough-wide housing requirement and for assessing housing supply against needs</p> <p>fair</p>
	10201	Housing needs are assessed at Borough level and nothing in national policy to suggest that housing requirement should be split by housing market area for purpose of assessing housing supply against needs
	10201	Boundary between housing market areas is often indistinct and whilst appropriate for purposes of spatial planning should not be used to prevent land in one part of the Borough from coming forward to meet the needs in another where there is a shortage of homes

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10120	Housing need must be assessed at borough level and there is no supporting national policy that supports the use of HMAs to determine the supply areas.
	10120	Boundaries between HMAs are not suitable for use in determining supply areas and if the Council choose to split their spatial strategy across the HMAs, the supply should be assessed on a borough-wide level and no policy should be used to arbitrarily restrict development in one part of the borough to meet the needs in another when a shortfall occurs.
Omission site	10082	The Parish is well endowed with facilities such as Primary School, pre-school, four public/village halls, two churches, two public houses, a smaller number of shops and outdoor sports facilities.
	10082	A Settlement Boundary has been retained in the northern part of the village but not the southern part of the village, when there is existing development centred on the farm buildings - one very large building is now primarily used as a workshop and for the repair and maintenance of agricultural machinery.
	10082	Adjoining farmland's future use is marginal and there is governmental encouragement to cease use as it has limited alternative agricultural uses. The owners have proposed the site be developed for housing while the greater part be used for SANGs.
	10082	The site is a sustainable location with foot and cycle access of many facilities including relatively close shops, two primary schools and a secondary school.
	10082	Site at Fairbournes Farm just 10 miles from Winchester - a large amount of people commute from the villages to Winchester. Working From Home allows people to enjoy the countryside during the week and people prefer to live in the countryside than towns. alternative site promotion - Fairbournes Farm, Braishfield

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		93
Rural housing requirement	10768	The unconstrained housing requirement for the Braishfield Designated Neighbourhood Area is likely to be between a minimum of 40 and 250 new homes to meet the demonstrable need for additional housing to increase the primary aged pupils living within the Braishfield Primary School catchment
	10768	It is recognised that 250 new homes would be highly disproportionate to addressing existing local affordable needs, however this would enable the primary school to operate at or near capacity and reduce any reliance on out-of-catchment pupils
Settlement Boundary	10364	The settlement of Braishfield is shown in 'Appendix 1 Settlement Boundary Assessments' but this plan omits to include the southern part of the village which is within the existing settlement boundary. It should be made clear that this part of the village is to remain in the settlement boundary
	10364	The land in close proximity to the Fairbournes Farm buildings could provide a modest extension of the settlement boundary. It would include the existing buildings associated with Fairbournes Farm which are situated behind the housing fronting the eastern side of Braishfield Road
Settlement Hierarchy	10364	This settlement is recognised as being a Tier 3 settlement. The settlement is focussed along Braishfield Road, but the development is intermittent. Braishfield is well served with facilities and services, and it is in close proximity to Romsey
	10364	The settlement is sufficiently close to Romsey to be able to benefit from the additional services of this higher order centre. Romsey is within easy reach by bicycle: a sustainable form of transport not even considered during the review of the settlements

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Omission site	10768	There is a need for sustainable development at Braishfield addressing the additionality above the minimum housing requirement to Braishfield and other settlements, would also assist to contribute towards the other upward adjustments
	10768	The site is centrally located in Braishfield and closely related to the existing built form to the immediate north. It is in direct access to the available services and facilities within Braishfield
	10768	Romsey is also easily accessible by active transport or public transport. The site is located off Braishfield Road where access constraints are unlikely.
	10768	It is recognised this is a Greenfield site where there is potential for some landscape impacts, however these are minimised due to the location of the site adjacent to the existing settlement
	10768	The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area however a sensitively designed scheme could ensure no harm results to the heritage asset.
	10768	The site could deliver up to 54 new homes, providing much needed new, quality, family homes, including provision of affordable housing to meet local unmet needs, in a community where people wish to live, in a suitable and sustainable location close to existing community facilities and services
	10768	The site provides opportunities to provide ecological and green infrastructure enhancements, particularly through the provision of an area of accessible natural greenspace which would be secured in perpetuity for use by the new and existing community, as well as retention of much of the existing green infrastructure
	10768	The site is not located within an area at risk from flooding from any sources, including groundwater flooding. The development provides opportunities to incorporate SUDs that will mitigate against impacts from climate change as well as create habitats for wildlife

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10768	Biodiversity of the site will be protected, diversified, and improved through new hedgerow and tree planting and delivery of new garden spaces and formal and informal green spaces. Overall, the proposal will achieve a net gain in biodiversity
	10768	The scheme is of a scale that could come forward relatively quickly. There are no technical constraints that would prevent the development of the site
	10364	Land at Fairbournes Farm has already been promoted to the Council as land suitable for removal from farming and to be used for either nitrate mitigation, Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space or Biodiversity Net Gain or a combination of these uses
Housing Requirement	10812 Romsey Town Council	There is still the matter of the Brewery brownfield site that Romsey is desperate to have developed
	11129	There are other adequate options within the town centre, i.e., the old brewery site.
Omission site	10818	Alternative site promotion - Coolers Farm Field, Horsebridge Road, Broughton; and Old Donkey Field, Horsebridge Road, Broughton. Both sites are suitable and available and would assist in boosting housing supply and delivery of specialist housing, such as for self and custom build housing.
	10606	site at Trickledown Estate Broughton should be allocated (46 hectares)
Settlement Hierarchy	10818	Need for housing in small to medium sized villages is an acute issue that needs a strategic solution. Broughton Housing Needs Survey (2022) found there is insufficient housing in the parish for people to access (50.25% of respondents). 189 out of 211 respondents said they would support a development of some kind in the parish over the next 15 years. 98% of respondents lived the parish.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	11074	Object to the revised SPB for Broughton (South) as shown in the draft policies maps
	11074	Further expansion of the SPB for Broughton (South) to include 'Land adj. to Hyde Farm' would be encouraged. Site is available and suitable to provide residential development.
	11074	Settlement Boundary assessment is already out of date as Broughton now has a Neighbourhood Plan Status. There is only one minor adjustment in relation to the inclusion of 'The Rising' in the SPB and there are no boundary recommendations for any land on the settlement edge
	11074	'Land adj. to Hyde Farm' well positioned in relation to the exiting SPB and would result in a natural and logical rounding off of the SPB
	10801	We object to the revised SPB for Broughton (South) as shown in the draft policies map.
Settlement Hierarchy	11074	Support the inclusion of Broughton as a Tier 3 settlement. Growth in such settlements is strongly encouraged, particularly if the capacity of the larger sites in Tiers 1 & 2 are reduced. A reduction in capacity on the larger sites may be likely due to the recent introduction of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
Omission site	11074	'Land adj. to Hyde Farm' in the village of Broughton is considered suitable for allocation in the DLP as an alternative to those sites allocated for development, subject of the current public consultation.
	11074	Confirm it is available, suitable, achievable and deliverable and would help to meet Test Valley's housing need in a sustainable way whilst also providing benefits to the local community and the Borough's economy
	11074	It could provide an opportunity to deliver between 20-30 dwellings to maintain the current density of housing within the immediate surroundings

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11074	The local village shop and other public services are accessible via public footpath routes. There are existing access points onto Horsebridge Road, directly from the northeast boundary and from a track which runs parallel with the north west boundary
	11074	There are no known environmental, heritage or landscape designations that apply to the site itself. The site is located within flood zone 1. The site is therefore relatively unconstrained
Spatial Strategy	10139	TVBC have destroyed the attractive surroundings of Andover and Romsey by neglecting brownfield sites
Site selection	11119	The emphasis is on developing brownfield land in the town centres as a first option. It is important to note that this may only provide limited options of such land being available and may be costly to bring forward for development, impacting upon viability.
	10540	Brownfield Sites be utilised first where there needs to be development.
	10796	Support the principle of seeking to maximise opportunities to redevelop brownfield (previously developed) land, as set out at Paragraph 3.12, this approach is consistent with national planning policy and is therefore justified and sound
	10796	Support the Council's recognition at para 3.12, that it is also necessary to allocate some greenfield land for development. Amongst other things, this reflects the fact that brownfield sites are often more constrained in terms of having higher land use values, increased costs associated with site clearance and decontamination, which in turn affects their deliverability and viability including the delivery of affordable housing and biodiversity net gain
	10776	As encouraged by the NPPF, brownfield sites should be prioritised for redevelopment
	10470	TVBC must consider using the extensive Brownfield land available in the Borough even through compulsory purchase
	10722	Brownfield sites should be prioritised for housing development over greenfield sites

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10139	We would like to see a 'Brownfield First' policy. This would be a proactive approach to finding sites close to town centres, unsuitable developments could be encouraged to move and the take of greenfield land could be reduced. NPPF paragraph 125/6 suggests TVBC could be more proactive.
	10841	There is more that could be done to make use of empty abandoned buildings rather than watching them fall into states of dis-repair, TVBC need to listen to local communities who will be affected by the development of green spaces
General	10420	I draw your attention to the prime minister's statement advising that it is wrong to force large new greenfield estates in the countryside where there is strong public resistance and not available infrastructure to support the new development.
Buffer	10201	Question whether level of housing supply buffer in reality is accurate
	10201	Table 3.3 sets out total housing supply 12,415 and buffer of 1,240 or 12.86%. Buffer between needs and supply is welcomed and necessary to deliver sufficient flexibility in housing supply to ensure planned needs can be met in full over plan period
Housing Requirement	10794	While support the principle of a 10% buffer in terms of supply beyond the requirement, this does not address the issues identified in the PPG as to why an uplift of the local housing need figure may be appropriate.
	11147	agree with contingency approach employed making provision of a minimum of 10% above the identified housing requirement although believe a more ambitious level of contingency would be pragmatic with the premise to deliver a greater excess of the number of dwellings required. This would ensure the Council maintain a 5-year housing land supply over the duration of the plan period as well as the need to deliver affordable housing and the need to ensure the best use is made of previously developed land

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10120	The Council will need to be mindful that housing sites identified may not deliver as anticipated. It is recommended that a flexibility buffer is provided to ensure the Local Plan is flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan.
	10120	A flexibility factor is included so that sufficient capacity exists to ensure all needs are met in full. Therefore, the Council will need to allocate beyond its minimum housing requirement in a reasonable way. A healthy contingency within its housing supply of development land through the identification of additional housing allocations. Many experts in the housing sector often advocate the use of 10-20% buffer of sites.
	10182	The 10% buffer is not reflected in table 3.1 or policy SS3
	11096	Level of buffer between the minimum housing needs and supply is encouraging; question if there is a buffer within the Council's HLS as these are based on the Local Plan covering the period 2020 – 2040. Consider the Council should be calculating housing need requirements, based on the standard method between 2024 to 2034 with the affordability ratio relating to income and house prices in 2023
Rural housing requirement	11096	An increased buffer to the overall housing requirement should be provided to ensure that the minimum housing requirement in the Borough is met, in the event that the provision of rural housing is not designated through the active Neighbourhood Development Plans
NDP Housing Requirements	10120	Do not consider it appropriate to cap the housing numbers in sustainable locations based on Neighbourhood Plans that have preceded this document.
Settlement Boundary	10681	Rural communities epitomise the essential character of Test Valley
	10681	We should all do our utmost to protect the beautiful and iconic nature of these great places to live and visit

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Omission site	10099 Hampshire County Council	Given its proximity to both the draft strategic allocation and the allocated site at Land North of Goch Way for approximately 50 dwellings (Policy CNP2 in the Charlton Neighbourhood Plan), the County Council can confirm that Grazing Land at Charlton (SHELAA 2024 Ref. 242) is available should there be a requirement for additional housing land in the Northern Test Valley Area, or as part of a review of the Charlton Neighbourhood Plan.
Settlement Hierarchy	10905	Support Charlton being a tier 2 settlement
Settlement Boundary	10204 Chilbolton Parish Council	Request TVBC consider again part of Test Valley Farm has not been removed from settlement boundary
	10204 Chilbolton Parish Council	Change to Chilbolton Settlement Boundary includes a part of Test Valley Farm, we asked for clarification on the criteria that enables the boundary to be changed. The outcome was that TVBC has set out a clear and proper procedure for the criteria for boundary changes and there is a clear list in the settlement boundary review
	10204 Chilbolton Parish Council	TVBC changed about 10 settlement boundaries, Chilbolton was not changed although it states in TVBC criteria that farm settlements should be excluded from settlement boundaries, request TVBC reconsider this matter
	10204 Chilbolton Parish Council	To demonstrate that residents support the removal of Test Valley Farm from the settlement boundary a referendum was carried out. 93.2% of those who responded agree it should be removed from the settlement boundary

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Remove Test Valley Farm from the Chilbolton Settlement Boundary r
	11014	Highest priority is to revise the settlement boundary to exclude a part of Test Valley Farm to avoid disputes at a later stage of the planning process. TVBC has not yet recorded our position and excluded it from the settlement.
	11014	Believe this principle should extend to Neighbourhood Plans being able to reduce as well as extend the SB set by an LP, which is not currently the case
	11014	Clear that TVF 'relates better to the countryside than the built form of the settlement.' Moreover, there is no logic in placing a small part of a public right of way (PRoW) within the SB while for most of its length it remains outside.
	11014	Strongly believe that the SB should finish at the curtilage fences of the west facing properties of Station Road, leaving the whole of the PRoW outside the SB.
	11014	Propose that decision making on SB's should be devolved to parish councils that have a made NP set to meet local housing needs and thus should be decided by local communities. Which would safeguard against 'not in my backyard' tendencies.
	11014	As TVF adjoins West Down Nature Reserve, there would be a natural symmetry if the section in question also had SINC designated status.
	10937	Removal of the settlement boundary around Test Valley Farm correct. Decisions of settlement boundaries should be devolved to parish councils.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10157	Objection to inclusion of Chilworth within Tier 2 of Policy SS1
	10157	Objection to definition of settlement boundary for Chilworth as it relates to land at Woodside, Chilworth (Inset Map 6). Additional properties should be included within SS1 settlement boundary (several properties at/near Woodside and north of Carlisle House) as they are not detached from Chilworth, functionally or geographically.
Settlement Hierarchy	10094	Elevation of Chilworth to tier 2 is unjustified. The services / facilities accessible to Nursling & Rownhams, and all other tier 2, and some tier 3 settlements, are greater than those available to Chilworth.
	10094	With regard to the council's justification to including Chilworth in tier 2, employment opportunities are not considered to compensate for a lack of shop, primary school, post office, takeaway and many other facilities (as should be found in a Tier 2 settlement); and facilities in these other larger settlements are beyond an accessible walking distance. Chilworth should be reclassified as tier 3.
	10157	The plan is unsound in respect of the treatment of Chilworth in the spatial strategy, including the definition of the settlement boundary, the local gap boundary and the forest park boundary in respect of the property at Woodside, Chilworth
Settlement Boundary	10858	Request land beside the church in Chilworth Old Village is removed to give it protection from development as it is a facility used by the public
	10858	Object to addition of land south of the avenue to Kennels Farm, close to the Science Park as it would remove the visual benefit of the field beside the avenue of trees
	10858	Manor View (south of Manor Road, adj Science Park) adjustment should not extend beyond existing fenced garden boundary to ensure woodland around the outside of the garden fence is not affected

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10858	Object to addition of land by Park Pond and Shubbery Pond at North Stoneham on the basis the amenity ponds and surroundings would be damaged by development
Housing Requirement	11014	Strongly supports it will be for communities taking forward locally driven schemes to meet community's needs and the LP will not make allocations to meet this local need
Settlement Hierarchy	10213	The policy is considered restrictive when applied to Kimpton. Kimpton should be classed as a rural cluster
NDP Housing Requirements	10033	The approach proposed appears to be a technical exercise that does not involve consideration of community support as expressed through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. The methodology, should, in its consideration of the scale of the housing requirement, take account of the involvement and support of the community. This would be consistent with the approach set out in policy HOU2.
	10033	The approach to neighbourhood planning and the setting of a housing requirement, as set out in paragraphs 3.80-3.91, does not place the community at the centre of the process.
	10033	The timing of the decision on the housing requirement is too soon in the process. Local communities should have the opportunity to assemble information, local evidence and views of the community on key issues (such as housing provision) and to discuss them - this should all be part of the process. This would mean that the assessment of the merits of the housing requirement would be led by the community rather than a technical exercise undertaken by the Council.
	10033	This is not a community-led approach, which is what the Local Plan sets out to do (set out in paragraph 2.36), with the Council providing a housing figure for neighbourhood areas.
	11014	LP allows parishes to identify and propose land for new development, understand that parishes undertake site suitability assessments for community-led housing, should that be one of the residents' priorities.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11074	Such provisions are relatively small scale (one neighbourhood proving 40 dwellings and the others only providing 10-20 dwellings.) The total requirement is 40 for NTV and 70 for STV. This leaves a shortfall of 220 homes for NTV and of 212 homes for STV. The only mechanism for delivering the current shortfall housing in rural areas, outside NDPs, is through community led development
Settlement Hierarchy	11073	Support the settlement hierarchy set out within Policy SS1 of the Draft Local Plan and support the primary focus of growth to be within the two tier 1 settlements; Andover and Romsey, where historically previous growth has also been focused. It is therefore appropriate for community-led development to be in these locations
Housing Requirement	11150	it must be shown that the 492 housing completions and commitments relied on for housing supply in the rural area are deliverable within the NPPF definition
Rural housing requirement	10170 Houghton Parish Council	In assessing housing requirement for a neighbourhood plan it is not clear the extent to which TVBC would take into account completions since the start of the plan period (April 2020)
	10170 Houghton Parish Council	HPC would like to see paragraphs 3.87-3.91 amended such that TVBC's assessment of any housing for a review of a neighbourhood plan should take account of recent development post 2020
Employment Land Requirement	10125	The plan has allocated employment land based on a theoretical assessment of employment need which unduly constraints economic growth-it fails to take account of constraints and opportunities for growth.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
NDP Housing Requirements	11103	Policy SS5 should contain a contingency should allocated NDP sites not deliver, to ensure housing requirements are met
Spatial Strategy	11129	Concerned about the proposals set out in the Local Plan and the volume of impact this will have on the surrounding countryside
Monitoring	10120	The policy must list the expected actions if delivery is failing and recognised that delivery delays are not always the fault of development partners. It is essential that the Council considers whether slow decision making is impacting on the delivery of new development.
Definition	10760	How is 'high quality' defined?
NDP Housing Requirements	10818	The southern HMA rural housing requirement is unlikely to be achievable within the constrained tier 3 villages without plan led allocations in the LP. The expectations behind the figure are unrealistic.
	11150	Whilst the benefits of community led planning are noted, relying on NDP to allocate rural sites leaves uncertainty as to whether or not the housing requirement will in fact be delivered, given that community led planning is not mandatory, and is a significant burden for local communities; whilst grant funding is available, this is very limited in relation to the local consultancy costs and as such, communities bringing forward Neighbourhood Plans rely heavily on voluntary efforts. There is a risk that the rural housing anticipated to come forward via Neighbourhood Plans will either take significant time, or not come forward; which could have implications for the housing trajectory, and for the soundness of the overall strategy and plan at examination
Rural housing requirement	10314	Draft Local Plan proposed that 90% of the rural housing requirement will come forward via neighbourhood planning – yet this is not a mandatory requirement and requires considerable time and expense for local communities. There is a risk that the rural housing anticipated to come forward via Neighbourhood Plans will either take significant time, or not come forward;

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		which could have implications for the housing trajectory, and for the soundness of the overall strategy and plan at examination
	10314	Council will monitor delivery of the rural housing requirement and undertake a plan review if this is not forthcoming, five years after adoption. Any such review and additional allocations (via a Development Plan Document) would take further time and would result in under delivery in the rural area for a significant period of time
	11150	Rural Housing Supply via Neighbourhood Plans must also be shown to be deliverable: a review mechanism does not go far enough to ensure supply
Housing Requirement	11095	Number of sites classed as deliverable within the Council's housing supply are classed as Category b) within deliverable in the NPPF. There should be clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within first five years. There is no evidence thus existing supply should be much less.
Housing Trajectory	11001 Kimpton Parish Council	Housing trajectory suggests the first housing could be delivered in 2031/32, presumably the bridge will need to be built prior to any construction works taking place? Is it feasible the bridge will be constructed in time to meet the trajectory?
	10729	If any problems with deliverability of sites, plan will fail to deliver a consistent supply of housing
Spatial strategy	10194	Delivery in the south of the Borough is also being impacted by nutrient mitigation requirements so housing requirement may need to be increased
Monitoring	10036 Thruxton Parish Council	Critics if the developer contributions system argue it is not working effectively and lacks transparency. LPAs could make better use of their powers and raise more funds, and service

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		providers more active in securing funds. CIL is too complicated and pooling restrictions are unhelpful
	11014	Any payments for site specific mitigation (S106) and broader impact on the development of infrastructure (CIL) should be made to PCs and not TVBC. If that is not possible, then the PCs must have the overriding vote on how the money derived from their parishes is spent.
Spatial Strategy	10650	The proposals adjacent to the Borough's boundaries (Ludgershall and Valley Park) is unethical and all concerned should be ashamed of
Settlement Boundary	10120	A criteria based policy should be used that allows sustainable development beyond the settlement boundaries to come forward in the event of a drop in housing land supply or changes in the local or national political context.
	11119	This policy does not allow any flexibility for sustainable development adjacent to settlement boundaries where appropriate i.e. adjacent to the settlement boundary of Andover, a Tier 1 settlement.
Development in the Countryside	10778	<p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>“Within the boundaries of the settlements identified in the settlement hierarchy in Tiers 1-3 and identified on Policies Map or Neighbourhood Development Plan, the principle of development and redevelopment will be permitted provided that it is appropriate to the other policies of the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Development Plans.</p> <p>Development adjacent to settlement boundaries will be supported where the benefits of the development outweigh its adverse impacts.</p> <p>Development outside of settlement boundaries will be permitted if:</p> <p>a) it is appropriate in the countryside as set out in Local Plan policies CL5, HOU2- 3, HOU8-</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		12 and EC1-4 or policies in made Neighbourhood Development Plans b) it is essential that the proposal needs to be located in the countryside, and this has been justified”
Settlement Boundary	10818	<p>Policy should provide more opportunities for small scale residential development adjacent to settlement boundaries, where schemes are; less than 10 homes, adjacent to settlement boundary and contiguous with the existing form of development and demonstrated to be sustainable, with regard to the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Policy should be amended to provide opportunities for small scale residential development adjacent to settlement boundaries, where schemes are; 1) less than 10 homes, 2) located adjacent to settlement boundary and contiguous with the existing form of development, and 3) demonstrated to be sustainable, with regard to the settlement hierarchy.</p>
	11108	<p>If allocations are not forthcoming in the rural area, consideration should be given to introducing an additional criteria (c) that allows for a reservations policy, facilitating the release of additional land adjoining tier 1-3 settlements in the event the housing trajectory isn't being met.</p> <p>Introduce additional criteria in Policy 2 (SS2) to facilitate the release of additional land adjoining tier 1-3 settlements in the event that the housing trajectory isn't being met, to ensure timely delivery and meet identified housing needs</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10778	Should the Council following consultation not amend the settlement boundary, policy needs to provide flexibility for sustainable development adjacent to settlement boundaries where appropriate
	10119	Flexibility should be incorporated into the emerging plan to provide adaptability and the opportunity to respond to changes, as per the NPPF (para11) and the policy approach should not be tied to a physically defined boundary but should allow for flexibility and future changes in the nature of edge of settlements through the duration of the plan period (see also NPPF para 74).
	11115	Settlement boundaries are arbitrary and blunt and may preclude development coming forward on edge of settlement locations that are still appropriate
Spatial Strategy	10729	In sustainable locations where the level of services and facilities can support further growth, policy should permit unallocated sites to come forward if they meet a specific need not being delivered Permit unallocated sites
	10988	Test Valleys strategy of allocating large scale development in Andover and Romsey should be changed to a positive allocation of housing in all settlements including those in Tier 1 and 2
	10735	The proposals are not equally divided throughout the borough, concentrating development in certain areas creates issues and resentment

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10986	Test Valleys strategy of allocating large scale development in Andover and Romsey should be changed to a positive allocation of housing in all settlements including those in Tier 1 and 2
Development in the Countryside	10778	Support the aspirations of the Council to sustainably grow rural settlements as we consider there is an opportunity to allow communities to prosper, in all areas of the Borough and not just top tier settlements. Sustainable growth of the rural areas will support communities and their facilities
Settlement Hierarchy	10082	Opportunity for choice of housing is restricted due to the maximisation of development in Andover and Romsey - pushing people to the villages for properties with a choice of designs and large gardens.
Economic growth	10094	There is an imbalance between employment and housing in that a higher level of employment land is identified in the south, but a higher housing requirement is directed to the north.
Employment Land Requirement	10125	The draft plan has allocated significantly more employment land in the south which is a congested and constrained area-more should be allocate din the North.
	10125	The figures in Policy SS7 are supported but the proportionate split should be abandoned and allocations made based on the availability of land and the suitability, deliverability and marketability of specific sites within the borough as a whole
	10125	Policy SS7 should be amended to include further employment land in key higher tier settlements such as Andover and the potential of the Littlebridge site should be properly assessed.
	11119	Contrastingly, table 3.4 indicates a total need of just 71.7Ha of employment floorspace over the plan period. The Plan does recognise at paragraph 3.114 that the highest need figures

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		are for class B8 storage and distribution, with around 40Ha of B8 floorspace required. Of this, 13.9Ha of B8 floorspace is required in Northern test Valley over the plan period.
Housing Market Area	10768	SHMA identifies there were a total of 3,167 households in the Borough with a housing need. The highest needs being in the Andover and Romsey HMA), however 17% of need is identified in the Northern TV Rural HMA, and 9% in the Southern TV Rural HMA
	10768	Housing Topic Paper outlines that the housing requirement figure of 550 homes per year and its split 57:43 between the NTV and STV HMAs has been assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). There is no assessment of differing proportions of growth between the HMAs and therefore the approach has not been justified
	10768	While population is an indicator, it projects existing proportions of population and does not reflect adjustments for circumstances defined in PPG
	10776	4,730 (43%) of the housing provision will be provided in the southern area of Test Valley with a focus on growth in Romsey, one of the two main settlements of the district
Settlement Hierarchy	10729	Each tier has a different level of facilities and proportional growth across these locations should be supported
	10729	Distribution of new housing should be delivered across settlements of varying sizes and villages should be encouraged to deliver a proportional level of growth. This will ensure all housing needs across the Borough are met Wider distribution
	10818	Recommend that plan is amended to include non strategic rural village allocations to deliver housing in Tier 3 settlements, including Broughton. Housing is much needed in these

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		<p>villages and this would also help to offset the loss of settlement boundaries (and infill opportunities) for 9 villages at Tier 4 of the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Suggested amendment to LP to include non strategic rural village allocations to deliver housing at Tier 3 of settlement hierarchy.</p>
Settlement Assessment	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	Policies and decisions should support development that reflect local needs and identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive. National guidance recognises that people in rural areas face challenges in terms of housing supply and affordability and new housing can be important for the sustainability of rural communities
	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	There is some required development in rural villages, but this varies between a minimum requirement of 10 with the upper being 50 in one case only. Meanwhile, the vast bulk of new housing is being proposed in already congested areas
	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	The obvious consequence of this spatial strategy approach of concentrated development is that little or no development is proposed in the rural villages which will exacerbate the current decline and closure of schools, post offices, village shops and pubs in those villages as houses are unaffordable to young families and there is little choice of housing

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	Residents in these villages will have to transport their children to distant schools and travel to shop and for other services. It's a laudable aim for people to live so close to their work or other amenities, that they walk or cycle to them, but it's not at all realistic and the vast majority will still use their vehicle on already busy roads
Spatial Strategy	10080	The development strategy does not fit with the statement in p.3.14 "the spatial strategy identifies a wider distribution of development than set out in our current Local Plan 2016" because new housing will be steered to Andover, Romsey and the Tier 2 settlements and will restrict the opportunity for new development in the settlements that need to grow in order to prosper.
Settlement Hierarchy	10729	Support recognition that a range of settlements will need to contribute to accommodating growth.
	10941	There is some required development in rural villages, though this varies between the minimum requirement of 10 and upper limit of 50 in one case only - the majority of developments are happening in already congested areas.
Spatial Strategy	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	The over-riding opinion of the PC is that the high ideals and praiseworthy key objectives of the draft Local Plan are not reflected in the actual spatial development proposals
	10083	It seems to us there is a significant disconnect between the policy wording and what is being proposed on the ground over the next 16 years

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	
	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	There is a familiar business as usual approach to the plan with the same few localities across the borough being expected to take the vast majority of the proposed new development as in the current and previous Local Plans
	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	The draft Local Plan proposes that the great majority of new development is located in the south east corner of the borough between Romsey, Eastleigh and Southampton
	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	It is our view that the proposed spatial strategy ultimately fails to deliver sustainable development because the scale of development in the locations proposed is not sustainable
	10799	In addressing the Spatial Strategy paragraphs indicate that the Plan seeks to support and sustain communities whilst recognising that much of the Borough is rural. It is considered that the Plan fails in this endeavour

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10605	advocate for more equal distribution of housing figures among other tier 2/ 3 settlements to balanced sustainable development across borough
	10605	important to avoid overburdening Andover and Romsey with excessive housing provision
	10611	advocate for more equal distribution of housing figures among other tier 2/ 3 settlements to balanced sustainable development across borough
	10611	important to avoid overburdening Andover and Romsey with excessive housing provision
	10814	Object to the overall spatial strategy for the delivery of housing in Southern Test Valley, principally through too much reliance being placed on housing delivery at Land South of Ganger Farm and Land at Velmore Farm
	10722	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
	10113	Believe that the distribution of development should seek to achieve the principles of sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF, as such we would encourage the adoption of a flexible policy approach to the settlement hierarchy
	10650	Concentrating developments at a small number of major development sites neglects the chronic housing shortage in many of the villages
Housing Requirement	10204 Chilbolton Parish Council	Chilbolton generally support TVBC aim to meet housing needs, but do not include and targets for urgently needed downsize housing
Unmet Need	10120	National policy is clear where unmet housing exists, neighbouring authorities need to help provide for these housing needs, however the Council have opted to postpone consideration

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		of unmet need until the levels of need have been quantified through the local plan process of neighbouring authorities.
Settlement Hierarchy	11142 East Dean Parish Council	Note that East Dean (in Tier 4) has no proposed sites for allocation for development
Mapping	10047 Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	The ecological map, and when in place the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, should be referred to when deciding allocations so there are no conflicts between new development and plans for landscape recovery needed to reach the government's biodiversity targets.
Distribution of development	10101	For employment and logistics development in particular, sustainable location requires good access to strategic road network
	10101	Access to workforce important which encourages locations close to centres of population in sustainable locations
Housing Allocation	11153	it is essential, we consider, to provide employment within these new allocations
Housing Requirement	10047 Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	The Council must be confident that the environment can accommodate the in-combination effects of development at this scale. Environmental limitations must be considered, such as water and drainage infrastructure being overwhelmed.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11111	The revised NPPF states the standard method should be treated as 'an advisory starting-point for establishing a housing requirement for the area'. The Local Plan appears to have used this and not an objectively assessed need approach in consideration of the need to protect the environment, as stated in paragraph 11 b i) of NPPF (Footnote 7), which requires Local Plans to protect SSSIs and SACs as they represent a strong reason to restrict the overall scale, types and distribution of development.
	11111	Challenge of pollution places constraints on development but there does not appear to be due weight given to ensuring the scale of development can be matched by the need to improve the provision of water and the effective scale of control of pollution in order to protect the SSSI and SAC rivers in the Local Plan.
	11111	Should be a revision of the Local Plan with a focus on matching the planned development trajectory with the need to stop adversely affecting the environment. This will require revision of the planned number of houses and the trajectory planned.
Evidence	10091 (2nd response)	The Councils 2022 SHMA by JGC Consulting is not in the evidence as it should be.
Settlement Boundary	10080	The review of settlement boundaries has resulted in a reduction in the extent of the settlement boundaries. The changes have not included much more land but has excluded open spaces, recreation grounds, allotments and school playing fields. These settlements need to be able to permit growth to ensure their viability.
Spatial Strategy	10080	The review of the settlement boundary has excluded Lockerley Green and Butts green and a few smaller areas, this reduces the opportunity for the village to undertake even minimal expansion.
Settlement Boundary	10364	Noted that the review of the boundaries of Tier 3 settlements has resulted in a reduction in the extent of the settlement boundaries. The review has seen very modest changes to

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		include more land, but a greater number of reductions in the settlement boundaries as areas of open space, recreation ground, allotments and school playing fields are now excluded
Settlement Boundary	10364	The latest review of the settlement boundary has removed more land from the settlement boundary than it has added. This is counterproductive to ensuring the long term success of the settlement of Braishfield. The settlement would benefit from additional land allocations which could provide housing to help support the various services and facilities within the area
Specialist housing	10181	there is a significant shortfall of supply to meet the ever-growing demand for care; a shortfall that the site will go some way towards, without fully satisfying, the large demand. A shortfall which is expected to substantially grow
	10606	C2 units should not count towards housing supply
	10606	not clear whether 44 c2 units represent a discounted ratio or are being considered on basis of 1:1
	11120	The needs of accommodation for older people should be quantified and identified within this policy.
	11115	The plan should identify a target for care accommodation, to address the significant rise in ageing population in Test Valley and consider making allocations for older persons accommodation.
	10729	SHMA 2022 identifies number of people aged 65 and over is expected to increase by 43% across the Borough to 2040. Based on this evidence highlights need for specialist housing for the elderly and identify the range of housing models that are available and required
	10181	King Edwards Park, Ampfield allocates land for approximately 44 extra care units. This will only meet only a very small element of the needs identified in the SHMA
	10181	the emerging Local Plan does not contain anywhere near enough detail in the way of specific policies which categorically sets out the need, quantity, type, or location of specialist C2

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		accommodation for older people and how this is to be planned for in the plan period. This is contrary to national policy and guidance and is an unsound strategy
	10181	in Test Valley, there is clearly an identified need, which is not set out in terms within the plan. Other than at Ampfield, there are no allocations for older persons housing. The plan does not show how the need will be met in a planned way.
	10181	Too much is being left to the vagaries of the market, a hope that major sites might deliver under HOU5, and general development management policies. This is not a planned approach to meeting an unmet need.
	10181	do not have confidence that the Plan will deliver the specialised accommodation needed and this is important because a more sophisticated mix of different types of accommodation benefits all sectors of the community by helping to reduce costs to the social care/health systems freeing up housing, particularly underoccupied family housing and not competing for smaller units mainly aimed at first time buyers/younger people when older people are seeking to downsize
	10181	There are not enough by way of proposed allocations or policies to meet the need identified in the SHMA. There is no possibility in our view that enough fragmented smaller sites will come forward to meet the identified unmet need and allocations should be provided in this case, in accord with PPG Paragraph 013.
Housing Requirement	10119	Note the Northern and Southern HMA totals tally correctly (Borough wide total is 11,000 homes), however, the homes per annum for each HMA do not quite add to their respective totals. The Northern HMA total calculates to 6,260 and the Southern HMA totals 4,740 homes. This should be reviewed for accuracy and amended through the Plan and evidence base.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Update/amend the HMA annual requirement to tally with total of 11,000 homes across whole Borough to 2040 (in LP and evidence base).
	10119	<p>Table does not appear to include the rural housing requirement figure of 542 homes. The inclusion of this figure would give a total of 12,957 homes instead.. This issue also applies to the split figures for Northern and Southern Test Valley. The table should be reviewed and adjusted accordingly for accuracy.</p> <p>Amend Table 3.3 to include rural housing figure (542 homes)</p>
	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	Why are Existing Completions included in table 3.3.? Is this double counting?
Housing Market Area	11108	<p>Whilst the Southern and Northern HMA totals tally in Table 3.1, the homes per annum for each of the HMS's do not.</p> <p>Refresh the SHMA and review annual figures in table 3.1 in the interest of accuracy</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Rural housing requirement	11074	The housing requirements for rural areas are out under this draft policy. The rural housing requirement for both Northern Test Valley (NTV) of 260 homes and Southern Test Valley (STV) of 282 homes, totals 542 homes
Settlement Hierarchy	10113	We consider that a more sophisticated and flexible approach to the definition of sustainability is required alongside a more sophisticated and flexible approach to how the hierarchy is used in any future emerging policy
Monitoring	10099 Hampshire County Council	The County Council also note that the monitoring of the flood policy only considers objections from the Environment Agency and not the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). Given that there are elements of this policy that fall within the remit of the LLFA to comment on it will be necessary to consider the LLFA objections as well to fully monitor the entire policy.
Housing Requirement	11147	need to release land at lower risk of flooding to deliver new homes
Employment Land Requirement	11081	Support approach as important to recognise that employment land figures are not ceilings and as acknowledged in para.3.115 there is a need to take a flexible and pragmatic approach.
	11081	Minimum requirement builds in important element of flexibility to accommodated needs not currently anticipated (in line with NPPF para.86)
	11081	Minimum requirement of 31.1ha employment land is sensible approach and doesn't preclude additional land (over and above the minimum) coming forward for development
Spatial Strategy	11108	W1 suggest that appropriate mechanisms be put in place, to further justify further allocations in the LP, in some instances, whilst deferring to Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	11078	Fyfield is regarded as a Tier 4 Settlement. However we consider the assessment of the Settlement Hierarchy has missed a few key facilities: The Kimpton, Thruxton and Fyfield C of E Primary School has been included in the assessment of Thruxton Village, but not in the assessment for Fyfield, the Andover Aikido Club. There is a mobile post office within 1 mile at The Hillier Garden Centre. There are two bus services serving Fyfield operated by Cango – an on demand service. Fyfield has Superfast Broadband
	11078	There is presently a difference of just 1 point between Fyfield and Thruxton. However, we note that the village of Vernham Dean has the same school as Fyfield, and is a Tier 3 settlement. Similarly Ampfield has a total of 3 existing facilities and 2 other facilities and is a Tier 3 Settlement. As such, there is an inconsistency in the Council's Settlement Assessment and justification that Fyfield should be reclassified as a Tier 3 Settlement
	11078	Reclassifying Fyfield as a Settlement would promote sustainable development in this rural area and help to maintain the viability of this community. Further, development in Fyfield can help to sustain the services in the nearby villages of Kimpton and Thruxton consistent with the Framework
Omission site	11078	Land rear of The Wayne is in agricultural use. The site includes agricultural buildings in the southwest corner of the site where Prior Approval (PA) has been granted for the change of use of the agricultural barns to provide five dwellings
	11078	Site lies in a sustainable location on the edge of the existing village of Fyfield and within easy reach of the facilities and services in the larger village of Thruxton, and the Town Centre of Andover. It also has good access to the A303
	11078	The only reason that the Land to the Rear of the Wayne was excluded from the Site Selection Process (at Stage 4) was due to this settlement classification. If the settlement is reclassified, it would be appropriate to reassess the merits of making an allocation at The

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Wayne which could contribute to the Council's windfall allowance and additional housing need
	11078	Site is suitable, available and achievable for housing development, as well as being deliverable in full within the 15 year plan period. The site is in single ownership. There are no significant infrastructure requirements that would be expected to delay delivery. This has been demonstrated by the granting of the Prior Approval application
	11078	Keen to bring forward as a first phase a small scheme which might deliver c. 15 units in addition to the Class Q Prior Approval. This scheme importantly could provide affordable housing in response to local needs. The wider scheme could also provide further affordable housing, but also has the potential to deliver additional community facilities including a play area and recreation space
	11078	Land at The Wayne is a suitable site, and free of constraint. An allocation here should seriously be explored for the draft plan and we are continuing to gather survey information to assist the LPA, and are willing to work with the LPA collaboratively to bring the land forward to meet housing needs
	10800	parcel of land that is located to the north-east of the village of Fyfield, positioned to the west of Dauntsey Drove. The site is adjacent to, but outside the proposed Settlement Policy Boundary of Weyhill (West). Site 3.34 hectares, the site is large enough to accommodate around 60 new dwellings. These would be a mix of open market and affordable homes (including affordable rent, discounted market sales and starter homes), with scope to incorporate self-build plots as well
	10800	Land at Fyfield is immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary – where new housing development can be successfully brought forward. The Land at Fyfield has no physical constraints that would limit development, there is direct access from the primary road network, and has the capacity to bring forward a maximum of 60 new homes in the Village

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		which will successfully make a contribution towards meeting the rural area housing requirement
	10800	important that windfall and small sites come forward to support the housing delivery of the Borough. The Land at Fyfield is a suitable site for new housing development, that can be brought forward quickly to help Test Valley maintain its housing land supply over the plan period
	10800	Object to the absence of a housing allocation at Weyhill (West), and in particular the land that they own to the west of Dauntsey Drove
Monitoring	10201	Notable that Council does not recognise own actions may be delaying delivery of new homes. Essential consider whether slow decision making is impacting on delivery of new development, due to waiting for planning approval to be granted and pre-commencement conditions approved
	10201	Would expect that some of actions listed: liaison with infrastructure providers, registered providers and development industry be undertaken regularly and not once delivery is not in accordance with what is expected. Should ensure issues do not arise in first place.
Affordable housing	11095	Acknowledge the SHMA expresses caution in trying to make a direct link between affordable need and planned delivery which is accepted.
Contingency	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	Can the Council not describe what is meant by implementing appropriate action?

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial Strategy	10082	Difficult to interpret the confusing set of policies that pull in both direction - the Plan recognises that decisions are marginal.
Development in the Countryside	11129	There are increasing concerns about food security and our ability to utilise farming land to maximise food production within the UK
Employment Land Requirement	11129	Over-developing of areas is impacting the need for people being forced to travel to work due to inadequate employment land
Housing Requirement	11095	High housing delivery over 2020-2023 where there were challenges from COVID and nutrient neutrality shows 550 dpa is well below what has been delivered across the area in recent areas.
Housing Completions	11095	Disappointing that TVBC refers to high level of completions from 2017/18 to 2021/22 when in the Housing Delivery Test for 2022 TVBC was ranked 237 out of 293.
Housing Requirement	10605	Council has a duty to ensure sufficient land for housing will be allocated to meet the forecasted requirements over the plan period
	10655	Council has a duty to ensure sufficient land for housing will be allocated to meet the forecasted requirements over the plan period
	10655	to identify housing requirement Council should take into account the extent to which their identified housing need can be met over the plan period
	10655	plan should consider all relevant factors before identifying sites as suitable for development
	10119	Noted that the requirement of 550 dpa is higher than in the SHMA evidence in 2022 (541 dpa) reflecting demographic changes and affordability ratios, applied in the standard method, and that further data will be published for the next Regulation 19 stage consultation.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11129	There are substantial other locations in the UK which need regeneration to encourage people to live there
	10139	Why would TVBC consider 571dpa desirable, does it want additional income from New Homes Allowance?
	10139	Why would TVBC consider 571dpa desirable, does it have a relationship with major housebuilders to provide continuous stream of large site approvals?
	10139	Why would TVBC consider 571dpa desirable, does it believe Andover and Romsey would be more important if they were bigger?
	10139	Why would TVBC consider 571dpa desirable, does it like the image of being a growth-oriented district?
	10139	TVBC have destroyed the attractive surroundings of Andover and Romsey by adopting housing targets that have led to higher population growth than needed which brings issues such as, increase in traffic, stressed water resources, sewerage capacity and local services
Housing Market Area	10106	Welcome the re-definition of the boundary between southern and northern HMAs such that Michelmersh and Timsbury would be within the southern HMA as the parish has a much closer relationship geographically and functionally with Romsey
	10768	Northern Test Valley has consistently delivered higher levels of growth since 2011, indicating that market signals, economic growth and the availability of land enables certainty on delivery
	10768	The SHMA proposes a change to the geography of the Northern Test Valley area, this continues to contain Andover and the new growth point at Ludgershall, indicating past trends can continue
	10768	In the event that land availability, suitability and achievability is becoming constrained at Andover to reach or exceed past levels of completions, there are a range of sustainable

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		settlements that offer suitable land and deliverable opportunities for a greater proportion of growth above that currently planned-for
	10768	This includes a range of small and medium-sized sites at the villages to meet local needs, as discussed later in these representations
Housing Trajectory	10201	Para.3.102 states housing trajectory provided, but is not included within local plan document Include housing trajectory within local plan document the
NDP Housing Requirements	10082	The decision to allocate more housing came too late to save the village store.
	11041	Awbridge have already had a lot of development in recent years and have increased the number of houses available to buy on the open market
	10364	Village Design Statements are not intended to be vehicles for proposing development such as housing, shops or industry. They provide a useful indication as to what local people consider to be important in their community, but they make no provision for new development
	10082	Even where Neighbourhood Plans are proposed, it is unclear how development will be in accordance with the wishes of residents. For example in Kings Somborne an appeal was allowed for an application for 18 dwellings even though it was widely objected by the community.
	10082	The Kings Somborne Neighbourhood Plan was made following a positive referendum, the majority in favour was 90.11% but turnout was 27.27% out of an electorate of 1600-this is a really low turn out.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10799	Not all settlements will want to provide a Neighbourhood Plan so these settlements will not be required to make housing provision.
	10799	objection to reliance on Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements for housing allocations.
	10082	Considers the fact that Neighbourhood plans can override country restrictions as wrong.
	10082	This is a dark art.
Settlement Hierarchy	10101	Whilst broadly supports proposed spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy, spatial strategy needs to take account of NPPF and policies elsewhere in local plan, acknowledging for certain types of development, locations will not always follow settlement hierarchy
	10101	NPPF highlights plan making should enable delivery of sustainable development and should positively seek opportunities to meet development needs of the area. Emerging local plan opportunity to be more ambitious.
Public Transport	10082	<p>The LP accepts that car travel is dominant though should recognise that fuel costs may mean people search for an appropriate alternative.</p> <p>Points to Wiltshire Connect bus service which has been enhanced by embracing the use of digital technology.</p> <p>object</p>
Rural Strategy	10799	both the Regulation 18 Stage1 Plan and in this Regulation 18 Stage 2 Plan the spatial strategy offers greater support to rural settlements. This was supported in the previous consultation with the expectation that more specific policies would emerge in the Stage 2 Plan

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11152	all settlements should be able to grow to an extent, to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities by supporting local services and allowing young people and families, looking to buy their first home, to stay local
Settlement Boundary	10364	It is only by permitting some growth in the settlements that their viability and vitality can be assured and they may be sustained in the longer term
	10775	New housing development is permitted within the defined settlement boundaries according to the scale and type of development permitted within the identified settlement tier, and subject to compliance with other policies within the draft Plan
	10397 Chilworth Parish Council	Do not consider the current proposal of lithium battery storage as being renewable energy development under the classification of the agreed scale of development
Settlement Boundary	10801	The housing requirements for rural areas are out under this draft policy.
Unmet Need	10606	given unmet need there is a clear demand for additional housing
Rural housing requirement	10768	An additional 40 new homes through sites triggering an affordable housing contribution would make a substantial contribution towards meeting housing needs with up to 16 affordable homes, including meeting the need for at least 9 rented dwellings
	10768	An additional 40 new homes are also estimated to generate approximately 12 – 16 primary school aged children, significantly contributing to the declining forecasted population and supporting the valued rural primary schools

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10768	The minimum of 40 new homes may rise following receipt of the admissions data from the Clatford CoE Primary School and assessment of the reliance of the establishment on out-of-catchment pupils
	10768	SHELAA identifies a range of available land at Goodworth Clatford that could come forward to meet the aforementioned needs. A total of eight sites are defined with an estimated yield of 920 dwellings. Nine sites are identified in the SHELAA at Braishfield with an estimated yield of 777
Settlement Assessment	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	The plan states that Upper and Goodworth Clatford share a village shop, Upper Clatford/Anna Valley has its own shop (Greenfields Farm Shop), this leaves only one shared facility which is the primary school
	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	Seems an unjustifiable assertion that by having only one shared facility two settlements should be grouped together. To rely on one shared facility for a grouping would mean that multiple other villages would be required to be grouped
	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	Goodworth Clatford is self-contained with its own community as is Upper Clatford/Anna Valley. A large degree of separation is physical and characterised by rural countryside

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	The retention of green spaces between settlements is essential the conservation area character appraisal states it is particularly important in retaining visual separation between the two communities and careful consideration should be given to the impact of development on the edge of conservation area boundaries
Omission site	10768	There is a need for sustainable development at Goodworth Clatford. Addressing the additionality above the minimum housing requirement to Goodworth Clatford, and other settlements, would also assist to contribute towards the other upward adjustments
	10768	Site performs positively against the majority of objectives identified by the SA. It is closely related to the existing built form of the village, and is in direct access to the available services and facilities within Goodworth Clatford
	10768	Site is well located for access to strategic employment sites and the town centre of Andover and is located directly off Barrow Hill where there are suitable access opportunities, as well as direct connections to the existing footways
	10768	Only limited landscape impacts on this greenfield site, minimised due to the location of the site between the existing settlement, which means the northern and eastern parts of the site relate well to the village form
	10768	The site could deliver up to 40 new homes, providing much needed new, quality, family homes, including provision of affordable housing to meet local unmet needs
	10768	The site provides opportunities to provide ecological and green infrastructure enhancements, particularly through the provision of an area of accessible natural greenspace to the south of the site which would be secured in perpetuity for use by the new and existing community

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10768	The site is not located within an area at risk from flooding from any sources, including groundwater flooding
	10768	Biodiversity of the site will be protected, diversified and improved through new hedgerow and tree planting and delivery of new garden spaces and formal and informal green spaces. Overall, the proposal will achieve a net gain in biodiversity
	10768	The scheme is of a scale that could come forward relatively quickly. There are no technical constraints that would prevent the development of the site
	10768	The site represents an available, suitable, and deliverable location for new homes which should be released for housing development in response to the important matters previously identified in these representations
	10768	Had the Council positively prepared a justified approach to Policies SS4 and SS5 that were effective and consistent with national policy, then no strategic factor would exist to exclude SHELAA 115
Rural housing requirement	10768	There are no land availability reasons at Goodworth Clatford or Braishfield to conclude that the unconstrained housing requirements cannot be met
Omission site	10611	0.89ha of land south of Streetway Road, Grateley potential for around 12 dwellings
NDP Housing Requirements	11077	Supportive of the requirement for Neighbourhood Development Plans to make provision for a minimum housing requirement. However, to identify a minimum housing requirement of only 10 units for Grateley, which is effectively a Tier 2 settlement, is at odds with the characteristics of that place and its ability to accommodate growth sustainably
Settlement Assessment	11148	promotor says A large strategic allocation at Palestine/Grateley would potentially include provision of other community facilities (e.g. new Primary School, local centre, sports pitches etc), which would increase the overall sustainability of this location by providing such facilities for use by new and existing residents

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	10611	0.89ha of land south of Streetway Road, Grateley should be included in settlement boundary
Settlement Hierarchy	11077	To the extent that facilities and services are used to inform the spatial hierarchy and distribution of development, a more nuanced approach should be taken, taking into account the possibility of making housing-led but mixed-use development allocations in targeted locations. Such an approach would be particularly appropriate at Grateley
	11077	Majority of 'Tier 2' settlements are highly constrained; certainly, more so than Grateley, and this analysis is also true of Ludgershall, a Wiltshire settlement that this Local Plan effectively draws into the Test Valley hierarchy at this level. Despite having (in TVBC's terms) relatively good facilities and services, none have immediate access to a railway station, placing a greater reliance on relatively poor bus services and/or the car
	11077	None of the 'Tier 3' settlements benefit from a railway station and thus all have been classed as having 'medium' quality public transport, rather than 'high' as at Grateley
	11077	At Grateley there are no ecological designations of any kind within or around the village, there are no landscape designations, there are no Listed Buildings or Conservation Area, no part of the village is at risk of flooding. For all these reasons TVBC need to fully review the SA and the Settlement Hierarchy approach to redesignate Grateley as a 'Tier 2' settlement, with an expectation of market-led housing
	10320	Encouragement that Grateley has been moved from a Tier 4 to a Tier 3 settlement, although the margins are fine as to the impact of this.
	10320	The transport link of having a mainline station such as Grateley should be given more consideration when TVBC consider the prospects for future development.
Omission site	11077	This document provides representations in relation to two sites located at Palestine, Grateley Station 386 – Land north of Hill View Farm and 387 – Land north of Streetway Road.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Consider these sites well-placed within the District for making a significant contribution towards housing needs. The sites had an assessed capacity of up to 160 dwellings in the next 5 years by TVBC
	11148	Rubix promoting a significant area of land to the southwest of Grateley ('Land at South View Farm') for a residential-led development ranging from 250 – 1,000 dwellings - site 140 acres
	11148	Rubix is promoting South View Farm, to the southwest of Grateley, which can accommodate a wide range of development scenarios from 250 to 1,000 dwellings and which is within a sustainable location immediately adjoining the existing settlement. The land is not constrained in terms of environmental and heritage designations (with the exception of a Scheduled Ancient Monument, which would be retained and protected as part of any adjoining development) and is therefore suitable for development
	11148	Land at South View Farm (Appendix 1) will be taken forward as a single promoted site for development as a strategic allocation. The site is therefore suitable, available and deliverable
	11148	South View Farm could incorporate up to 1,000 homes across a wide range of dwelling types and tenures to meet all housing needs including affordable housing and self/custom build, Open spaces and recreational areas, Areas for biodiversity improvements, Community facilities, potentially including a convenience store and primary school and Cycle and pedestrian routes connecting the site to Grateley rail station
	11094	Land at Grateley and Palestine offers an opportunity to provide employment in addition to housing, including 45,000 sq ft retail space and 15 ha employment land as well as 12 ha woodland planting.
Settlement Hierarchy	10 Upper Clatford Parish Council	We note the amended criteria for Tier 3 and acknowledge that Upper Clatford and Goodworth Clatford continue to be grouped together. We continue to highlight that the villages are separated by several km of rural landscape and the grouping should not establish a rationale for coalescence.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10213	Kimpton should be grouped as a rural cluster with Thruxton and Fyfield and they should all be Tier 3 settlements and have a settlement boundary.
	10314	Villages of Middle Wallop, Over Wallop and Nether Wallop have been treated as a single unit, as have the villages of Palestine and Grateley, presumably on the basis that they are sufficiently close to each other to share the relevant facilities, this principle has not been applied to other settlements which share facilities
	10314	Why should Michelmersh and Timsbury not be joined together as a single settlement for the purposes of the local plan if others can be? The basis of this distinction is not explained. What was done for the Wallops should be done for Michelmersh and Timsbury
	11148	although Palestine/Grateley Station/Grateley settlements have been grouped together as a "Tier 3" settlement but the existence of the rail station coupled with the generally unconstrained nature of the land in and around the settlement boundaries means that this should be recognised as a higher Tier 2 settlement, with the potential to provide strategic allocations that could take advantage of the existing rail service
	10213	Object to the exclusion of Kimpton from the grouping in Table 6 as Kimpton, Thruxton and Fyfield CofE Primary School is located within Kimpton parish, is located centrally and serves all three settlements but is excluded from table 7 of the Settlement Hierarchy topic paper despite it being a key facility
	10213	Kimpton, Fyfield and Thruxton should be grouped together and one of the shared facilities should be listed as the Primary school
	10213	Propose that Kimpton, Fyfield and Thruxton are grouped together as a 'Rural Cluster' and that the settlements are collectively designated as Tier 3 settlements

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11020	The grouping of Upper Clatford with Goodworth Clatford into Tier 3 appears anomalous when the allocation of any new housing numbers will consider the two villages/parishes on an individual basis.
Settlement Boundary	10405 North Wessex Downs National Landscape	Agree with Hatherden having its settlement boundary removed
	10780	Hatherden currently benefits from a Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB) in the existing Revised Local Plan (RLP), and therefore is a location that the Council consider to be capable of accommodating additional residential development. We agree with this
	10780	The draft Local Plan 2040 is proposing to remove settlement boundaries from these nine Tier 4 settlements, strongly object to the omission of a SPB from the village of Hatherden
	10780	Removing the SPB from Hatherden will not allow the village to grow or thrive, and would certainly not help support local services. Indeed, since the RLP was adopted in 2026, the Council have only granted permission for one dwelling in Hatherden, which related to a Class Q approval at Hatherden House – a site that is outside the SPB for Hatherden
	10780	No new dwellings have been approved within the SPB of Hatherden over the current Plan period. The SPB is therefore not facilitating development and not allowing the village to grow – a situation that will become worse if the SPB is removed as part of the DLP
	10780	Rather than removing the SPB for Hatherden, our clients believe that a SPB should be retained for the village and that their land should either be included within the SPB or allocated for housing, this would allow the village to grow.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Omission site	10780	Our Clients' land is an entirely appropriate location for new housing, and although it falls within the National Landscape it would form a natural continuation to the residential development seen immediately to the south east of the site
	10780	Hatherden itself is a sustainable settlement, with a village pub, church and primary school, all of which are within walking distance of our Clients' land. The site is a short walk from the nearest bus stop, and walking/cycling are realistic alternatives to using the private car
Unmet Need	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We do not see any strong or logical reason why a contribution should be made towards Havant's needs, it is self-evident that needs should be met closest to where those needs arise.
Spatial Strategy	10099 Hampshire County Council	The Local Plan would support development that supports health, equity and wellbeing. A key suggested aim for the Borough's spatial strategy and its communities is 'Our health and wellbeing is shaped by much more than just our health care. The places we live in affect our health in countless ways, including through the way a neighbourhood is designed, access to green spaces and the provision of active travel choices.' The local plan and its policies are a key tool in delivering this ambition.
	10049 Historic England	object to articulation of spatial strategy as it feels incomplete. We recommend clearer integration of the historic environment within the wording presented. Promoting access to the countryside and conserving and enhancing the Borough's diverse and historic landscape character" "Promoting the town centres as destinations through delivering well designed, accessible,

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		mixed-use developments with improvements to our public realm, conserving and where possible enhancing locally important assets, maximising the use of previously developed land, to support the day and evening economies in accordance with our Masterplans”
Reasonable alternatives	10126	While demographic considerations are a key part of determining an appropriate split in the housing number, they are not the only one. There are many considerations, which may stem from the vision and objectives of the Local Plan for the plan period. This requires analysis, consultation and testing through the SA process, as was recognised and explored for the adopted Local Plan. The adopted Local Plan split was based on factors including job forecast data, aspirations for Andover to maintain a degree of self containment in the labour market, and assist in sustaining its leisure and retail offer.
	10126	Having regard to paragraph 7.10 of the Housing Market Areas Study, in relation to taking into account wider considerations, suggest that this does not just apply to the distribution of sites but also the spatial strategy implications of the housing requirement split adopted at the outset.
	10126	There is sufficient evidence to justify a need to consider reasonable alternatives to failing to meet needs, which would otherwise be contrary to the NPPF paragraph 35. It is recommended that these alternatives are explored further through the next iteration of the Sustainability Appraisal.
HMA	10779	Why is there a 57% to 43% split with more housing to be built in the South when the plan acknowledges the greater need for housing in the South?
Reasonable alternatives	10126	Any updates to the HMAs should be pursued through joint working with the relevant adjoining authorities, not unilaterally. If the Council does not pursue this course of action, as a minimum, the Sustainability Appraisal should test the existing HMA boundaries as a reasonable alternative. There is no justification for omitting this reasonable alternative.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	11076	Draft Local Plan, it is proposed to remove the settlement boundary from Houghton completely and move the village into tier 4. We strongly object to this proposed amendment
Settlement Hierarchy	10170 Houghton Parish Council	TVBC have reviewed the settlement hierarchy and proposed to place Houghton in Tier 4 and remove the settlement policy boundary
	10170 Houghton Parish Council	HPC fully supports placing Houghton in Tier 4 and removing the settlement boundary as proposed
	11076	Houghton is located close to Stockbridge, which is a key service centre in the adopted Local Plan and a tier 2 settlement in the draft Local Plan and is an important destination for services and facilities. Houghton itself is served by a number of local services and facilities, including The Boot Inn pub, bakery, local café provided within Houghton Lodge, a yoga studio, a small number of local shops and a Church
	11076	Houghton therefore has good access to services and facilities and should remain a tier 3 settlement and clearly does not have the characteristics of a tier 4 category as described in the Settlement Boundary Review. It sets out the criteria of what should be included and excluded from settlement boundaries
	11076	Draft Local Plan in its current form is suppressing rural communities, not allowing them to grow and thrive and will offer such rural villages Houghton little opportunity for the future generation if the draft Local Plan is not amended accordingly

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Omission site	11076	The sites are all clearly well-related both physically and functionally to the built form of the settlement and are not outlying or detached from the settlement, with existing development surrounding all three sites
	11076	Houghton Allotments is currently included in the settlement boundary in the adopted Local Plan but is now being proposed for removal. The Settlement Boundary Review states the reason is due to the allotments comprising “open land free from urban influences which is appropriate to remove from the settlement boundary”. This is not a justification for removing the site and is not accurate
	11076	Exclusion of these sites is completely illogical and does not align with TVBC’s own methodology. Therefore, not only should the settlement boundary and tier 3 status of Houghton remain, but the proposed settlement boundary should also be amended and expanded accordingly as described above. This will allow for modest, organic growth of the village within the settlement boundary, where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development
	11076	Land West of Rose Cottage lies at the northern end of Houghton and is surrounded by existing residential development. The site is known as reference 239, with an approximate capacity of 12 units. The site is now being put forward with an amended, reduced boundary and a suggested capacity of approximately 4 dwellings
	11076	Houghton Allotments lies in the northern half of Houghton but almost in the centre of the village and is surrounded by existing residential development. The site is currently included in the settlement boundary in the adopted Local Plan, but is now being proposed for removal, which we strongly disagreed with. The site is being put forward for development, with an approximate capacity of 4 units
	11076	Land Rear of Steven Drove lies adjacent and to the south-west of Houghton Allotments. To the north, south and east is existing residential development and to the west is open fields.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Promoted in the SHELAA, reference 238, with an approximate capacity of 45 units. The site is now being put forward for approximately 20 units. There is also potential for an upgraded community sewage system for the existing residents of Stevens Drove. The development would be able to deliver affordable housing, which would be a valuable contribution to the Borough
	11076	All three sites represent logical locations for sustainable, modest growth of Houghton and are well related to the existing surrounding development and built form of Houghton. There are no overriding constraints preventing their development and such development would align with the Local Plan's visions and objectives to distribute development throughout the Borough, particularly within rural areas to enable to grow and thrive and not get left behind through accommodating development to sustain vibrant and healthy rural communities
Housing Requirement	10794	Having reviewed the rationale for not setting the housing requirement above the local housing need, the question of affordability requires further consideration. For example, the ratio of median house price to median gross annual workplace-based earnings in Test Valley has increased over the past ten years; the affordable housing need as evidenced by the SHMA and summarised in the SA is telling in the identification of an annual affordable housing need of 652 dwellings; it is clear the affordable housing need will not be met; it is likely that the gross affordable housing need will increase over the plan period leading to a net shortfall and in turn a higher number of people in need and on the Council's housing waiting list.
	10137	Anticipated changes in the LHN figure may result in a different housing requirement and clarity is sought on how a changing LHN figure would be dealt with through the LP process
Rural housing requirement	10120	Paragraph 3.79 states this is a device for monitoring delivery which would trigger a review of options if insufficient homes are provided in rural areas. Consider this policy must

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		be redrafted to outline this review process and the relevant triggers to ensure that it is effective in monitoring and maintaining a rural housing land supply.
Housing Requirement	11111	Object to the scale of proposed development on the grounds that the aggregated impact of the Local Plan and those other surrounding Local Plans will adversely impact the River Test SSSI and River Itchen SSSI/SAC and the major tributaries in the Test & Itchen catchment.
	11111	Rivers Test and Itchen are globally rare and fragile chalk streams that need protecting, the Local Plan does not do so, as the scale and speed of planned housing delivery exceeds practical mitigation to protect the rivers and surrounding environment.
	11111	In addition to the 11,000 homes planned in the Local Plan, there are an additional 59,180 houses projected in a similar timeframe from neighbouring planning authorities (HRA, paragraph 5.61), all of whom will be drawing water from the over abstracted rivers in the Test and Itchen catchments and the majority of whom will be requiring wastewater services from Southern Water.
Rural Communities	10139	Difficult to see how the proposed policies will have a positive impact on the issues faced by rural communities such as, affordable homes, lack of public transport and availability of services and facilities
Spatial Strategy	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	Far too little assessment has been made as to what the impacts of these allocations of land for new built development will have on local communities and the local environment
Affordable housing	10139	We would suggest increasing the percentage of affordable homes in new developments to 50% to boost supply

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Monitoring	10120	Policy as drafted is highly ineffective.
	11161	As drafted, the policy is weak, vague and ineffective and should be revised. It does not state what measures will be taken if the plan is not delivering. It does not state what action will trigger an early plan review.
	10661	There is no analysis of what infrastructure improvements are needed in the south of the borough and how those needs compare with what could be delivered via the preferred growth option.
Distribution of development	11094	Adding more housing to the fringes of Andover would swell the towns population by 10%-12% to around 57,000, putting more strain on the existing infrastructure without materially contributing new infrastructure.
	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	Support development at the most sustainable location, however would want to ensure appropriate weight is given to the adequacy of the infrastructure in conjunction with development
Settlement Hierarchy	10101	Residual benefits flow from getting development in right place from outset and directing growth to locations that benefit from existing infrastructure
	10101	Locations that do not require significant investment in transport infrastructure are better able to deliver employment growth and sustainable population increase, which in turn supports vibrancy and resilience of Borough's rural areas
Housing Requirement	11111	The level of housing demand in this Local Plan and neighbouring Local Plans is highly likely to exceed Southern Water's Water Resource Management Plan and Drainage and

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Wastewater Management Plan in the early parts of the plan period. The Local Plan places too much reliance on Southern Water to deliver these plans.
Housing distribution	10941	The proposed development contradicts the focus stated in Paragraph 3.14 to focus on development of sustainable settlements where there are key facilities, due to the strain the development will put on already declining services and facilities.
Settlement Boundary	10720	The proposed development will increase pressure on local dentist services which are already oversubscribed.
NDP Housing Requirements	10082	Test Valley has an ageing population, and therefore developments conducted through the Neighbourhood Plan puts significant strain on local health and social care infrastructure.
Settlement Boundary	10937	<p>Future developments on settlement boundaries once Electricity infrastructure has been progressed to cope with additional constructions.</p> <p>This should be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.</p>
	10720	The proposed development will increase pressure on local GP services which are already oversubscribed.
	10937	<p>Future developments on settlement boundaries once Roads infrastructure has been progressed to cope with additional constructions.</p> <p>This should be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10720	The proposed development will increase demand for already oversubscribed primary schools and there is also no secondary school in the local area.
	10937	Future developments on settlement boundaries once Sewage infrastructure has been progressed to cope with additional constructions. This should be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.
	10720	There are insufficient shops locally to provide for the increased population.
	10937	Future developments on settlement boundaries once Utilities infrastructure has been progressed to cope with additional constructions. This should be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.
	10937	Future developments on settlement boundaries once Water infrastructure has been progressed to cope with additional constructions. This should be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.
Spatial strategy	10656	The Council is seeking to approve plans for more buildings in villages where road access and blocked roads are already the norm
Monitoring	11111	The Local Plan requires further revision in the context of the Southern Water's ability to provide potable water and wastewater services, accounting for their over abstraction and

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		being off target to rectify this; pollution via overflows; modest investment in infiltration reduction; and past and present performance.
	11111	Local Plan needs to be assured that the Environment Agency consider that Southern Water has a robust, funded and implementable Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan that brings river pollution from their CSOs under control.
	11111	Local Plan needs to be assured that the Environment Agency consider that Southern Water has a Water Resource Management Plan that brings abstraction from rivers in the Test and Itchen Catchment back into balance with the need to protect them from adverse flow rates and that meet their obligations under the Section 20 Order to reduce abstraction rates on the Test and Itchen.
Settlement Hierarchy	11108	W1 is pleased to see reference made to the importance of broadband and electric car infrastructure
Spatial Strategy	11077	Though agreeing with the principle here, raise two concerns: (a) What seems to be missing is the need where possible to align development with infrastructure, especially where that infrastructure is both of strategic importance, and not deliverable anywhere else in the Borough. (b) By aligning infrastructure with development currently identified within the LP40, this will only be to the benefit of Tier 1 and 2 settlements, with Tier 3 settlements missing out. This is confirmed in the overarching priorities for NTV
	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	Far too little assessment has been made as to whether these locations can support the proposed additional development and whether they have the necessary infrastructure especially as no new infrastructure seems to be proposed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	Focus is to support appropriate levels of development at largest range of suitable settlements where there are key facilities, however without new services, facilities and infrastructure more pressure is placed on existing services and infrastructure in the key settlements
	11077	Appears to be concerned with distributing housing development alone, without recognising that this can be accompanied by new infrastructure. Paragraph 3.14 refers only to locations where there 'are' key facilities, as opposed to where these could be positively planned for along with housing growth. This is an important distinction
Monitoring	11111	If past and present performance is an indicator of Southern Water's future ability to deliver fit for purpose plans, then confidence in the Local Plan being realistic and robust in its assumptions on such matters is low.
Settlement Boundary	11001 Kimpton Parish Council	KPC do not intend to explicitly confirm support or opposition to the removal of the settlement boundary, we see potential positive and negative implications for both retention and removal
	11001 Kimpton Parish Council	The removal of the settlement boundary effectively makes the whole of the parish "open countryside" we understand this means that will be tighter criteria to be met on any proposed development in the parish
	11001	The removal of the settlement boundary would impact any proposed development within the existing boundaries, this may impact residents who wish to undertake development of their

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Kimpton Parish Council	property making such development more challenging that it would if the settlement boundary remains in place
	11001 Kimpton Parish Council	KPC is considering a NDP, it is unclear whether the retention or removal of the boundary would affect the way the plan is written
Settlement Hierarchy	10213	Object to the removal of the settlement boundary for Kimpton as this will remove the presumption in favour of development and redevelopment within the boundary.
	10213	The designation of Kimpton as a tier 4 settlement without a settlement boundary does not provide an appropriate policy basis to sustain Kimpton and support local services particularly the primary school, public houses and other community facilities
Site Allocation	10194	Policy 6 (SS6) identifies the site as “Land at King Edwards Park, Chandler’s Ford” It is suggested that naming should be adjusted to “Land north of King Edward Park, Chandler’s Ford” as site not directly associated with Park
NDP Housing Requirements	10082	Uncertain in regards to Neighbourhood Development proposed plans in accordance with wishes of local residents. King's Somborne - appeal allowed prior with considerable objection but dwellings were allowed due to District wide housing shortfall.]
	10082	The King's Somborne Neighbourhood Plan (2020-29) was made following a positive referendum result in Nov 2023 despite the very low turnout of 27.27%.
Settlement Hierarchy	10778	Report notes that Tier 3 settlements vary considerably in terms of their overall sustainability. Kings Somborne ranks relatively well in Tier 3 in terms of number of services and facilities and we agree this has been rightfully categorised. As such, support that King’s Somborne

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		has been assessed as a Tier 3 settlement due to the essential services and facilities accommodated within its settlement boundary
Settlement Boundary	10778	Following the methodology set out in Tables 2 and 3, we are of the opinion that the Council have incorrectly excluded our client's site Land at Froghole Lane from the settlement boundary. This site has a functional relationship with the settlement as a result of its positioning behind dwellings on the Romsey Road to the south of the site's boundary
	10778	Site's east and west boundaries are adjacent to existing dwellings and associated gardens located on Froghole Lane and Highfield, whereby access into the site is currently granted. Furthermore, mature trees and hedgerows help to create strong site boundaries, particularly towards the north and in place to the east, separating the site from the open countryside further north
	10778	The site is within close proximity to a number of the services within the village, much closer than the three allocated sites, including The Crown Inn pub, Kings Somborne C of E Primary School, Village Hall and Parish Church
	10778	Consider that Land at Froghole Lane should be included within the settlement limits due to location and relationship to the existing settlement and Conservation Area
Omission site	11103	Land has been promoted through the local plan and King's Somborne neighbourhood plan. No details of proposals included in the comments
	11103	Land has been promoted through the local plan and King's Somborne neighbourhood plan. No details of proposals included in the comments
Affordable housing	10139	The 40% target in the current plan has in reality, only resulted in 30% of new dwellings constructed in the last 5 years being affordable
Housing Requirement	10816	The policies fail to demonstrate a consistent supply over the plan period.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Monitoring	11095	Concerned over the policy lacking detail regarding timescales, actions or measures that would be taken if development is stalling, in particular what circumstances would trigger an early review of the Local Plan.
Settlement Hierarchy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We broadly endorse and support the settlement hierarchy however, the approach that follows from first principles fails to account for the fact that unconstrained development opportunities may not exist within or adjoining these settlements. Where they do exist, they may not be easy to integrate with the existing settlement due to factors such as land control, topography and railway lines.
Housing Requirement	11152	the Local Plan should include a policy mechanism to facilitate the delivery of small sites adjacent to existing settlements within the Borough where it can be demonstrated that the location is sustainable in terms of access to local facilities.
Settlement Boundary	10101	Need to consider locations outside or beyond settlement boundaries where sustainable development is possible
NDP Housing Requirements	11103	Policy SS5 should allow development to come forward on sites adj. to settlement boundaries in certain circumstances eg allocations not coming forward at expected rate
Spatial Strategy	11147	would like to add that locations such as those surrounding the most sustainable locations in the Borough would play a significant role in delivering sustainable development
5YHLS	11117	The council is relying on some large strategic allocations that may not deliver in first 5 years of plan. The council should allocate additional deliverable sites.
Distribution of development	10803	object to allocating large sites to deliver housing,

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10803	overall housing strategy for the northern housing market area principally relies on the delivery of very large strategic allocations (other than the proposed allocation south of London Road, East Andover), rather than to propose a range of housing allocations in terms of sizes to ensure a continuity of housing supply over the plan period, including in the first five years
Housing Requirement	10655	relying solely on allocations for housing development may introduce uncertainties due to factors such as delays in planning approval, land availability, viability and policy changes
	10803	there are significant time delays involved in delivering large strategic sites and securing residential occupations to help meet local housing needs (including affordable housing need)- caused initially through planning timescales and are often further exacerbated through discussions/negotiations required between landowners and developers to acquire sites and enable a start on site with often significant levels of up-front infrastructure required on large sites before housing development can commence.
	10803	likely delays caused through an over-reliance on large strategic sites is demonstrated by housing delivery of larger sites to principally deliver housing in the latter part of the plan period and whilst Bere Hill site is suggested as possibly delivering housing in the short term, it is not controlled by a developer and is constrained in terms of its access. Therefore the likelihood of delivering housing in the short term has to be questioned.
	10803	a strategy that relies on large strategic sites is likely to result in delays to housing delivery and a 'back loading' of delivery into the latter stages of the plan period
Housing distribution	10814	Council has sought to outline an overall housing strategy for the southern housing market area that heavily relies on the delivery of two large strategic allocations at Velmore Farm, Valley Park and South of Ganger Farm, Romsey rather than to propose a range of sizes of housing allocation to ensure a continuity of housing supply over the Plan period

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10803	a strategy that relies on large strategic sites only requires a delay/ non-delivery to one site to cause significant issues with the Plan's overall strategy to meet housing needs and maintain a deliverable housing supply
	10803	it is considered that this Policy is unsound as it is not sufficiently justified to meet the tests set out in the NPPF, due to its over reliance on large housing sites that can affect the maintaining of a continuous housing supply throughout the plan period in the most sustainable locations.
	10384	There is an overreliance on large strategic sites. Small and medium size sites can make an important contribution.
	10094	Council is over reliant on larger allocations and may need to identify smaller, deliverable sites, such as Rownhams.
	11115	Plan is relying on some large sites (Whitenap, Ganger Farm) which face challenges in delivery. Smaller sites, such as Sandy Lane, would deliver housing in the shorter term and increase the overall supply to reinforce the early part of the trajectory.
	10798	Reg 18 LP almost wholly reliant on proposed allocations to deliver the 11,000 homes across plan period
	10803	The Plan relies on sites of 350 dwellings or more to deliver more than 97% of dwellings in the housing allocations and sites of 800 dwellings or more to deliver over 88% of dwellings in the housing allocations
	10816	A strategy that relies to such an extent on large strategic sites is likely to result in delays to housing delivery and a 'back loading' of delivery into the latter stages of the plan period.
	10816	Relying on Velmore Farm and Ganger Farm will leave the borough at the mercy of 1 or 2 developers and their build out rates/sales rates which are susceptible to market conditions. There are often significant delays in delivery and securing residential occupations to help meet local housing needs (including affordable housing need).

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11121	Delivery of housing requirement relies on a small number of large sites which is not consistent with the advice in NPPF (2023) paragraph 70. The plan should be amended to include land at Maurys Mount for housing.
	11120	The preferred approach relies disproportionately on larger strategic sites 81% of which are 800 or more units. Strategic sites of this size are inevitably more complex and take longer to commence. They also require significant infrastructure to be delivered. Insufficient consideration has been given to the risk of delays in delivery on how this could affect the supply of homes.
	10801	This policy relies too heavily on delivery of larger strategic allocations when small and medium sites can contribute to meeting the housing requirements quicker. Alternative options have not been thoroughly considered
	10816	Object to the spatial strategy for delivery of housing in Southern test Valley due to over reliance on land South of Ganger farm and land at Velmore farm
	10817	Object to this policy as it relies on two sites to deliver 85% of the total number of draft allocation dwellings in Southern test valley.
	10817	Object to this policy as over reliance on just two sites will leave the Borough at the mercy of one or two developers and their build out/ sales rates, which are susceptible to market conditions.
	10817	Velmore Farm is proposing to deliver housing in the latter part of the plan period while Ganger Farm is proposing delivery in the short term- the likelihood of a developer delivering 80 dwellings in years 3,4 and 5 is questionable.
	10817	A strategy that relies on just 2 large strategic sites is likely to result in delays to housing delivery and delivery in the latter stages of the plan period.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10817	The Policy in its current form is unsound and not sufficiently justified to meet the tests set out in the NPPF due to its over reliance on two large housing sites.
	10816	The housing strategy for the southern Test Valley heavily relies on the delivery of Velmore Farm and Ganger Farm rather than allocating a range of sizes to ensure a continuity of housing supply over the plan period, including in the first five years.
	10814	There are significant time delays involved in delivering large strategic sites and securing residential occupations to help meet local housing needs (including affordable housing need). These delays are caused initially through planning timescales
	10814	These timescales are often further exacerbated through discussions/negotiations required between landowners, statutory consultees and developers to acquire sites, additional land and / or additional consents to enable a start on site with often significant levels of up-front infrastructure required on large sites before housing development can commence
	10814	SHELAA identifies the Land at Velmore Farm, which accounts for over 65% of dwellings on the draft site allocations, as delivering all of its proposed 1,070 dwellings in the latter part of the Plan period. Whilst the Land South of Ganger Farm is suggested as possibly delivering housing in the short term, the likelihood of a single developer delivering 80 dwellings in years 3, 4 and 5 has to be questioned. It is also interesting to note that the reference is made in the SHELAA to both the draft allocations being unlikely to commence in 5 years
	10814	It is considered that a strategy that relies to such an extent on just two large strategic site is likely to result in delays to housing delivery and a 'back loading' of delivery into the latter stages of the Plan period
	10814	Such a strategy only requires a delay/non-delivery to these sites to cause significant issues with the Plan's overall strategy to meet housing needs and maintain a deliverable housing land supply. At present it is considered that this Policy is unsound as it is not sufficiently justified to meet the tests set out in the NPPF, due to its over reliance on two large housing

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		sites that can affect the maintaining of a continuous housing supply throughout the Plan period in the most sustainable locations
	10661	The largest sites combine to account for approximately 2,600 homes in Southern Test Valley. They will have long lead in times to the commencement of development, particularly where there are major infrastructure issues to be addressed. This can have a significant impact on the delivery of a continuous five-year supply of housing land. The inclusion of a range of sites can help with the delivery of the Local Plan requirement, particularly in the early years of the plan period.
	10814	Lack of consideration/reference to justify why a mix of sites suitable for residential development and in sustainable locations could not better help meet Borough's housing land supply requirement, in particular in the early years of the Plan period and without the risk of delayed delivery often experienced on larger urban extensions
	11095	The Local Plan relies on too few a sites in Southern Housing Market Area and is too reliant on Velmore Farm. Given there are a number of issues which could stall delivery of homes, a greater number of sites.
	10729	Strategy relies too heavily on few large scale housing sites across only six locations
	10816	At present this policy is unsound as it is not sufficiently justified to meet the tests set out in the NPPF, due to its over reliance on large housing sites that can affect the maintenance of a continuous housing supply throughout the plan period in the most sustainable locations
Strategic sites	10181	The currently preferred approach relies disproportionately on new, larger, strategic sites, 81% of which are 800 or more units. Strategic sites of this size are inevitably more complex and take longer to commence. A local example is Whitenap. They also often require significant infrastructure to be delivered. It does not appear that sufficient consideration has yet been given to the risks of delays in delivery and how this could affect the supply of homes to meet the Council's housing needs.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	11074	See the benefit in delivering housing through the larger strategic allocations, we are concerned that the spatial strategy contained in the DLP, particularly policy 6 (SS6), over relies on the delivery of such site without recognising the important contribution small and medium sites can make to meeting the housing requirement and how they can be built out relatively quickly compared to larger sites
Mix of sites	10661	The delivery of the housing requirement relies upon a small number of large sites, which is not consistent with advice in the NPPF (paragraph 70) in terms of providing a range and choice of sites. There is a lack of a mix of sites. Local planning authorities should promote the development of a good mix of sites.
Settlement Hierarchy	10729	Concerned about the overreliance on the concentration of housing allocations across only 6 locations within the Borough. Of these, only two of the settlements have allocations for less than 100 dwellings, with Andover for examples expected to deliver 2,290 over the plan period
Strategic sites	10343	Policy is deficient because it relies too heavily of Velmore Farm for housing delivery when a mix of sites would better help meet the Boroughs land supply requirements in line with para 69 of NPPF and avoid risk of delayed delivery (which is often experienced on larger urban extensions). Policy is therefore at risk of being unsound (para 35 of NPPF)
Spatial strategy	10352	Objection. Delivery of housing requirement in LP relies upon a small number of large sites which is not consistent with the NPPF para.70 in providing a range and choice of sites
Settlement Hierarchy	10814	Considered however that there is a significant deficiency in Policy SS1, in that development at Velmore Farm, Valley Park forms a major part of the Council's housing delivery strategy in Southern Test Valley
Spatial Strategy	10813	In the local plan the proposed supply of housing is predominantly to be delivered by large sites including two existing local plan allocations at Hoe Lane (300) North Baddesley and Whitenap 1300 (Romsey) and five proposed allocations for: 80, 110, 340 and 1070 dwellings respectively

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10813	Large sites will have a longer lead-in time to commencement of development, particularly where there are major infrastructure issues to be addressed This can have a significant impact on the delivery of a continuous five-year supply of housing land. The inclusion of smaller sites can help with the delivery of the local plan requirement particularly in the early years of the plan period
Settlement Boundary	10113	Do not have any specific comments at this stage on what the extent of a revised settlement boundary for Leckford should be, would welcome the opportunity to work proactively and positively with Test Valley Borough Council as part of any emerging proposals
	10113	Do not dispute the assessed sustainability of Leckford based on its current level of key facilities and public transport provision. However, we are concerned that the approach taken would restrict future growth and negatively impact the sustainability of the village, as well as other settlements within this tier
	10113	Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper provides an updated settlement assessment in Table 7 which shows that Leckford has 2 Key Facilities and 2 other facilities, which is a contributing factor in it being moved into Tier 4
	10113	Leckford Estate's plan for Leckford would provide housing (including affordable), community facilities such as a multi-purpose community hub whilst, conserving and enhancing heritage assets. This would enhance the sustainability of Leckford by enabling the community's day-to-day needs within the village, the provision of additional housing would crucially support the vitality of the village
Settlement Boundary	10080	The minimum requirement of 10 new dwellings over the plan period in neighbourhood Plans is really low that the contribution to affordable housing is likely to be minimal.
	10080	If the housing numbers come forward over a few sites, then the requirement could fall below the affordable housing thresholds set out in Policy HOU1

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Monitoring	10120	Expect some actions listed, such as liaison with the development industry to be undertaken regularly and not once delivery is not in accordance with what is expected. The Council should ensure that these issues do not arise in the first place rather than waiting until delivery of development is not as expected.
Spatial strategy	10737	The Council should reconsider the sites chosen and find sites which do not erode the local gaps
	10682	It is important to maintain the Strategic Gap between Andover and Abbots Ann as it is - agricultural land, to keep the character of the village and its historical nature, prevent being absorbed into the urban sprawl and maintain the identity of the community of Abbots Ann
	10682	The Draft Local Plan must be clear in stating that Strategic Gaps must be preserved for perpetuity to preserve it for future generations
	10680	Keen to see the local gap between Andover and Abbots Ann maintained by keeping the natural boundary of the railway line and the A303
	10680	Planning applications such as in the one at Little Park would encroach on the village of Abbots Ann and the boundaries of Andover would encroach onto Abbots Ann
	10656	The overdevelopment of Andover into the countryside, means there will be no green belt left between villages and Andover
Settlement Hierarchy	11020	The gap between Upper Clatford and Goodworth Clatford is cherish and there is concern that the policy will lead to excessive development, possibly as a ribbon sprawl on the countryside between the two communities.
Spatial strategy	10342	TVBC need to allocate land to meet the future development needs of the borough. In assessing the merits of sites, it is appropriate to review existing policy constraints including the local gaps policy. TVBC's own study on local gaps highlighted the potential to review the North Baddesley-Chilworth local gap boundary where it includes Roundabouts Copse

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10342	There is an opportunity to provide an enhanced and permanent green buffer to the Local Gap with public access for the local community whilst protecting and positively managing areas of ecological importance
	10342	In that context, a modest revised boundary to enable a small-scale development with good access to services and facilities which retains a significant area of undeveloped land of ecological and landscape value which retains the separation of the two settlements is justified. The proposed boundary of the North Baddesley-Chilworth Local Gap should be revised to omit land at Roundabouts Copse, North Baddesley
Settlement Hierarchy	10622	There are lots of issues with flooding in the area and thus it would not be suitable for development.
	10622	The villages are in the River Dun Valley and Mottisfont Bat area, and thus cannot be considered for development.
	10622	There are not enough essential services local to the parishes and thus it would not be suitable for development.
	10622	The road networks are not good enough for the parishes to be placed in a higher tier, and would not be suitable for development.
	10622	There are no gas mains, sewers or mobile phone coverage in the parishes and thus it would not be suitable for development.
	10622	The parishes of Lockerley and East Dean have been appropriately designated within the Settlement Hierarchy.
Omission site	10816	Strongly recommend the Council review the spatial strategy and site allocation process to include land at Coombs Meadow, Lockerley (SHELAA ref. 166) as a draft allocation as it is in a sustainable location, immediately available, deliverable, has been assessed in the SHELAA

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		2024, is achievable, commence-able in 5 years and has no significant development constraints.
	10817	The Land at Coombs Meadow Site is adjacent to Settlement Boundary of Lockerley, a tier 3 settlement in STV. Has access to primary school, village hall, public open space, village centre, place of worship, no significant constraints, SHELAA indicates site is deliverable within 1-5 years
	10817	The draft plan does not sufficiently recognise the important contribution that the site - Land at Coombs Meadow- could make to the housing land supply and the soundness of the draft local plan.
	10080	The site is in a sustainable location, 0.7ha suitable for about 20 small scale/custom build units that could be built out quickly. The site is constrained in the north close to a watercourse is at risk of flooding.
	10080	The site is 3.5km from west Dean railway station, it measures just over 1ha, is developable capable of about 65 dwellings
Spatial Strategy	10133	Ludgershall fall outside boundary of Test Valley (within Wiltshire) and therefore does not feature within the settlement hierarchy. Directing a significant amount of development to Ludgershall, represents a significant shift in the spatial strategy for the NTV sub area.
Settlement Hierarchy	10779	A new town is not in accordance with Kimpton being designated as a Tier 4 settlement as it has properties such as open countryside.
Distribution of development	10803	Notwithstanding the apparent lack of any robust assessment by Test Valley Borough Council in this respect, Wiltshire Council's own assessment has confirmed this as a 'market town' and not a highest order or most sustainable settlement. relying on two sites within the Borough adjacent to Ludgershall to deliver almost 40% of the housing allocated in northern Test Valley

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		(1,500 dwellings). This is considered to be unsound as it fails to be consistent with national policy set out in the NPPF to direct development to the most sustainable locations.
Housing Requirement	10126	Further work needed to understand the absorption rate implications of building out all three sites in Ludgershall into the same local housing market at similar times. It is unclear whether such evidence has been commissioned and factored into the housing trajectories.
	10803	reference is made in the SHELAA to the east of Ludgershall and south east of Ludgershall sites being promoted by the landowner, with 'interest' from a promoter and consequently they do not appear to be under developer control to provide certainty over delivery
	10803	disproportionate reliance placed on housing delivery is further exacerbated when allocations within Wiltshire Council's emerging plan are considered, resulting in 2,720 dwellings at this settlement overall and is likely to require coordination with delivery of the site in Wiltshire to provide a coherent development
	10803	there is a disproportionate reliance placed on housing delivery at Ludgershall for a significant quantum of development, as a likely less sustainable settlement than Andover and which is likely to meet the wider needs of Wiltshire rather than Test Valley
	10817	Support identification of Land South East of Ludgershall within Policy SS6. Table in policy should be amended to be consistent with the Northern Area and Southern Area site-specific policies that reference 'approximately' when referring to the quantum of development for consistency. As drafted the table appears to fix the number of homes.
	10803	the overall strategy of the plan to identify Ludgershall for strategic expansion has not been appropriately or sufficiently referenced, considered or assessed as part of this Plan to confirm it as a suitable and sustainable location for strategic growth

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10803	from references in the sustainability appraisal/SHMA, the Council may be heavily relying on meeting development needs of the wider Wiltshire HMA rather than concentrating on and meeting the specific development needs of Test Valley Borough
	10803	The relative sustainability of Ludgershall has not been considered or determined in the settlement hierarchy to confirm its suitability as a sustainable location for development in the Borough
	10803	object to too much reliance being placed on housing delivery at Ludgershall as a less sustainable settlement
	10803	although Ludgershall is located in the neighbouring local authority area of Wiltshire Council, in seeking to implement the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out at Policy SS1 and justifying the housing strategy at Policy SS6 then there should be an appreciation in the Test Valley Local Plan of the sustainability of Ludgershall relative to other settlements in Test Valley Borough, to confirm the approach. If not through detailed assessment, at least through cross-reference to Wiltshire Council's Settlement Strategy set out at Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Local Plan – Pre-submission Draft 2020-2038 (Regulation 19), where Ludgershall is recognised as a 'market town' and accepting that it is not a highest order settlement
	11161	Surprising to see 1500 dwellings allocated to eastern edge of Ludgershall, which is a rural location on the Test Valley side of the boundary. Ludgershall is not a key settlement or larger settlement in the Spatial Strategy and the allocation is not explained by the spatial strategy.
	11161	Proposed strategic development at Ludgershall appears to be an opportunistic route to deliver homes within a peripheral part of the Borough where no existing Test Valley residents will be impacted.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10126	Substantive pre-application work is likely to be required for the Ludgershall sites in advance of adoption of both the Wiltshire and Test Valley Local Plans to achieve the trajectory. Unless this is evidenced, suggest the trajectory is revisited.
	10126	If completions from the sites in Ludgershall will extend beyond the plan period, then additional sites should be allocated to address any shortfalls identified in supply as a consequence.
	10202 Wiltshire Council	Whilst some benefits of expanding Ludgershall into Test Valley concerned over scale of growth being proposed that overlaps with planned growth in Wiltshire over similar plan period and potential implications this may have for place shaping of the settlement
	10202 Wiltshire Council	Housing Trajectory that identifies assumption about site delivery at Ludgershall: NA7 350 homes 2028/29-2032/33 and NA8 1,150 homes 2031/32-2039/40. There will be an overlap from anticipated delivery of draft Wiltshire local plan allocation
	10202 Wiltshire Council	Two draft allocations of 1,500 homes added to draft Wiltshire local plan allocation of 1,220 homes, represents significant uplift to scale of growth planned for Ludgershall within a relatively short timeframe to 2040
	10202 Wiltshire Council	Scale of development at Ludgershall does not appear to align with the plan's spatial strategy, which focuses on meeting needs of settlements within the hierarchy

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10202 Wiltshire Council	While Ludgershall is sustainable location for growth (as demonstrated by proposed Wiltshire allocation), this does not mean that any scale of growth is justified within the plan period
	10202 Wiltshire Council	Concerns with spatial strategy and proposed approach to directing such a significant scale of growth to Ludgershall within plan period
	10202 Wiltshire Council	Scale of development at Ludgershall does not appear to align with the plan's spatial strategy, which focuses on meeting needs of settlements within the hierarchy
	10202 Wiltshire Council	Scale of growth at Ludgershall would have implications for settlement as a place
Northern HMA	10803	whilst the northern Test Valley HMA is 'aligned to the Borough boundary', there is a relationship with the adjacent Wiltshire HMA and consequently it is reasonable to consider potential strategic allocation adjacent to the settlement boundary in Test Valley, that contributes to the Borough's need, consistent with the HMA evidence and the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. Furthermore, the Test Valley Strategic Housing Market Assessment

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		(January 2022) sets out at Paragraph 1.31 that the 'north of the Borough, particularly around Andover is influenced by Salisbury and other Wiltshire settlements'.
Settlement Hierarchy	10803	there is a significant deficiency in Policy SS1, in that development at Ludgershall forms a major part of the Council's housing delivery strategy in northern Test Valley (Policy SS6), yet there is no reference in Policy SS1 or its supporting text to Ludgershall or any attempt to reference its relative sustainability in the settlement hierarchy or confirm its suitability for the strategic growth of this Borough as a sustainable location for development
	10803	due to the lack of consideration/reference to Ludgershall in the settlement hierarchy at Policy SS1 that this is a significant omission and consequently this policy and the whole spatial strategy for northern Test Valley has not been appropriately justified and is unsound, being inconsistent with the tests set out at Paragraph 35 of the NPPF.
Spatial strategy	10119	The emerging Wiltshire Local Plan states that any future need to further expand the town into Test Valley will be the subject of review in future development plans, which indicates the proposed allocations in the TVBC Local Plan have not yet been fully considered. Further, Ludgershall had a population of 5,390 (2021 census) and it is noted the Wiltshire and TVBC allocations could add another 6,500 occupants which raises concerns about whether this can be classed as sustainable for a location that is relatively remote and in a town that lacks rail links.
	10126	Allocations directed to Ludgershall in particular seem likely to take longer to be delivered than indicated in the Council's trajectory and may not be completed in the plan period. Scale and complexity of co-ordinating all three proposed allocations at Ludgershall, which includes cross-boundary infrastructure and masterplanning co-ordination, and a lack of certainty over timescales for the delivery of a key railway bridge, suggests housing trajectory may be overly optimistic. Research undertaken by Lichfields (2020, updated 2024) suggests average lead

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		in time for sites of 1000-1499 homes could extend over 6 years from validation of outline application to completion of first dwelling.
Settlement Hierarchy	11161	Council has undertaken an assessment of the sustainability of settlements in the Borough and hierarchy but have not undertaken this process for Ludgershall as part of this SA work and have accepted the designation of the settlement at Tier 2 in the Wiltshire Core Strategy, a local plan that is almost 10 years old.
Spatial Strategy	10817	Promoter supports dispersed spatial strategy including a proportion of growth at main centre of Andover and also Ludgershall. Sustainable Spatial Strategy should explain the justified approach to direct a proportion of growth to proposed sites NA7, NA8 and SA6 at the fringes of the Borough. Para. 3.13 gives some indication that reduces ability to deliver growth at Andover and Romsey but further explicit reference will assist in understanding the decisions made. Further reasoning specific to Ludgershall to outline the clear benefits of the large scale cross-boundary development with the emerging allocation in the Wiltshire LP would assist.
	10817	Identification of the sustainable settlements in neighbouring local authorities in Figure 3, such as the market town of Tidworth and also Ludgershall, will aid the context of the site allocations at Ludgershall.
	10133	Do not support spatial strategy directing significant scale of development to Ludgershall. This is not sound as matter of principle, in aligning with local plan objectives, specifically delivering sustainable pattern of development and minimising need to travel by promoting active and sustainable travel patterns.
Settlement Hierarchy	10202 Wiltshire Council	Proposed spatial strategy seeks to distribute development with more dispersal of growth and identifies a focus for growth on Tier 1 settlements and also a wider distribution of growth to a larger number of settlements in accordance with settlement hierarchy. Ludgershall is not one of the settlements within the hierarchy

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10202 Wiltshire Council	Ludgershall is described as having good access to services, facilities and employment and public transport. The spatial strategy topic paper explains that which Ludgershall falls within Wiltshire and is therefore not in the Test Valley settlement hierarchy, it is considered to be the equivalent of a Tier 2 settlement, being classified as a Market Town in the draft Wiltshire local plan
	10202 Wiltshire Council	Wiltshire Core Strategy and draft local plan pair Ludgershall with Tidworth as a Market Town, recognising that two settlements are closely linked in terms of shared services and presence of military. As such, Wiltshire plans for the two settlements together rather than separate from each other
	10202 Wiltshire Council	Previously supported emerging spatial strategy through previous stages, which sought to direct development to existing settlements depending upon settlement hierarchy. Emphasis has now changed and Ludgershall has been included as location for strategic allocations.
Spatial Strategy	10202 Wiltshire Council	Particular interest in proposed spatial strategy and proposed allocations close to and adjoining Wiltshire proposed allocation: NA7 East of Ludgershall (350 homes) and NA8 South East of Ludgershall (1,150 homes)
	10243 Stagecoach South and Go	Ludgershall should be marked on the Key Plan and referred to in the supporting text as the soundness of these allocations substantially depends on the adjacency to Ludgershall within Wiltshire.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	South Coast Limited	
	11108	W1 question whether the proposed Wiltshire and TVBC allocations in Ludgershall are sustainable as the location is remote and lacks rail links.
	10133	Proposed allocations at Ludgershall run counter to basis principles of spatial strategy and as such represent flawed and unjustified approach
Employment Land Requirement	10129	<p>The Legend for Strategic Employment Sites (Policies SS8) should be corrected to include all strategic employment sites (i.e. SS8 to SS15).</p> <p>Replace 'SS8' with 'SS8-SS15'</p>
Affordable housing	10181	Viable market led developments are the surest way of maximising affordable housing delivery
	10181	Market led sites would help better address the acute affordable housing need in a sustainable way
Settlement Boundary	10119	It would be logical to apply different approaches to settlement boundaries based on the scale and nature of the settlements. For major centres and growth areas, a more flexible and loose approach would provide flexibility over the plan period, including opportunities for limited growth beyond infill and redevelopment to adapt to changing circumstances, such as a housing land supply shortfall, which might enable more land to be released for housing. In rural areas, a more rigid approach to defined settlement boundaries may be more appropriate to ensure against unregulated harmful growth in more sensitive locations.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10120	Disagree with the use of settlement boundaries to restrict otherwise sustainable development coming forward.
Settlement Hierarchy	10082	The survey conducted on facilities makes it unclear how housing developments will be assessed.
Housing Requirement	10033	The methodology outlined in paragraph 3.89 should be revised to include: local housing issues, affordability, characteristics and composition of the local housing stock including availability of affordable housing, relevant recent planning history regarding the provision of affordable housing, and community engagement and support.
Rural housing requirement	10033	There does not appear to be any analysis of the housing needs of rural Test Valley communities such as the issues of affordability or type and tenure of homes, as highlighted in the Housing Market Area Study and Strategy Housing Market Assessment.
Rural Strategy	10082	The treatment of rural villages ignores that delivery vehicles will be delivering food supplies, clothes etc.
Settlement Boundary	10397 Chilworth Parish Council	Aware the 2016 methodology used for establishing settlement boundaries has been reviewed and amended and that the methodology is a technical assessment, but without guidance set nationally on how to undertake the process
Settlement Hierarchy	10812 Romsey Town Council	Concerns about the methodology used for establishing the settlement hierarchies and the conclusions reached, RTC believes that Wellow and King's Somborne should be Tier 2

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Site selection	10905	Policy SS6 is unsound because it relies on a flawed site selection methodology and is inconsistent with the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy due to removing potentially sustainable sites at stage 4 of the site selection due to NDP designations.
Settlement Hierarchy	10082	The documents states that the rural strategy supports rural settlements but this in only in relation to certain settlements and the strategy still refers to bus services which the plan no longer includes in the assessment.
Rural Facilities Survey	10082	The policy is supported but does not make clear how the housing developments will be assessed
Settlement Hierarchy	11150	The analysis of facilities and services, and Rural Facilities Survey was undertaken in 2021. By the point of adoption of the Local Plan, in 2026 (at the earliest) this will be over 5 years old. As is recognised by the Council, rural services and facilities change with time
Settlement Hierarchy	11150	the approach to growth in rural areas should not rely so rigidly on presence of four key facilities
	11150	Shops can close; as can schools as was seen recently in Hatherden
Settlement Assessment	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	Core facilities have been pared down further from Stage 1, we question whether the limited nature of the four facilities determines the sustainability of a village, whilst we believe that this will result in more equitable development
	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	Including more settlements in Tier 3 more proportionate allocation over the rural area is enabled and ensure that it does not result in overwhelming development in fewer villages. Acknowledge some development to ensure villages remain viable, but believe this should be

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		determined by the community and be proportionate to the existing scale and infrastructure of villages
	11077	Superficial logic, but it carries risk and could potentially be counterproductive. Particularly given that 'key facilities' include primary school, food store, outdoor sports facility and community facilities, but public transport provision has been excluded. Concerns with the way the methodology attributes equal weighting to different facilities, with the judgement on sustainability based on the total number in situ. However, certain facilities and services provide higher levels of reliance for residents to service their daily needs than others. Some weighting system should be applied for it to be a true sustainability metric underlying a settlement hierarchy
	11149	Fully support the methodology to considering the sustainability of villages in terms of the key facilities.
Settlement Boundary	10813	Table 2 identifies areas to be included within a settlement boundary including car parks. It would be helpful to include within the table other examples of what TVBC considers are land uses which have a functional relationship and cross refer to criteria C of Table 3.
	10813	Criteria C refers to including buildings and land within a settlement boundary which has a clear functional relationship with the settlement. It will most likely the case that land would be related to a nearby building or use rather than the settlement as a whole. The criteria should be amended to read 'and have a clear functional relationship with adjoining buildings and land and the settlement will be included within the boundary
	11074	Table 2 in the Draft Settlement Boundary Methodology which sets out the criteria of what should be included and excluded from settlement boundaries is considered to be very limiting. It does not make provision for areas of land which may no longer form part of a farm complex but relate well to the existing settlement boundary and other built form. There

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		appears to be no clear assessment as to why those sites which may have come forward through the 2024 SHEELA have been discounted
	10314	The methodology which has been used relies too heavily on the concept of accessibility and not enough on the social aspect of sustainable development. New housing, in rural villages, supports this social limb of sustainable development – new homes can allow for younger people to move out of home and stay in the village where they have grown up; it can allow adults to move to a village to live near/ care for their ageing parents
	11076	Noted that a criterion for exclusion as listed above is ‘public open space including allotments’, however, this site is privately owned land and is not a public allotment, therefore does not fall into this category. The landowner currently allows the land to be used by local residents, but this is a benefit to a limited number of individuals and not a right. The allotments are not subject to any formal designation and could be closed at any time should the owner wish to do so
Settlement Hierarchy	10080	it is unfortunate that the criterion of proximity to bus services has now been omitted from the review of settlements when it is an important consideration.
	10080	The assessment review still does not take into consideration the suitability of the use of bicycles and accessibility to good cycle routes. This should be included.
Settlement Boundary	11014	The draft LP states: ‘Areas Included/Excluded from SB. Farm complexes have been excluded from the SB which were previously included in the 2016-2029 LP.’
	11150	the methodology should be clearly set out and applied; it is based on the physical character of land, or its functional use?
	11150	The methodology suggests the revised boundary is based on “the factual situation of built development on the ground” but this approach has not been consistently followed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11117	Concerned that the Settlement Boundary Review does not consider or assess potential further allocations coming forward and has therefore pre-judged the areas that are suitable for inclusion in an updated boundary for north Baddesley. The review should consider the revision of the boundary in relation to sites identified as variable Allocations in the SA. Packridge Farm would be a logical extension to the settlement.
Settlement Hierarchy	10082	The settlement hierarchy distinguishes nine settlements as Tier 4 and therefore restricted from housing development, despite recognising the marginal difference between Tier 3 and Tier 4 settlements.
	10817	The Settlement Hierarchy relates to settlements within the Borough. Reflection within the settlement hierarchy should be given to the role of settlements outside of the Borough that will influence the Council's Spatial Strategy.
	10113	Approach does not appear to match the aspirations set out in the Local Plan Objectives, in particular the 'Our Communities' objective which seeks to ensure the vibrancy of rural villages
	10113	Consider it imperative for future planning policies which set parameters about the scale of development according to tiers within a settlement hierarchy to be applied with flexibility which allows for the specific circumstances and opportunities available in each individual settlement to be taken into account
	10364	Review has seen a different approach to the assessment of settlements as made under the original Rural Facilities Survey
	10364	Changes in the provision of bus services have resulted in access to public transport changing. This has impacted on where some settlements now sit in the settlement hierarchy as the level of public transport is now removed from the methodology

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10364	Recognised that sustainable forms of transport are important in a rural area. It is unfortunate that the criterion of proximity to bus services has now been omitted from the review of settlements as it remains an important consideration
	10364	Suggested amendment Noted that the assessment review still does not take into account the suitability of the use of the bicycle. This was raised at the Stage 1 consultation. Why is accessibility to good cycle routes not a key consideration? This should be included
	10778	Settlement Hierarchy assessment notes, which is reflected in the Plan's vision and objectives, that a challenge is retaining local facilities in villages to maintain and potentially improve their sustainability and that "Enabling an appropriate level of growth at our more sustainable rural settlement can help to do this."
	10778	Assessment quantified the number of existing facilities and services, then used a judgement on the role and function of the settlements including the accessibility to these by public transport. Four key facilities were used as the starting point. Those villages that have the four key facilities but not an extensive range of other facilities, such as those in Tier 2, fall into Tier 3.
	10314	The methodology for deciding on the settlement hierarchy is wrong in principle and inconsistently applied
	10314	Settlement hierarchy methodology gives decisive significance to the presence of all four of the relevant facilities – lack of any one is said to be fatal to inclusion of that settlement in Tier 3. This is not an appropriate basis upon which to decide whether a settlement should be

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		allowed to bring forward small scale windfall development (which would be the result of inclusion in Tier 3).
	10314	NPPF requires that all rural areas should have the opportunity to grow and thrive. Lack of a sports field or village hall should not change this. Not all households will require use of a local primary school. The methodology is too rigid at present
	10314	This has been changed, at Stage 2, in two important respects. First, the requirement for good public transport has been dropped, in recognition of the significant uncertainty over the future of rural services in the short term, as well as over the longer plan period to 2040. In Test Valley, a largely rural borough, it is accepted that a number of journeys will need to be via car, cycle or on foot, save for limited journeys on the railway
	10314	A similar conclusion could be reached in respect of commercial facilities (for example, food shops), given that Permitted Development rights (Class MA) allow conversion of these to residential use, without the need to apply for planning permission
	10314	Reducing the key facilities from 6 to 4, the Council has lumped together the 3 previously separate categories of a public house, community/ village hall and place of worship. This means that a settlement which has a public house, a village hall and a place of worship will now only score 1 rather than 3. However, it is obvious that the social function and importance of a village hall, a public house and a place of worship are not at all the same, and the logic of putting them together is faulty. Each of them has independent importance, as the previous consultation recognised
	10314	Alleged purpose of this change of methodology is to avoid a situation in which marginal differences between Tiers 3 and 4 would be eliminated. However, that problem remains with the revised proposal. Under the proposal affecting the 9 settlements, the lack of any one of the four revised key facilities leads to the consequence that the settlement is to have its

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		settlement boundary abolished, and with it with the presumption in favour of development within that boundary
	10314	A thriving settlement which has a primary school, a shop and village hall but no outdoor sports facility will for that reason alone lose its settlement boundary. It is obvious that such a settlement is in principle suitable for development notwithstanding the absence of a sports facility
	10314	Recognised that some settlements can properly be grouped together so that the presence of some facilities in one settlement can be added to other facilities in another settlement so as to create a group which taken together comprises a viable place for further development. But the principle on the basis of which this has been done has not been clearly articulated or consistently applied
	10314	Residents of Michelmersh and Timsbury are within the school catchments of facilities in other nearby villages. Local children travel a short distance to Awbridge, or Braishfield. It is illogical that the assessment methodology allows some settlements to rely on the use of nearby schools in other villages, and so be placed in Tier 3, whilst others are not, and are placed in Tier 4
	10314	Draft Local Plan permits a settlement to be in Tier 3 notwithstanding the absence of one of the four 'key' facilities. 4 villages near Andover lack a primary school, but are included in Tier 3 on the basis that there is a primary school close by, albeit in another village. This shows that the insistence on the presence of all four revised facilities as the criterion for inclusion in Tier 3 is illogical, and recognised as such in placing these four villages, each of which lack a primary school, in Tier 3
	10314	If a village can be in Tier 3 without a primary school where does that leave the principle that all four facilities are required for other villages? What is the basis for allowing this exception in some cases and not others? How close does the school have to be to the village in

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		question to be in Tier 3? None of these questions are addressed and the required logic and consistency which should underlie the formulation of the principles of the settlement hierarchy is lacking
	10314	Proximity to major centres is taken into account in some instances but not in others. An example where this has been taken into account is Chilworth, near Southampton. Chilworth scored low on the presence of the relevant facilities, but has nevertheless been placed in Tier 2, because of its proximity to Southampton. There is no primary school in Chilworth, but the draft Local Plan reaches its conclusion that Chilworth should be in Tier 2 on the basis that there are schools in Southampton
	10314	The data on which the Settlement Hierarchy has been developed dates to 2021. Much has happened in the intervening period, including the pandemic affecting small business, and the Government's relocation of rule for conversion of commercial space to residential use. There is no guarantee that a pub or shop which was open in 2021 is still open now, still less that this will be the case in the 15 year plan period in future
	10314	The methodology, and the four factors relied upon, are not the most appropriate means of directing growth. Other factors, such as being near a major town, or being near a school which is not in the settlement, are obviously relevant as well, and the draft Local Plan recognises this. The problem is that it only recognises this in some instances and not others, and does not explain this inconsistency
	10314	No attempt appears to have been made to judge the suitability of the 9 settlements for inclusion in Tier 3 by taking all relevant factors into account, such as proximity to schools outside the settlement and proximity to major towns
	11076	A large proportion of land is rural compared to other authorities and many villages are likely to offer a lower number of services and facilities by default. Therefore, it should be accepted that for an appropriate distribution of housing to take place in a Borough which is

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		predominantly rural, some people may need to be more reliant on the private vehicle and TVBC should recognise that the only way to make rural public transport more viable is through more people increasing the demand
	11077	New development can support and boost facilities and services in villages, and it is correct to factor them into spatial plan-making. But as acknowledged by TVBC in the Settlement Hierarchy Assessment, any survey of village facilities reflects a single point in time. Inevitably provision will change over the plan period, and changes are likely before the plan is even adopted
	11077	In determining the future role of settlements, there is risk in attaching too much weight to the presence of facilities at a point in time: a facility such as a shop, post office or pub may have closed before the arrival of new residents that might have supported it. Provision is also likely to reflect market conditions i.e., availability for start-ups and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) to acquire investment for leases, etc
	11077	Main concern is that the focus on facilities and services overlooks more important considerations of environmental impacts and deliverability, particularly in the villages of the Borough. Without a more complete analysis of these factors, the settlement hierarchy risks distributing development in inappropriate and potentially harmful ways, contrary to other objectives of the plan
	10114	final column of the uses table - not clear if development types not listed (i.e. retail, community uses, leisure etc) would not be supported and no obvious difference between Tier 1 and 2 uses so the Council may wish to review how this table is presented.
	10799	It is unfortunate that the criterion of proximity to bus services has now been omitted from the review of settlements as it remains an important consideration. It is noted that the assessment review still does not take into account the suitability of the use of the bicycle.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		This was raised at the Stage 1 consultation. Why is accessibility to good cycle routes not a key consideration? This should be included.
	11122	Decision to exclude any allocations outside Tier 1 and 2 settlements has not been justified in the SA or the LP and will mean little housing delivery in rural settlements.
	11150	the methodology fails to recognise that access to local shops can change over time
Site selection	10978	Harewood Farm and Finkley Farm should be allocated over Manor Farm and Land at Bere Hill Farm as they score better in the SA. The site assessment process is flawed and unsound
	10091 (2nd response)	The document that accompanies the SA does not include a summary of the site specific assessments
	10091 (2nd response)	The site promoter disagrees with the scoring used to assess the sites and has reviewed each site individually using a different scoring matrix- the scoring has resulted in a number of sites that have not been allocated scoring more favourably than those that have.
	10091 (2nd response)	The site promoter disagrees with the scoring used to assess the sites and has expressed that the SA provides evidence that more sustainable sites have been passed over in favour of less sustainable ones.
	10091 (2nd response)	The site promoter disagrees with the scoring used to assess the sites and has reviewed each site individually using a different scoring matrix- and SHELAA site 231 has scored best jointly with the allocated Bere Hill but with a potential to deliver 2500 houses.
	10091 (2nd response)	The site promoter disagrees with the scoring used to assess the sites and has reviewed each site individually using a different scoring matrix- and SHELAA site 305 (Land North of Finkley Fram) has scored more favourably than allocated sites.
	10091 (2nd response)	The site promoter disagrees with the scoring used to assess the sites and has reviewed each site individually using a different scoring matrix- and has concluded that the allocation of

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		SHELAA site 173, Land at Manor Farm is unsound and unsupported by the evidence base and other sites including the Trinley estates Land score more favourably.
	10091 (2nd response)	The draft plan is unsound, flawed and the evidence is incomplete-particularly the Sustainability Assessment and it includes allocations that are not based on correct evidence.
Settlement Hierarchy	10082	The consequence of this statement is that settlements without key facilities will not receive the same level of support as those that do.
	11149	We support the Local Plan 2020 to 2040 methodology of identifying sustainable locations, taking into regard key services and updating the Hierarchy Tier system from the 2016 version.
Spatial Strategy	10661	The process of site selection on which Policy SS6 is based is unclear and lacks justification. It does not form a sound basis for the justification of the proposed allocations. The methodology is unclear and should be reviewed.
Settlement Boundary	10106 Michelmersh & Timsbury Parish Council	Current situation with a settlement boundary leads to large houses built on divided garden plots with adverse effects on character. There is no incentive for developers to construct smaller low cost housing appropriate to local needs
Rural Strategy	10020	Test Valley needs to build a lot more rural homes for example in Michelmersh and Timsbury.
Settlement Boundary	10314	Para 3.41 proposes to remove the boundary from Michelmersh and treat it as open countryside goes against this principle. Communities and landowners in Michelmersh have clarity as to the type of development which will be accepted in the village envelope. Within the settlement boundary, the principle of development is acceptable; outside the boundary, it is not, save for the limited circumstances set out in policy

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10106 Michelmersh & Timsbury Parish Council	Our settlement being in Tier 4 would not have a settlement boundary and policies relating to development in the countryside would apply. Noted the inset maps do include settlement boundaries presumably retained for completeness in the event policies are revised and boundaries remain defined
	10106 Michelmersh & Timsbury Parish Council	Note it is proposed to revise settlement boundaries with changes explained in Settlement Boundary Assessments. Not clear whether is it intended to modify the current plan to incorporate the changes or whether they would only apply to the 2040 plan
	10314	A key issue of concern is the approach to the settlement hierarchy, and the proposal to remove the settlement boundary from 9 settlements, including Michelmersh and Timsbury. The Council proposes that Michelmersh be in Tier 4, and so treated as open countryside, where no windfall development is allowed. This conclusion has been reached on the basis that it does not satisfy all four of the revised criteria for inclusion in Tier 3
	10314	This represents a significant change in the policy position for landowners in these rural settlements. The manner in which this significant proposed change has been communicated, is flawed. The proposed policy map continues to show a settlement boundary at Michelmersh. Yet the text of the draft Local Plan itself says that it is proposed to remove the boundary
	10314	Suggested that the plan identifies 'a potential settlement boundary' following the revised methodology so as to invite comment on this. The council is not proposing a settlement boundary at Michelmersh; so the proposed policy map should accord with the text of the draft Local Plan. This approach to the consultation is clearly flawed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10314	Small scale limited growth in a village such as Michelmersh would not result in isolated homes in the countryside, and would be consistent with the NPPF's aim to deliver sustainable development and significantly boost housing numbers
Settlement Hierarchy	10106 Michelmersh & Timsbury Parish Council	Consider the criteria and rating method adopted in determining the hierarchy designation for rural settlements well-reasoned and logical. Welcome Michelmersh and Timsbury being included in Tier 4 and the settlement boundary removed
	10314	Combined villages of Michelmersh and Timsbury have sufficient facilities and are sufficiently close to the major centre of Romsey for them to be treated in principle as suitable places for further development, provided that such development takes place within the appropriate envelope of the existing settlement. They should be included in a higher tier of the Settlement Hierarchy (Tier 3), where windfall development is allowed
	10314	In the case of Michelmersh and Timsbury, there is a village hall, 2 pubs and 2 churches, but this still only leads under the new system to a single "community facility" being present, because of this lumping together
	10314	This is particularly relevant to Michelmersh and Timsbury. The combined settlement is very close to Romsey, which is a major, thriving centre. Why should Chilworth get into Tier 2 because it is close to Southampton but Michelmersh and Timsbury languish in Tier 4 notwithstanding that they are close to Romsey? There is an obvious lack of logic and consistency in the approach taken
	10314	Michelmersh and Timsbury is truly to be regarded as a satellite settlement of Romsey. Whilst there is no shop in Michelmersh and Timsbury itself, ample shops are a very short distance away and there are primary schools in Braishfield and Awbridge, as well as Romsey itself

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	10314	Our client's land should be included in the settlement boundary for Michelmersh. That land is in use as residential garden and has been for some 35+ years. Other residential gardens are included in the boundary, and so too should this parcel of land
	10314	Settlement Boundary review sets out a review of the Michelmersh boundary but makes no reference at all to the submissions we made at Regulation 18(Stage 1) regarding the inclusion of this site in the settlement boundary
	10314	Exclusion of this land from the current settlement boundary is a historical anomaly based on a configuration of the land which ceased to exist 36 years ago. It is functionally linked to the settlement, not the countryside; it is a residential garden and so its character is more closely linked to the settlement than to the countryside
	10314	Applying the Council's methodology, it should be included in the settlement boundary. Sites such as this, located in the centre of a rural village, provide opportunities for small scale growth and development which allow the settlement to grow and thrive in an appropriate manner
HMA	10033	Inclusion of Michelmersh and Timsbury in the proposed Southern Test Valley Housing Market Area is supported.
	10033	Michelmersh and Timsbury are located close to Romsey (Tier 1 settlement) with access to a wide range of facilities and services. There are strong linkages with Romsey including education (Romsey School), health facilities (GP surgeries and Romsey hospital), employment and leisure facilities.
Housing Requirement	10776	11,000 homes is indicated as a minimum number of homes to be delivered over the plan period, supportive of this minimum figure and encourage the council to be ambitious to allocate a sufficient number and variety of sites to ensure that the Local Plan seek to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10776	As per NPPF para 61, the outcome of the standard method is an advisory starting-point for establishing a housing requirement, further, as per PPG the standard method for calculating local housing need provides a minimum number of homes to be planned for
	10776	Authorities should use the standard method as the starting point when preparing the housing requirement in their plan unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach. We do not believe that there are any exceptional circumstances which would justify an alternative approach in Test Valley
	10814	Is not considered that the draft Plan sufficiently recognises the important contribution that this sustainable site could make to the housing land supply. In order to improve the soundness of the draft Plan it is considered that the site should be allocated for 'minimum of 170 dwellings' to reflect the 'minimum' wording in the Borough's housing requirement at draft Policy SS3, the NPPF and to reflect the capacity set out in the SHELAA
	11077	The Council are aware that this figure is a minimum requirement and that they must consider whether there are any circumstances which would indicate housing needs are likely to exceed past trends. The SHMA (2022) sets out that at the time of writing there were 3,167 households in TVBC living in unsuitable housing. The SHMA notes that the greatest demand in Test Valley is for 3-bedroom market dwellings (40%) and 2-bedroom affordable homes (40%)
	11146	550 homes per year is a minimum figure and there is the ability for the Council to deliver above this requirement if the right sustainable sites comes forward. The intensification of development at Ganger Farm would help meet this requirement.
NDP Housing Requirements	10778	Inclusion of the word "minimum" housing requirements in Policy SS5 is supported and is important to be retained. This will ensure a deliverable supply of houses and allow suitable and sustainable sites to come forward where appropriate. It is important for this to be enshrined in policy to avoid any housing requirement figures becoming a 'ceiling' figure

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Small sites	10729	NPPF requires at least 10% of housing requirement to be identified on sites of no more than 1 hectare. Local plan relies on windfall sites to deliver this provision. This is not intention of NPPF and unlikely to deliver number of homes required under NPPF
Housing Requirement	11152	NPPF states that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and requires that development plans identify land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare
	10939	<p>Policy SS6 shows a huge disproportion of new home allocation for the rest of Test Valley compared to Valley Park, Bere Hill and Ludgershall.</p> <p>Balance and of additional expansion of all areas would be a sensible and fairer approach based on the current residents of the area.</p>
	11122	Delivery of housing requirement relies on a small number of large sites which is not consistent with the advice in NPPF (2023) paragraph 70 in terms of providing a range and choice of sites. In particular, the need to provide at least 10% of housing requirement on sites that are no larger than 1Ha.
	10816	There is a significant deficiency in Policy SS1 because of the lack of consideration/reference to justify why there is no mix of sites suitable for residential development and in sustainable locations that could better help meet the Boroughs housing land supply requirement in the early years of the plan period & without the risk of delayed delivery on large sites.
	10816	The lack of mix of sites is a significant omission and the whole spatial strategy for Southern Test Valley has not been appropriately justified.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10776	By allocating a range of sites, the Council will be able to maintain a stable housing land supply enabling the delivery of homes throughout the plan period to meet the identified local requirements and to ensure Test Valley is not vulnerable to speculative development
	11074	Pertinent to note that in order to have a robust five-year housing land supply, in addition to focusing growth within or adjacent to the principal settlements of the Borough, the Council should look to all tier settlements in the hierarchy to deliver homes through a range of small, medium, and strategic sites
	10342	SS6 identifies the proposed sites in the Southern Housing Market Area(SHMA). There is a lack of a mix of sites, particularly small sites. In the local plan the proposed supply of housing is predominantly to be delivered by large sites eg Hoe Lane 300, Whitenap 1300 and two of the five proposed allocations are for 340 and 1070 dwellings respectively
	10342	Large sites will have a longer lead-in time to commencement of development, particularly where there are major infrastructure issues to be addressed, which can have a significant impact on the delivery of a continuous five-year supply of housing land. The inclusion of smaller sites can help with the delivery of the local plan requirement particularly in the early years of the plan period
	11096	Council should identify more sites in the most sustainable settlements to ensure the consistent delivery of homes in the short, medium, and longer term, preventing the Council from being overly reliant on a small number of strategic sites. Adopting an approach that included more site allocations would seek to de-risk housing delivery within Test Valley, even if one or two of the site allocations stalled with delivery
	10814	Paragraph 69 of the NPPF requires the Council to identify through its strategic planning policies a sufficient supply and mix of housing sites, this is a significant omission and consequently this policy and the whole spatial strategy for Southern Test Valley has not been

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		appropriately justified. The draft Plan is therefore inconsistent with the tests set out at Paragraph 35 of the NPPF and at risk of being found unsound
	10814	Considered that an alternative strategy to allocate smaller housing sites to bolster and help maintain a supply of deliverable housing sites, especially in the shorter term would be more sustainable strategy and improve consistency with the NPPF
Housing Trajectory	11096	When a limited number of sites are identified any delays can have a significant impact on meeting housing delivery targets, increasing the likelihood of Test Valley's housing needs not being met. Suggest allocating additional sites of varying size, would help the Council achieve the aim of a sound and positively prepared Local Plan.
	11096	Council are only proposing four new residential site allocations, plus a commercial site allocation which features a small provision of residential accommodation. Disagree with this approach, as the Council should be identifying a variety of site allocations within the most sustainable settlements to ensure that the delivery of new homes, particularly from 2026/27 is not solely dependent on a small number of sites within the Borough
Housing Requirement	10776	Considered the Council should also look to small and medium sized sites to assist delivery of shortfall of homes which may be generated through BNG requirement. Sites such as Lakelands are a suitable size to assist in providing short to medium term housing supply
NDP Housing Requirements	11108	<p>Rural sites that benefit from key services and connectivity to tier 1 settlements should be allocated through consultation with local communities to ensure that they are deliverable and that the plan is effective and justified in accordance with p23 and 69 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Propose allocations in the rural areas to ensure the LP is sound.</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Rural housing requirement	10818	Only one made Neighbourhood Plan in the south has allocated housing and it is difficult to see how the 282 home requirement can be effectively met in the southern HMA without small scale housing allocations in key villages. This should be addressed through allocations for new housing in small and medium sized villages.
	10812 Romsey Town Council	Rather than relying on NDPS to deliver rural housing, there should be a positive policy of allocation to the rural area. Would make a positive contribution to maintain/recover vitality of villages, and make housing allocation fairer. RTC object to the policy for housing allocation
	10124 Andover Town Council	Whilst 30% of the TVBC population lived in villages outside the main towns, they would be expected to provide only 5% of the housing allocation
	10124 Andover Town Council	This would lead to increasing gentrification of villages, preventing downsizing for their inhabitants, and their loss of viability would increase the strain on the services provided in the towns
	10124 Andover Town Council	Test Valley instead of being a set of viable communities would increasingly be two urban clusters around Andover and Romsey
	10314	Draft Local Plan proposes that 5% of the housing requirement will come forward in rural locations (Policy SS4 sets a requirement for 542 dwellings), yet a significant area of the

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		borough is in fact rural. Rural areas are the least affordable, and the NPPF is clear that planning policies should identify opportunities for rural villages to grow and thrive. The spatial strategy, at present, does not go far enough to allow some limited growth in the rural settlements to ensure their sustainable growth and ongoing support and demand for rural facilities, such as schools and local shops
	10314	Council should make appropriate provision now, in the draft Local Plan, for the rural housing which is needed over the plan period. 90% of the supply of rural housing (against the rural housing requirement) is proposed to come from housing completions and commitments yet these have not been shown to be “deliverable” within the NPPF definition
	11150	The strategy should be amended to ensure delivery of rural housing, to address affordability issues and allow rural villages to grow and thrive as is required by the NPPF
	11150	The Council should proactively allocate sites in rural communities, or ensure that amended settlement boundaries make provision for some limited growth within rural settlements
Spatial Strategy	10813	Paragraph 3.53 of the local plan identifies the need for a sufficient supply and mix of sites. Spatial Strategy Policy6 (SS6) Meeting the Housing Requirement identifies the proposed sites in the Southern Housing Market Area (SHMA). There is a lack of a mix of sites, particularly small sites
Rural housing requirement	10120	The Local Plan is able to, and should be, directing the required and suitable levels of growth to settlements such as Wellow to ensure their continued vitality and viability.
Unmet Need	11096	Within the Sustainability Appraisal a total of four growth strategies were proposed in total. Each growth scenario proposed relatively modest variations in total number of homes above Local Housing Need levels none of which tested variable site options directly adjacent to Southampton e.g. Nursling and Rownhams

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Rural housing requirement	10201	Whilst helpful to set out specific requirement for rural areas of the Borough, not clear in policy how this will be used and impact on the Council's decision making
	10201	Supporting text para.3.79 sets out device for monitoring delivery of rural housing which will trigger review if insufficient homes provided in rural area, and if so review options to bring forward more homes. To be effective policy outcome of if insufficient delivery should be set out in the policy itself which without it lacks clarity and is ineffective Include device for monitoring delivery under para.3.79 within policy the
Housing Requirement	11095	The Local Plan should allocate a great number of sites and in a variety of locations to provide choice and competition in and around the most sustainable settlements, including Nursling and Rownhams, where not many new homes are proposed.
Housing distribution	10047 Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Strongly recommend that the Council prepare and use the Nature Recovery Network to identify the best sites for development and those areas where development should be avoided.
Rural housing requirement	10364	Noted in paragraph 3.73 that there are no development allocations to meet local needs in the Tier 3 villages. It is presumed that the Neighbourhood Plans will provide for new development
Housing Requirement	10812 Romsey Town Council	HMA's and their housing requirements are accepted. Policy will need to be amended to show that all settlements in Tier 3 should have a NDP which seeks to allocate housing unless constraints prevent it

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10033	It is of interest to note that meeting the housing needs of a community is not included in the methodology outlined at paragraph 3.89. Meeting housing needs can be a key reason for preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.
NDP Housing Requirements	11074	It appears that the policy merits and wording of SS5 does not take into account those areas which may have a 'designated neighbourhood area' but are at the early stages of preparing a NDP, such as Broughton. It should therefore be easier to facilitate all types of new housing development in such neighbourhoods, where the need and shortfall of rural housing has clearly already been identified
	10768	Policy SS5 defines housing requirements, for designated neighbourhood areas, is supported in principle. However, the policy as worded does not align with NPPF para 66 which requires strategic policies to set a minimum housing requirement for all designated neighbourhood areas and be determined by the need for housing in the plan period
	10768	Not clear why Policy SS5 and the methodology identifies housing requirements for 'active' designated areas only. The policy should be amended to include, as a minimum, the housing requirements for all designated neighbourhood areas in the Borough
	10768	LP recognises that there are a 'few active designated areas where no housing requirement is proposed reflecting the outcomes of the assessment and the scale and constraints that exist at these areas.' These outcomes were not derived from strategic policy reflecting the needs to 2040. Where housing requirements are zero, this should be stated within the strategic policy text. Where this is not done, the PPG confirms the housing figure will need to be tested at the neighbourhood plan examination
	10768	SS5 must be more proactive in encouraging the uptake of neighbourhood planning by setting out housing requirements for all rural area settlements for the plan-period

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10768	Given the process of preparing a neighbourhood plan which allocates housing takes between 2 and 3 years, the Local Plan should consider timescales for neighbourhood plans should be made to ensure housing needs are met/exceeded, before the Council will take action
	10768	Encouragement should be given within the policy text to neighbourhood areas exceeding the requirement, where there are opportunities to do so, in line with the Governments objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes
	10768	Plan should also recognise that there may be new or additional evidence that comes forward during the course of the plan which would lead to an alternative housing number being required for a neighbourhood area and the Plan should make allowance for this
	10768	Correct to propose a policy defining a housing requirement figure for neighbourhood areas. To accord with NPPF 67 each requirement must reflect the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocation
	10768	Housing requirement for the designated neighbourhood areas must start with an unconstrained assessment of need alongside any adjustments to reflect the characteristics.
	10768	The failure to set a housing requirement in Policy SS5 for the plan-period is flawed, as it is not proactive in ensuring the rural housing requirement is delivered within the Plan period
	10768	Council should be incentivising communities to deliver unmet need. Other demographic or facility factors may relate to other designated neighbourhood areas
Rural housing requirement	10768	Important there is a mechanism to incentivise communities to prepare and update neighbourhood plans and ensure there is clear security that the rural housing requirement in SS4 can be included as a robust source within the Council's housing supply moving forward
Housing Requirement	10768	The unconstrained housing requirement for the Goodworth Clatford Designated Neighbourhood Area is likely to be a minimum of 40 new homes to meet the local affordable housing needs

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Rural Strategy	11147	generally supportive towards allowing development to come forward outside of defined settlement boundaries as identified in Neighbourhood Plans or for community led development
Rural housing requirement	10778	The absence of a site allocated through a Neighbourhood Plan should not prevent a site coming forward if it would result in sustainable rural growth, as this would conflict with the aspirations of the Plan
Housing Requirement	10074 Upper Clatford Parish Council	We note the housing requirement for Upper Clatford will be made following the NDP review due May 2026 and be derived using the Methodology at para 3.89. Local Plan does not explain how housing requirements will be provided to Parishes which do not have an approved NDP or intend to have an NDP. Recommend that this is addressed to ensure NDPs do not become the sole mechanism for allocating housing in Tier 3 settlements
	10074 Upper Clatford Parish Council	Note that having been grouped with Goodworth Clatford the housing requirement for the two parishes will be set individually and recommended that the shared amenity of the primary school represents a capacity limitation which should be factored into future housing requirements
	10320	<p>The methodology used to arrive at the given minimum housing requirement for Grateley does not account for the sustainability benefits of the railway station, and should be given more than the 10 housing units which has been given to Amport, Longstock and Nether Wallop, all without the transport links possessed by Grateley.</p> <p>Revisit the role and function of Grateley and its mainline train station in determining its appropriate minimum housing requirement.</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10384	Housing requirement for rural areas should be 20 homes minimum to address shortfall in the rural areas
	10384	SS5 does not take into account areas that are designated, or have a made plan, but do not have any housing allocations. NDP areas which have not allocated housing should consider ways to deliver smaller and more affordable units
	10119	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan Housing Requirement number for Southern Test Valley is 70 homes. There is a note to say that 18 homes have been permitted (Kings Somborne NP). It is not clear whether this has been double counted within the existing commitment figure. This should be checked and clarified to ensure accuracy.</p> <p>Clarify status of 18 homes approved against Kings Somborne Neighbourhood Plan to ensure not double counted as an existing housing commitment.</p>
	10119	<p>The policy text states that the Northern and Southern Test Valley minimum housing requirement is being met through housing completions, commitments, strategic allocations and the rural housing requirement. For clarity, it should be amended to confirm that it is also being met through neighbourhood plan requirements.</p> <p>Amend policy text to confirm the housing requirement is also being met through Neighbourhood Plan Housing requirements</p>
NDP Housing Requirements	10139	Allocating a housing figure for NDP's appears contrary to empowering local communities in the Spatial Strategy

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10812 Romsey Town Council	While requirement for housing allocations in designated areas is welcome the scheme is flawed in as much as settlements that do not have a designated area or choose not to produce NDPs have no specific minimum housing requirement
	10832	It is not clear whether all other Tier 3 settlements will have the arbitrary 10 dwellings requirement
	10832	Awbridge has seen a huge increase in dwellings, it should only take extra dwellings if they truly meet local needs such as small dwellings on small scale developments
	10106 Michelmersh & Timsbury Parish Council	Policy indicates that a housing allocation would be given to rural settlements on the designation of a neighbourhood area. For the Borough to seek to impose a housing requirement at a NDP designation stage or on review of a made plan appears perverse and at odds with the principles of local involvement
	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	The total of 70 houses, as a minimum requirement in Neighbourhood Plans, is in addition to the 282 houses in rural villages? So why is the 282 figure having to be exceeded to 382?
	10364	Neighbourhood Plans may be favoured as they pass control to local people it is often the case that such plans fail to reach the wider community and are steered by a few interested and articulate individuals. The policies are at times weak and conflicted having not been

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		subject to the more rigorous scrutiny of a team of professional planners as in the case of the Local Plan
	10364	The Plan has indicated at Policy SS5 and paragraph 3.91 that Neighbourhood Plans will be required to provide a minimum of 10 new homes over the Plan period
	10364	Not all settlements will want to provide a Neighbourhood Plan so these settlements will not be required to make housing provision
	10364	Paragraph 3.91 suggests that the requirement in Neighbourhood Plans for the provision of a minimum of 10 new dwellings over the Plan period will ensure that affordable housing can be provided in these rural areas. These numbers are so low that the contribution to affordable housing is likely to be minimal
	10364	If these housing numbers come forward over just a few small sites, which tends to be favoured in villages, then the requirement could fall below the affordable housing thresholds set out in Policy HOU1
	10082	It is evident that the formula for housing provision is not made in the plan but determined independently, it is unclear how this fits with the overall housing strategy
	11108	It is not appropriate to rely upon the delivery of housing in the rural area that have not been specifically identified in the LP.
	11108	It is disappointing that TVBC has not ascribed to a minimum housing requirement to each Parish, instead electing to provide a minimum housing requirement only when a Neighbourhood Plan area is designated or reviewed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Look at needs of rural areas in more detail and make allocations in/adjoining tier 3 settlements to ensure that the LP is sound and that the aim of enabling rural communities to thrive is realised.
Rural Strategy	10799	the requirement in Neighbourhood Plans for the provision of a minimum of 10 new dwellings over the Plan period will ensure that affordable housing can be provided in these rural areas. These numbers are so low that the contribution to affordable housing is likely to be minimal. Furthermore, if these housing numbers come forward over just a few small sites, which tends to be favoured in villages, then the requirement could fall below the affordable housing thresholds set out in Policy HOU1
Spatial Strategy	10080	This paragraph indicates that development in smaller communities will be reliant on Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements-this is not satisfactory
	10364	At paragraph 3.16 it is indicated that for development within smaller communities reliance will be upon Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements. This is less than satisfactory
	11077	By not allocating sites in the LP within the most sustainable rural settlements, and relying on Neighbourhood Plans to deliver minimal growth (in most cases with a requirement of 10 units), this will not benefit these rural settlements in the long-term
NDP Housing Requirements	11041	On the proviso that the allocation of 10 additional houses/dwellings is on a fair share basis across all parishes Awbridge would be aligned and accepting of this allocation till the end of 2040
	11041	We would not be accepting of any number above this given the size of our village it simply would not be feasible
	10364	Braishfield is currently preparing a Neighbourhood Plan which is in the early stages of preparation. This Neighbourhood Plan will need to provide a minimum of 10 new dwellings.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		The Local Plan omits to make reference to the Braishfield NP as it was in the early stages of preparation at the time of drafting the Local Plan
	10320	<p>Uncertain as to the use of Policy SS5 to delegate responsibility for allocating housing sites to neighbourhood plans, due to their uncertain nature and the lack of engagement from neighbourhood plan steering groups.</p> <p>Reconsider the appropriateness of delegating responsibility for allocating housing in Grateley to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Spatial Strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The fact sustainable opportunities including potential new settlement sites may exist in sustainable and unconstrained locations that do not adjoin the largest settlements is not properly recognised. The plan risks failing to robustly test other reasonable alternatives that would produce a strategy that satisfies both the NPPF and PfSH SPS.
Omission site	10776	Land at Lakelands is a small site which would provide an immediate, important contribution to Test Valley Borough's housing need over the plan period
	10776	Site is located to the west of Newtown Road in the settlement of Newtown. Newtown is located approximately 6km to the north west of Romsey, one of the two main settlements within the Borough
	10776	Site comprises an area of land currently containing 2 lakes, 2 buildings and a converted shipping container, remainder of the site is maintained grassland

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10776	Site has not been previously promoted to the council; however, the site is available, suitable, achievable and deliverable and would help to meet Test Valley's housing need in a sustainable way whilst also providing benefits to the local community
	10776	With the nature of the site being partially brownfield, it is considered that such a site should be prioritised for development in accordance with the Government's 'brownfield first' approach to new development
	10776	Without allocation the site could be developed for affordable housing, however we believe that the site provides a great opportunity to contribute to Test Valley's Housing Land Supply for a mix of housing types and tenures and therefore believe it should be allocated through the Local Plan for both market and affordable housing
	10776	The site, land at Lakelands, is located to the north of Newtown which is a settlement located to the north west of Romsey. The site is located within the countryside as the settlement of Newtown does not have a settlement boundary
	10776	Site access directly from Newtown Road to the east. To the south are dwelling and further to the north beyond a paddock is more residential development which runs along Newtown Road. To the east and west of the site are areas of grassland and woodland
	10776	No known environmental, heritage or landscape designations that apply to the site itself. The site is located within flood zone 1 as confirmed by the EA which means there is a very low risk of flooding from both rivers and the sea
	10776	Site is unconstrained and there would be no constraints which would prevent it from being developed for new homes
	10776	Capacity to accommodate circa 2-3 homes at a density appropriate to the existing built form and the surrounding area whilst retaining and enhancing the lakes on site. It is considered that the site could provide the mandatory 10%, or more, BNG on site

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10776	Opportunity for a partially brownfield site in a sustainable countryside location to be developed to deliver much needed high-quality homes for people
	10776	Would constitute a logical, sustainable and proportionate extension to Newtown and is available now; is in single ownership and therefore no constraints regarding land ownership. The site provides a great opportunity for proportionate growth to a village
	10776	In a suitable and sustainable location for future residential development and it is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years following the sites allocation
	10776	Acknowledged that the site may not be large enough for allocation in the Local Plan, however it should be considered for allocation at local level through a Neighbourhood Plan
Housing Requirement	11161	Flawed/overestimation of anticipated supply as sites have been included in table 3.3 that are not deliverable and where there is not clear evidence of delivery within 5 years. No evidence is presented by the Council. This does not accord with NPPF(page 69).
	11161	All five allocations in Northern Test Valley are not deliverable and should not be included within the 5 year HLS. The two allocations east of Ludgershall are particularly concerning.
Settlement Boundary	10080	Not all settlements will want to provide a neighbourhood Plan thus there will be no requirement to provide housing in these settlements
	10080	Object to the reliance on neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements for housing allocations.
	10080	There are no proposals to prepare a neighbourhood plan in Lockerley, therefore the village will be unable to allocate land for housing

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Affordable housing	11095	Unsatisfactory that neither the SHMA or evidence provides a clear target for affordable housing. Simply relying on what can viably be delivered through the 550 dpa target is not a positive approach. NPPF para 63 expects needs for different housing groups to be identified.
Settlement Hierarchy	10342	The proposed settlement hierarchy is the cornerstone of TVBC's approach to delivering its spatial strategy and sustainable development. North Baddesley is placed in Tier 2 where the scale of development is acceptable in principle and includes strategic housing allocations. That approach is supported
	11144	North Baddesley is a highly sustainable settlement that should at the very least be taking a modest level of new housing to support its existing services and facilities
	11117	Support inclusion of North Baddesley in Tier 2 and note it is one of the higher ranking Tier 2 settlements in the borough
Omission site	10342	The land at Roundabouts Copse has considerable merit in being allocated for development capable of providing a small deliverable housing site at a Tier 2 settlement. The Plan should be amended to include land at Roundabouts Copse, North Baddesley, for housing
Rural housing requirement	10119	The rural requirement accounts for a supply of 542 dwellings, or 5% of supply, which is not allocated or identified in the plan, and is therefore currently undeliverable.
Settlement Hierarchy	10101	Take account of NPPF para.83
Spatial Strategy	10803	object to the overall spatial strategy for the delivery of housing in northern Test Valley
Housing Requirement	10832	Why is TVBC proposing to increase building beyond what is required? Southern Test Valley has increased over the last 20 years leading to huge issues for services

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10812 Romsey Town Council	Allocations exceed the minimum, for STV and initial requirement of 1562 against an allocation of 1644 after inclusion of rural and windfall forecasts, an oversupply of 757
Settlement Hierarchy	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	There are no secondary schools in the parish and our young people therefore travel to Romsey or Southampton for secondary education. There are two primary schools but both are over-subscribed and cannot accommodate many existing children within catchment and therefore children have to travel to Romsey for education
	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	There are no health centres, no GP surgeries and no dental practices located in the parish. Parish residents rely on having to travel to either Southampton or Romsey for health services, the health centre and dental practice in Lordshill are both full and not accepting new patients
	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	In 2018 the parish had an overall deficit in open space of 6.68ha with actual open space totalling 8.76ha against a requirement of 15.44ha. Since 2018 the parish has grown to 6113 from a population estimated at 5147, therefore the shortfall in open space has increased significantly
	10083	There are no railway stations in the parish and the nearest are in Romsey and Southampton. There is only 1 regular bus service that caters for the parish.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	
	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	There is only a single convenience store to serve an existing population of over 6000 residents. There are no superstores within the parish but there are 2 superstores in adjacent Southampton but both are more than a 20 minute walk for many residents
	11095	Inclusion of Nursling and Rownhams in Tier 2 is not an accurate reflection of its sustainability given its proximity to Southampton and the options and frequency of sustainable travel links to Southampton
	11095	Nursling and Rownhams should be in Tier 1 given range of services and facilities including those in Southampton given proximity.
Settlement Assessment	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	2021 census data shows the parish had a population of 6113 and a mean density of 5.22/ha, between 1951 and 1971 there were less than 700 residents so in the last 50 years the population has grown by 873%
Settlement Assessment	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	At the previous 2011 census the parish had a population of 5137 and a mean density of 4.4/ha, there has therefore been a 19% increase in population between the two census periods, the population was predicted to increase to 6950 by 2027 an increase of 14%

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Assessment	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	In addition to the growth in homes the parish has experienced major commercial and employment growth at Nursling Estate and Adanac Park and the Aldi distribution centre off Brownhill Way
Settlement Assessment	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	All this growth has occurred in a parish that covers just 1.86% of the total land area of the borough and led to one of the highest population densities in the borough at 5.22/ha compared to the borough average of 2.1/ha
Settlement Boundary	10813	The methodology comprises a number of steps. First a decision is made as to which settlements would have a defined boundary, these would be all those in proposed Tiers 1-3. Nursling and Rownhams is a Tier 2 settlement in the proposed local plan settlement hierarchy. That approach is supported. The approach set out in Table 3 to amend boundaries in response to changes on the ground i.e.; issue of planning permissions is supported
Settlement Boundary	10813	The use of the land clearly has functional relationship with the PH and is of a relatively small scale when compared with the size of the settlement. It meets the guidance in Table 2 and Criteria C) of Table 3 of the methodology and justifies inclusion with the settlement boundary
Settlement Boundary	10813	The settlement boundary should the subject of a further revision to include the remaining land
Settlement Hierarchy	10083	Further growth is being proposed because Nursling and Rownhams is regarded as a Tier 2 settlement with key services and facilities, however the reality is quite different

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	
Settlement Hierarchy	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	Despite being classified as a Tier 2 settlement the parish and its residents are seriously underserved in terms of facilities and services that a community needs and relies on the proximity of Southampton City facilities which are oversubscribed
Settlement Hierarchy	11096	Underlying principles of the Settlement Hierarchy are generally supported but it is our view that the inclusion of Nursling and Rownhams in Tier 2 is not a proper reflection of its sustainability given its proximity and range and frequency of travel links to Southampton and the services and amenities it provides at a city scale
Settlement Hierarchy	11096	Given the range of services and facilities within Nursling and Rownhams (and those within Southampton), Nursling and Rownhams should be more reasonably described as the same as the Tier 1 settlements of Andover and Romsey and most certainly, greater than the status of other Tier 2 settlements that are significantly less well served
Settlement Hierarchy	11096	Settlement Hierarchy should be revised, either to include Nursling and Rownhams as a Tier 1 settlement based on the criteria set out within the Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper, or to include an additional tier of settlement that reflects the greater levels of sustainability and accessibility available at settlements such as Nursling and Rownhams that benefit from the services of adjacent major settlements

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10094	Nearby facilities in adj. settlement of Lordshill have not been taken into account in the assessment of Nursling & Rownhams, although they are within walking/cycling distance. If they were, this would elevate Nursling & Rownhams above many other tier 2 settlements.
Settlement Hierarchy	10094	The emerging Plan must recognise the greater sustainable merits of Nursling & Rownhams and upgrade it to have its own position as a new tier between Tier 1 and Tier 2.
Omission site	10813	The land north of Nursling Street is a small site (1Ha) which could deliver 30 dwellings in a relatively short period and in the early years of the new local plan. It is the sort of site that the NPPF paragraph 70 is encouraging local planning authorities to promote through their development plans
Omission site	10813	The site is well related to the existing settlement of Nursling and Rownhams and has good access to a range of services and facilities. It would have negligible impact on the wider landscape of the area, with the M27 and M271 motorways on the northern and eastern boundaries, the strategic employment site of Adanac to the south and the existing development of Nursling to the east
Omission site	11096	Fields Farm Site is situated within an extremely sustainable location, Nursling and Rownhams is identified as a Tier 2 settlement with good accessibility to all key facilities and services, in addition to excellent public transport links to Romsey and Southampton
Omission site	11096	Sustainability Appraisal has assessed the Fields Farm Site incorrectly, essentially scoring it lower and concluding that other sites are considered more suitable and subsequently identified for development instead
Omission site	11096	When the Fields Farm Site has been accurately compared to other site allocations the Fields Farm Site should be identified as a housing allocation, to meet the local housing needs.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Omission site	11096	Inclusion of the Site would add to the variety of new sites coming forward, sharing the distribution of new homes across multiple sites, reducing the Council's reliance on large strategic sites to deliver most new homes.
Omission site	11096	It is considered that the Fields Farm Site should have been allocated for residential development given the sustainable location and the high-quality design and landscape led scheme that can be delivered on the Site that respects the ecological features. Additionally, the Site context has changed due to the Broadleaf Park development to the north of the Site
Omission site	10182	The site is suitably located to provide a sustainable development which would significantly contribute to the employment and housing need of STV. The site can help to achieve the Council's aspirations by delivering a highly sustainable employment-led mixed-use development. The site is located within walking and cycling distance of a range of facilities, services and amenities. The site is in line with the transport and movement priorities set out in the LP40 by reducing the need for travel by private car and encouraging active and sustainable travel. There are opportunities for habitat creation and enhancements. There are no 'showstopper' constraints. The site could commence in the next 5 yrs.
Omission site	10182	The site is very close to the LCWIP and improvements to those routes would be of great benefit to the Upton Lane mixed-use allocation.
Omission site	10094	The site is in a sustainable location, close to major employment opportunities, and walking or cycling distance to local services / facilities. It is well contained in the landscape and ecological impacts can be avoided or mitigated. The site is available now.
Spatial Strategy		More growth should be accommodated adj. to Nursling and Rownhams, in recognition of its sustainability and accessibility. It should be considered ahead of Chilworth, North Baddesley and Stockbridge.
Housing Requirement	10803	objection to policy

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial Strategy	10803	to help improve the soundness of the draft plan, in particular through boosting the supply of housing both in terms of numbers and phasing to address current deficiencies in the draft plan we strongly encourage the Council to review the spatial strategy and site selection process
Spatial Strategy	11148	the Spatial Strategy for Test Valley is flawed in that it fails to recognise the significant sustainability benefits associated with rail services running within and through the Borough. The strategy is therefore considered to be unsound as it has not been properly Justified
Housing Requirement	11123	The SA and site selection process has resulted in the non-allocation at Halterworth, a site adjoining a Tier 1 settlement with no overriding constraints which is capable of delivering sustainable development and is preferable to Velmore Farm and the Plan should be amended accordingly.
Housing Requirement	11124	The SA and site selection process has resulted in the non-allocation at Halterworth, a site adjoining a Tier 1 settlement with no overriding constraints which is capable of delivering sustainable development and is preferable to Velmore Farm and the Plan should be amended accordingly.
Housing Requirement	10323	The SA and site selection process has resulted in the non-allocation at Halterworth, a site adjoining a Tier 1 settlement with no overriding constraints which is capable of delivering sustainable development and is preferable to Velmore Farm and the Plan should be amended accordingly.
Housing Requirement	10817	Object to this policy as it fails to allocate Land at Coombs Meadow , Lockerley for a minimum of 25 dwellings.
Housing Requirement	10814	Consider the draft Plan is at risk of being found unsound under the relevant tests to help improve the soundness of the draft Plan, in particular through boosting the supply of housing

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		both in terms of numbers and phasing we strongly encourage the Council to review the spatial strategy and site selection process and include SHELAA site 282
Housing Requirement	10814	Object to this policy as it fails to allocate the Land at Corner of Highwood Lane and Botley Road, Romsey for residential development and consequently to ensure a sufficient supply and mix of sites to meet the Borough's housing requirement and to direct development to the most sustainable locations.
Standard Method	10139	ONS trend based population and housing projections would be a more objective and reasonable estimate of need
NDP Housing Requirements	10082	The policy encourages the use of open space accessible for recreational and community activity as well as other facilities, though does not recognise that these facilities do not exist in the rural areas.
SHMA	11108	The SHMA is out of date and in need of a refresh ahead of Reg19.
Housing Requirement	10779	Evaluation is needed on whether the proposals in the 2029-2040 plan represent an over-estimate of local needs as the AMR details a decline in housebuilding rates.
Employment Land Requirement	10098 Southampton CC	Note that in Southern Test Valley supply of land for B1a/B1b and B1c/B2 uses exceeds the identified need in the evidence base.
Omission site	11117	Site is in a highly sustainable location, well connected to North Baddesley and would meet local housing needs in Southern TV. It is also well connected to Southampton and wider PfSH region so suitable for accommodating any unmet needs.
Omission site	11117	Queries inclusion of land outside of Permissions control (SHELAA 255). Request that the council clarify the approach and amend the areas shown in Scenarios 2 and 4 of the SA

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Omission site	11117	Officer identified capacity (150) is lower than that identified through the masterplan (170)
Omission site	11117	Reduced developable area of the site would deliver on-site SANG, and formal and informal open space. This would secure a defensible boundary and protect against further development and coalescence between North Baddesley and Rownhams.
Omission site	11117	Proposed site has the potential to provide for nutrient neutrality and recreational impact mitigation on site through the offsetting of existing agricultural land and the provision of SANG on site.
Omission site	11117	The allocation of the site would assist in meeting the acute need for affordable housing in the Borough.
HMA	10126	Parish boundaries are not an appropriate basis on which to align housing market areas, which are influenced by various social and economic factors, as opposed to where a parish boundary lay.
NDP Housing Requirements	10033	The decision on the housing requirement to be met by a Neighbourhood Plan should be made in consultation with the lead body, such as parish council.
Spatial Strategy	10364	Under this development strategy new housing will be steered by the Local Plan to Andover, Romsey and the Tier 2 settlements. The latter are focussed in the south of the Borough, this development strategy does not fit with para 3.14
Spatial Strategy	10374	In the event that land availability, suitability and achievability is becoming constrained at Andover to reach or exceed past levels of completions, there are a range of sustainable settlements that offer suitable land and deliverable opportunities for a greater proportion of growth above that currently planned-for
Duty to cooperate	11120	whilst it is welcomed that reference is made in the emerging plan to the PFSH spatial position statement off December 2023 add mention of the approximate 12,000 shortfall in homes to 2036 across the sub region it is not acceptable that TVBC just not seek to make a

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		contribution towards making up the identified shortfall particularly in the South of the borough. This risks the plan being found not legally compliant in terms of not fulfilling the duty to cooperate.
Employment Land Requirement	10362 Eastleigh BC	Note study to demonstrate employment needs are less than those identified in PfSH study, and proposed supply of employment floorspace to be provided will continue to be reviewed as plan progresses.
Housing Requirement	10119	In addition to unmet need there are growing housing pressures in south Hampshire with increasing environmental constraints and challenges. There is a housing land shortfall in the New Forest, with a capped requirement, and issues relating to nitrogen and phosphorus loading on the Solent, Itchen and Avon nature conservation designations, all of which are frustrating the delivery of housing in the region.
Housing Requirement	10119	The plan is not positively prepared or consistent with national policy as it does not sufficiently address the DTC, including within the PfSH Spatial Position Statement. Housing need must be fully considered in accordance with para 61-022 in PPG. If unmet need is not addressed, there is a risk the plan will not be considered to be legally compliant or positively prepared.
Housing Requirement	10120	Whilst recognising the strong record of ongoing collaboration between the Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH), outcomes of work around the distribution of unmet needs from this area remain incomplete and should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Housing Requirement	10120	Unmet needs arising from the Partnership for South Hampshire area is well know and stands in the region of c. 13000 dwellings. Given Test Valley's location and proximity to Southampton, it is well located to accommodate a significant proportion of the current unmet needs arising from the city and this needs to be factored into the assessment.
Housing Requirement	10126	The PfSH authorities have consistently worked together to agree the Housing Market Area boundaries, including those applicable to the southern parts of Test Valley, and have not

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		signalled any intentions to revise these in their latest Statement of Common Ground (see wording in paragraph 3.6), nor the Spatial Position Statement.
Housing Requirement	10194	There may be a requirement to respond to any un-met needs of the Partnership for South Hampshire area so housing requirement may need to be increased
Housing Requirement	10798	Havant Borough Council formally contacted during Reg 18 Stage 1 LP consultation requesting help with meeting their unmet housing needs. There remains a significant unmet housing need in South Hampshire and any change to TVBC's minimum housing requirement during their plan period ought to be upwards
HMA	10126	Recommend any decision to amend the HMA boundaries would be better informed through joint working and with adjoining Local Planning Authorities, including those comprising PfSH.
Unmet Need	10798	south Hampshire LPAs, including TVBC, need to address the 2,300 dwelling 'gap' in the very substantial housing delivery shortfall in the South Hampshire sub-region, identified by the PfSH Position Statement
Unmet Need	10798	stage 2 PfSH recommendations includes development at East of Romsey and South west of Chandlers Ford and this is allocated in Policy SA4 and SA6. VBC directly addressing PFSH position recommendations - welcome and supported
Unmet Need	10798	the Broad Areas of Search have combined potential to delivery around 9,700 dwellings against shortfall of 12,000 dwellings - balance of 2,300 dwellings which is not addressed by PfSH
Settlement Hierarchy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We broadly endorse and support the settlement hierarchy however, the approach that follows from first principles fails to account for the fact that pursuing the principles in the PfSH SPS at SPS1, SPS2 and SPS8 may not be best achieved or even achievable at all in the south and north, and continue to make it hard to pursue the national policy expectations set in the NPPF at paragraphs 108-110.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
HMA	10126	The definition of a HMA, and its influence on the spatial distribution of growth between the PfSH authorities is a clear example of a 'strategic' matter that needs cooperation over. This is covered by a Statement of Common Ground between such authorities. Unless and until this Statement is updated to support an alternative boundary, the current adopted boundary should be retained.
Unmet Need	10120	Welcome that a Spatial Position Statement has been produced by the Partnership for South Hampshire setting out the current level of housing need and supply in south Hampshire.
Unmet Need	10120	The Spatial Position Statement must be updated to reflect supply shortfalls in housing needs as individual Local Plans progress.
HMA	10126	Given the Housing Market Area boundaries are strategic in nature and are an established part of joint working between the PfSH authorities, surprised that the Council has unilaterally redefined the HMAs.
Unmet Need	11161	Joint PfSH Spatial Position Paper (December 2023), whilst not a statutory plan, is important and represents ongoing DTC. It sets out an overall anticipated strategic housing need and land supply position for the period to 2036, and indicates a shortfall of 11,771 dwellings in the PfSH sub-region. The PfSH Paper has identified a number of broad areas of search for growth and states that 'the suitability and deliverability of these areas will be considered in the relevant Local Plans'. The Council's response is contained in the Spatial Strategy Topic Paper which indicates there is no quantified unmet need at this stage and that there is not evidence of need. These comments appear to be contrary to SPS8 of the PfSH SPS and national policy.
Unmet Need	11161	The Council has signed a statement of common ground through the Joint PfSH Spatial Position Paper (December 2023) - suggesting an agreed position, but has not taken steps through the plan to address the shortfall set out in SPP policy SPS8, despite the Borough

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		being in a good position to do so. This is not a sound approach, with regard to NPPF paras 11 and 35.
Unmet Need	10768	LPA will need to take into account any requests to accommodate unmet housing needs. It is noted that Havant Borough Council has made a formal request, and the PfSH Spatial Position Statement demonstrates a shortfall across the wider geography and in six of the local authorities
Unmet Need	10374	LPA will need to take into account any requests to accommodate unmet housing needs. It is noted that Havant Borough Council has made a formal request, and the December 2023 PfSH Spatial Position Statement demonstrates a shortfall across the wider geography and in six of the local authorities
Unmet Need	11076	That TVBC state there is no 'clear evidence' of the level of unmet housing need in neighbouring authorities is quite clearly incorrect given the evidence summarised above. As a member of PfSH, TVBC therefore have an opportunity to help address some of this need, being significantly less constrained than many other PfSH Authorities
Unmet Need	11077	The PfSH spatial position statement identifies a potential shortfall. These 11,771 homes are currently unplanned for. The figure equates to approximately 1,000 dpa over the period 2024-2036. Havant Borough Council are seeking a commitment from Test Valley to accommodate Havant's unmet need (circa 2,000 homes). Whilst this request related to a now withdrawn Local Plan, this unmet need is likely to still arise
Unmet Need	11077	SPS anticipates delivery from said authorities in the short to medium term to deliver unmet need and that long term need will be met via Broad Locations of Growth. The Broad Locations of Growth are estimated to have a combined capacity of 9,700 dwellings, leaving a shortfall of 2,071 dwellings to be delivered in other locations. It is noted that the Broad Locations of Growth are currently speculative and therefore not concrete

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	11077	If adopted without taking into account the potential for unmet need from south Hampshire there is the distinct likelihood that Test Valley will serve no role in helping to meet this unmet need and an increased risk that the unmet need will remain unmet
Unmet Need	11096	The PfSH identified in the latest position statement (December 2023) that there is a shortfall of 11,711 homes across South Hampshire with significant shortfalls in the New Forest Borough Council and Eastleigh Borough Council. Both of these Authorities border Test Valley. Shortfalls in both Authorities account for well over 8,000 homes between 2023 and 2036. Due to the constraints faced by both Authorities
Unmet Need	11096	Essential that the Council start planning now to increase the supply of homes to address some of these needs in South Hampshire
Unmet Need	11161	Under the DTC, the Council has a duty to consider wider needs. At Regulation 18 (Stage 1) Southampton City Council requested that a higher amount of housing is tested through the SA (see Table 1 of DTC Paper). We have seen no evidence that this has been done. This suggests that paras 11 and 35 of the NPPF have not been met, in terms of the joint strategic approach agreed through the SPS joint PfSH Spatial Position Paper (December 2023).
Unmet Need	11151	Test Valley is arguably the least constrained of all the PfSH authorities. The PfSH Statement of Common Ground identifies two Test Valley sites in the Broad Areas of Growth demonstrating that Test Valley is the most suitable and sustainable location for meeting a reasonable proportion of South Hampshire's unmet need.
Unmet Need	11120	the council should review whether any contribution could be made to unmet need arising from within the PFSH area and consequently allocate additional sites in the southern part of the borough.
Unmet Need	10817	The Council will need to take into account requests to accommodate unmet housing needs. The PfSH Spatial Position Statement demonstrates a shortfall across the wider geography.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		No allowance is currently provided in Policy SS3: Housing Requirement to contribute towards meeting unmet needs.
Unmet Need	11151	Agree that Local Planning Authorities in the PfSH area are at different stages of plan making, but this is an inevitable function of the disparate plan making system in England and is not an excuse for delaying meeting unmet needs that adversely affect the affordability of housing in all areas.
Unmet Need	11151	The PfSH latest Position Statement still reports a shortfall in housing of nearing 12,000 units. The biggest deficit arises from the New Forest of 5,652 and given constraints of the New Forest it is unlikely they can address all of this shortfall. Southampton is also constrained by its urbanised nature and Havant Borough Council have formally requested TVBC help meet their unmet housing need. All of this points to an exceptional need for housing in the area which is continuing to remain unmet. There is insufficient evidence that TVBC have engaged and collaborated with its neighbours on how to address cross-boundary strategic matters like housing.
Unmet Need	10605	common ground statement should be prepared with PfSH given extent of unmet need in sub region
Unmet Need	10655	common ground statement should be prepared with PfSH given extent of unmet need in sub region
Unmet Need	10611	common ground statement should be prepared with PfSH given extent of unmet need in sub region
Unmet Need	10119	Affordability issues identified in the evidence based and unmet need from neighbouring authorities, specifically that highlighted in the Statement of Common Ground between PfSH authorities and through the joint Spatial Position Statement should be fully considered and accommodated, in order to the plan to be sound, in line with NPPF (paragraph 35).

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	10717	Para 2.19 acknowledges that a housing supply shortfall exists across the PFSH South Hampshire area. This has been quantified as 11,771 homes to 2036, which will be higher for the period to 2040 (the Local Plan period). This need is tangible and should be considered through the Local Plan process and plan making across the PfSH area.
Unmet Need	10717	Para 2.20 refers to the PfSH 'Broad Areas of Search' exercise, a high level assessment of areas which could potentially be sustainable locations for growth at a sub-regional level. Two locations are identified in Test Valley; East of Romsey and South West of Chandlers Ford. The proposed allocations at South of Ganger Farm (340 homes) and Velmore Farm (1070 homes) will erode the ability and capacity of these areas to act as broad areas for growth to meet unmet need, as envisaged by the PfSH Broad areas of Search exercise.
Unmet Need	10717	Para 3.62 notes that neighbouring authorities need to help provide for any unmet need across their areas, in line with NPPF, and para 3.63 suggests that this may be addressed via a future review, once plans across the area have progressed to evidence their unmet need. This does not pass the soundness test which requires plans to be effective on dealing with cross boundary strategic matters, which should not be deferred (para 35c). This approach is not consistent with the PfSH position statement which states that housing need exists and is accruing. Unmet need should be addressed collectively through the emerging plans across the Hampshire area, and in the absence of evidence to show that it is impractical or unsustainable for Test Valley to meet housing needs (para 35, NPPF), the plan cannot be 'sound', robust, positively prepared or effective. Further work is needed to establish how the full unmet needs of South Hampshire will be met.
Unmet Need	10119	Any needs that cannot be met in neighbouring areas should be taken into account in the plan, through the duty to cooperate, and it is noted the Southern HMA is within the PfSH area. Meeting the unmet need from the PfSH area will direct growth necessary to meet Test Valley's need towards the north of the Borough, including at Andover. The PfSH Spatial Position Statement (December 2023) identifies the current level of unmet need as some

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		11,771 dwellings up to 2036, demonstrating a shortfall in the region. The broad areas identified for strategic scale development in the Statement, within Test Valley are; East of Romsey and South West of Chandlers Ford. But it is unclear whether the strategic allocations in the Plan have been explored fully in the context of the identified PfSH broad areas of search for sustainable strategic scale development.
Unmet Need	11115	It is clear from the PfSH position statement that there are unmet needs. These should be addressed in the Plan. Test Valley is less constrained than some other boroughs/districts
Unmet Need	10201	Whilst para.3.59 states that there is no clear evidence as to unmet needs, evident from Partnership for South Hampshire Spatial Position Statement that unmet needs across South Hampshire between 2023 and 2036
Unmet Need	10201	Need to engage with Partnership for South Hampshire (PfSH) which has identified shortfall of 11,711 homes across South Hampshire with significant shortfalls in Eastleigh and New Forest bordering Test Valley
Unmet Need	10201	Table 1 of Partnership for South Hampshire Spatial Position Statement sets out unmet needs of Southampton are zero, as inappropriate to allocate 35% urban uplift. Whilst recognise uplift should be delivered in city or urban centre to which it applies, Council should consider whether still possible some of uplift could be delivered in and around areas adjacent or close to Southampton
Unmet Need	10120	At present, the unmet needs for the PfSH area is estimated to be in the region of 11,700 homes. There are significant shortfalls in the New Forest and Eastleigh (amounting to over 8000 homes between 2023-2036), both of which border Test Valley. In particular, the constraints of the New Forest, due to the National Park, will require neighbouring authorities such as Test Valley to identify further land to help meet these needs.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	10120	Vital to the soundness of the Local Plan that collaboration between the PfSH authorities continues and an effective strategy is set in place which positively deals with unmet needs of the PfSH area.
Housing Requirement	10096	It is stated that the plan will be submitted for examination in Q2, 2025, so the end date of the plan may need to extend and housing numbers increase, to allow for a minimum of 15 years, as required by PPG (para 064 ID:61-064-20190315)
Housing Requirement	11150	The local housing need of 550/year over the plan period 2020-2040 (a total of 11,000), should be increase by at least 500, to account for an additional year in the plan period (2041).
Housing Requirement	11151	Strategic policies need to be reviewed accordingly and additional housing allocations set out within the Local Plan to meet the need arising from an extended 2 year period.
Housing Requirement	10181	if plan period extended Table 3.3 'Housing Requirement and Supply' and Policy SS3 would need to be updated to include a further two years of requirement and therefore an uplift of 1,100 homes (at 550 dpa) to the housing requirement, plus any contingency considered necessary
Housing Requirement	11120	the housing requirement will need to be re calculated and additional housing allocations set out within the plan to meet the need arising from an extended. Two year extension would result in an uplift 1100 new homes.
Housing Requirement	10137	The plan period may need to extend beyond 2040 so that strategic policies look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption
Housing Requirement	11120	this means that table 3.3 and policy SS3 would need to be updated to include a further two years of requirement.
Housing Requirement	10091	The Housing requirement should be increased by at least 550dpa to account for an additional 1 year to the plan period.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We consider the policy to be flawed in some important respects. A plan horizon that looks to 15 years beyond a reasonable date of adoption is likely to require at least another 550 dwellings and likely 1100 at two years. Rolling the base date to 2022 would address supply delivered to that point which may be prudent, this would retain the current nominal need but require significant adjustment in the identified supply and the residual quantum to be planned for.
Housing Trajectory	10314	The Housing Trajectory which has been produced only sets out a trajectory up until 2039/40. The local housing need of 550/year over the plan period 2020-2040 (a total of 11,000), should be increase by at least 500, to account for an additional year in the plan period (2041). In addition, the rural housing requirement (Policy SS4) should equally be increased to cover the additional year
Housing Requirement	10201	<p>If plan period amended to 2023/24-2040/41 then housing need 9,900, but number of homes to be delivered reduced from 12,415 to 10,287, with buffer of 3.9%. To maintain 10% buffer, which is para.3.100 is necessary to ensure flexibility and housing need met in full, housing supply between 2023 and 2041 needs to increase to 10,890 homes minimum</p> <p>Amend plan period to 2023/24 to 2040/41 and consequently need to increase housing supply to 10,890 homes to maintain 10% buffer</p>
Housing Requirement	11078	The eLP is proposing to deliver 11,000 homes over the plan-period to 2040 which equates to 550dpa. It is considered that as a minimum, this should be increased to 11,550 to reflect the required 15 year minimum plan period from adoption
Spatial strategy	10182	Plan period should be extended to 2042 to allow 15 years post adoption

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial strategy	10978	The plan period should be extended to at least 2041 to ensure 15 yr lifespan
Spatial strategy	10978	As the Plan includes significant allocations the plan period may need extending to cover a 30 yr period to account for shortfalls in delivery and to identify broad locations for growth
Spatial strategy	11115	Plan period needs extending to cover 15 years
Spatial strategy	11115	Unnecessary for the plan period to start as far back as 2020. Should start from 2023/24, which is the period the SM calculation is based on
Spatial strategy	10094	Start date of 2020 is too early and plan period is too short. Considering covering a 20 year period post adoption. Identify additional sites to cover increase in plan period.
Plan Period	10091	The plan period will not allow for a minimum 15 years from adoption -contrary to P22 of the NPPF-should be extended to at least 2021
Plan Period	10091 (2nd response)	The plan period should be extended according to the transitional provisions under footnote 14 of the NPPF p.228 which indicate that the requirement for a longer plan period applies to plans that have not reached reg19 stage by 20/7/21
Spatial strategy	10182	If the plan period is extended to 2042 the overall requirement would increase by 1,100 homes to 12,100 homes and increase by 473 homes in Southern Test Valley to 5,960 homes. With 10% buffer, the overall requirement would increase to 13,310 homes and 993 homes in Southern Test Valley to 6,480 homes.
Rural housing requirement	11150	rural housing requirement for Northern and Southern Test Valley should be increased to cover an additional year in the plan period, to 2041

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Standard Method	10181	the outputs of the standard method should be updated and the minimum number of homes to be provided uplifted to reflect a later end to the plan period to ensure 15 years from date of adoption consistent with paragraph 22 of the NPPF
Spatial Strategy	10049 Historic England	wording unclear and suggested amendment to policy wording “...the principle of development and redevelopment will be permitted provided that it accords with the other policies of the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Development Plans.”
Landscape impact	10405 North Wessex Downs National Landscape	given part of the area is in a protected landscape the policy appears loose and needs to be laid out clearly rather than simply referring to other policies in the plan.
NDP Housing Requirements	10750	The proposal of ten dwellings on this land in Grateley will have a negative impact on pollution.
Settlement Boundary	11010	The Local Plan protects open countryside and should continue to do so
Settlement Boundary	11010	Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows is an open countryside location and the updated local plan should protect this status. Further development would alter the tranquil character of Fishlake Meadow Nature Reserve (FMNR) and isolate from surrounding countryside and impede wildlife access

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Development in the Countryside	11129	Farming community are concerned about potential impacts on utilities, loss of habitat and food production due to over development. Ganger Farm previous grew soft fruits and vegetables and is now housing. Countryside needs protecting as it is critical to feeding the nation
Development in the Countryside	11130	Concerned as a company with the scale of development around the town of Romsey
Settlement Boundary	10052	In the context of the vision, extending the settlement boundaries further out into the countryside will diminish that very countryside.
Distribution of development	10722	The development of housing and industrial buildings on greenfield sites has a significant impact on the amount of space available for farming and reduces the local environment.
Settlement Boundary	11032	No developments should take place in the open countryside.
NDP Housing Requirements	10750	The need for housing in the area can be found on other sites that do not develop over countryside.
Spatial Strategy	10139	TVBC have destroyed the attractive surroundings of Andover and Romsey by allocating greenfield land in excess of need
Rural housing requirement	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	It is considered that outside Andover and Romsey, access to public transport is more limited as there are only four rail stations across the Borough.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	11150	Future provision of bus services is uncertain and the Council accepts they should not rely on this in deciding where to focus rural growth
Spatial Strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The strategy being oblivious to the need to maximise public transport use does open up development to a wider range of options that can be justified on 100% use of personal vehicles. It is easy to claim based on DfT guidance that allow for all journeys up to 5 miles to be made by cycle however, this guidance is blind to the fact that a small proportion of journeys of such lengths actually are and worse in the context of Test Valley as active travel mode share is particularly low across much of the area
Delivery, monitoring and contingency	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We would strongly urge the Council and other plan stakeholders to work with us in the months to come to collaboratively address the issues and the clear opportunities we highlight. This is expected by national policy at NPPF paragraphs 15 and 16, but irrespective, we hope would be recognised to be both prudent and good practice notwithstanding.
Settlement Boundary	10720	There are insufficient transport links locally, with no access to trains and only one regular bus service, to support the increased population.
Spatial strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The draft strategy text makes no mention of securing mode shift away from car dependency or mention public transport at any point only 'active travel' which does not typically include public transport

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The strategy and approach to allocations is clearly and intentionally set up to be oblivious to the need to maximise opportunities for public transport use, despite the principles set out in NPPF chapter 9 paragraph 108-109 and the principle in the PfSH SPS.
Spatial strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The draft plan is likely to be considered to be unsound as it is out of conformity with the expectations of NPPF paragraphs 108-109 and the PfSH principles at SPS 1 and 2.
Settlement Boundary	10937	<p>Future developments on settlement boundaries once Public Transport has been progressed to cope with additional constructions.</p> <p>This should be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.</p>
Settlement Hierarchy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The fact the hierarchy has been undertaken without any consideration of public transport is a natural cause for concern however, given the fact that the availability of a limited public transport offer did not greatly influence the hierarchy, we are content this does not greatly influence the plan strategy.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The draft plan is likely to be considered unsound being inappropriately and inadequately evidenced, the plan does not attempt to sufficiently identify and take advantage of the opportunities for public transport
Settlement Hierarchy	11148	public transport has been removed from the methodology reflecting the uncertainty over future rural bus provision but the presence of a rail station, with regular services to the larger settlements, should be included as a significant sustainability feature. Providing further residential development adjoining Palestine/Grateley Station/Grateley would help to ensure the long-term viability of the rail service
Settlement Hierarchy	10120	Disagree with the removal of bus services from the methodology. The supporting text states the sustainability of settlements is based on a snapshot in time and yet settlements are not being assessed on the sustainable transport services that available at this moment in time.
Settlement Hierarchy	10120	Removal of bus services fails to reflect that increased growth results in increased demand, which will help to mitigate the reduction in bus services in the future.
Spatial Strategy	11148	Whilst the general strategy of identifying a wider distribution of development at the most sustainable settlements is supported, it fails to place sufficient emphasis on settlements with good access to rail services into the main settlements of Andover and Romsey and beyond
Spatial Strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go	The draft plan is likely to be considered to be unsound as it is ineffective in that transport mitigation strategies will be excessive reliant on providing additional capacity for private cars and may struggle to arrive at credible strategies to make active travel a 'genuine choice'.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	South Coast Limited	
Spatial Strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	This included responses on behalf of bus operators at Reg 18 (1) which drew the conclusion that insufficient sustainable opportunities existed adjacent to the largest and most sustainable settlements to meet development needs. Sites that would support rational extension of bus routes, or use of existing ones, were exceptionally hard to identify. This led us to conclude that development needs would require addressing at a wider number of settlements or one or more new or expanded settlements related to existing or potential high quality public transport corridors.
New settlement	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The opportunities for new settlements on existing or potential bus corridors, including Activ8 between Andover and Ludgershall in the Weyhill area or a potential new bus route between Romsey and Nursling via the A3057 Southampton Road, are not picked up by this approach.
Distribution of development	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	This is broadly supported subject to facilities including a relevant public transport choice as beyond the main towns, the density of the commercial public transport network is very low and consultation is ongoing on the funding of those limited services funded by the County. Salisbury Reds X7 including the X7R branch falls into this category, if sufficient development were allocated on this route it could form the basis to see the corridor strengthened rather than removed. However, this would imply a larger development quantum than the plan or local communities is likely to consider appropriate.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The plan risks allocating development to a substantial number of rural settlements that have no credible alternative to car use, aggravating an already excessively high level of car dependency. Alternatively, failing to assess how far one or more key corridors might become viable for a meaningful public transport offer if development were concentrated on it/them.
Rural housing requirement	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	There may be potential to look with some urgency establishing a more regular Andover-Stockbridge-Winchester bus service which would be justified by development at Stockbridge and/or at other sustainable points on the corridor to meet rural needs much more sustainably.
Spatial Strategy	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	One of the most sustainable locations for housing provision is around transport nodes, such as railway stations, and the Council should give due consideration to these opportunities
Rural housing requirement	10729	Plan should include provision of a range of sites of varying scales to ensure deliverability across the plan period Range of sites of varying scales

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10776	To ensure that the Local Plan can meet the identified housing needs and is positively prepared, the Council need to ensure that the housing numbers each site is proposed to be allocated for is realistic and achievable
Housing Requirement	10126	It would be prudent for the Council to test a reasonable alternative higher than 550dpa through their Sustainability Appraisal process. The absence of which is a significant omission in the SA, which is both unjustified and contrary to the NPPF and PPG.
Housing Requirement	11147	Town centre sites are often more encumbered with heritage constraints while viability concerns are a well-known burden when developing brownfield land in urban areas that often require high standards of design, whilst the high-density nature of such developments means that they do not typically deliver suitable family homes. Town centre regeneration therefore needs to be part of a blended strategy that includes greenfield allocations to help deliver affordable and family housing.
Spatial strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Maximising the capacity of regeneration opportunities in Andover and Romsey town centres is supported subject to ensuring that facilities for buses are maintained and as far as possible improved.
Monitoring	11096	Welcome that the Council will monitor delivery, and if the plan is not delivering appropriately, contingency measures will be undertaken. However, it is considered that the Council should be reviewing some of the suggested appropriate actions on a regular basis regardless of if the Local Plan is delivering or not

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
NDP Housing Requirements	10799	it is indicated that for development within smaller communities reliance will be upon Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements. This is less than satisfactory
NDP Housing Requirements	10799	Neighbourhood Plans fail to reach the wider community and are steered by a few interested and articulate individuals. The policies are at times weak and conflicted having not been subject to the more rigorous scrutiny of a team of professional planners as in the case of the Local Plan.
NDP Housing Requirements	10080	Neighbourhood Plans may be favoured as control is passed to local people but they fail to reach the wider community and are steered by a few individuals, policies are sometimes weak and conflicted as they have not been scrutinised by professional planners.
Contingency	10812 Romsey Town Council	What contingency measures are envisaged? Would it be appropriate to have some reserve sites identified?
Housing Requirement	10812 Romsey Town Council	Believe that there should be agreed reserved housing allocations to action should the housing land supply fall below 5 years
Spatial Strategy	10049 Historic England	questioning the the lack of reference to reuse of buildings for Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements. Presumably reuse can feature in those tiers too?

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	11150	Any potential LP review and additional allocations (via a Development Plan Document) would take further time and would result in under delivery in the rural area for a significant period of time
Omission site	10352	<p>Objection. Local plan should be amended to include land north of Oxlease Meadows, Romsey for housing</p> <p>Allocate site north at Oxlease Meadows, Romsey for housing</p>
Omission site	10352	<p>Land north of Oxlease Meadows SHELAA site 384 would be immediately adjacent to existing developed area of Romsey, which it is in practical terms. Site forms logical final piece in jigsaw in this part of town can no justifiable reason for not allocating for development</p> <p>Allocate site north at Oxlease Meadows, Romsey for housing</p>
Omission site	10352	<p>Land N of Oxlease Meadows SHELAA site 384 was subject of dismissed appeal, but on relatively narrow grounds of overdevelopment of the site which would impact unfavourably on adjoining Fishlake Meadows SINC. Wrong to assume Inspector's judgement on specific detailed planning application should directly impact on assessment of suitability of site for local plan allocation. Issues considered by inspector are resolvable with revised scheme. To exclude site due to previous appeal decision is entirely flawed approach.</p> <p>Allocate site north at Oxlease Meadows, Romsey for housing</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Omission site	10352	<p>Land N of Oxlease Meadows SHELAA site 384 exclusion on basis of recent appeal decision and relationship of site to settlement is not justified. Site is sustainable location where other development recently been approved and site would complete development in this area. Surrounding development should in any event be designated within settlement boundary and site would therefore be on edge of Tier 1 settlement Romsey and would display high performance scores equal to or above site chosen for allocation</p> <p>Allocate site north at Oxlease Meadows, Romsey for housing</p>
Omission site	10120	<p>Land at Halterworth Lane, Romsey is available for development and is deliverable. Not expected to be any insurmountable constraints to the development of the site. Site promoter has a proven track record in ensuring delivery of sites. Welcome the ability to meet with the local planning authority to discuss.</p>
Settlement Boundary	10450	<p>There has been a decrease in the numbers of fish life in the Romsey barge Canal which is part of the building of biodiversity in the SSSI Fishlake meadows.</p>
Settlement Boundary	10450	<p>Suggest that the Oxlease Meadows is removed or reviewed from the plan to give the Romsey barge Canal and the Fish Lake Meadows time to recover- the new development will impede this.</p>
Development in the Countryside	11008	<p>Land North of Oxlease Meadows is green open countryside and would like the plan to protect this status</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Development in the Countryside	10991	Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows is an open countryside location and the plan should protect this status
Settlement Boundary	10812 Romsey Town Council	The boundary proposed for Romsey is perverse in that certain areas that are clearly associated with settlement are excluded whilst certain SINC areas are included. The boundary and the rationale behind it needs to be further reviewed.
Development in the Countryside	11130	Concerned with any further encroachment on Yokesford Hill Industrial Estate which holds a waste permit for 360,000 tonnes of waste per year. This just brings confrontation
Development in the Countryside	11130	Aware of other outline planning developments in Jermyns Lane which are already at capacity. Not against redevelopment in urban areas as the infrastructure and road network is already in place
Settlement Boundary	10812 Romsey Town Council	The boundary proposed for Romsey is perverse in that certain areas that are clearly associated with settlement are excluded whilst certain SINC areas are included. The boundary and the rationale behind it needs to be further reviewed.
Settlement Boundary	10450	The Romsey barge Canal and Oxlease meadows are experiencing a decline in habitat as a result of the Cupernham Lane developments -and both were permitted without being part of the local plan.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	10352	<p>Objection. Settlement hierarchy is cornerstone to delivering spatial strategy and sustainable development. Romsey Tier 1 settlement where majority of development including strategic housing sites should be targeted. Failure to include already fully developed areas at and around Oxlease Meadows within defined settlement area is however inexplicable. These areas should be included within defined settlement area rather than designated countryside as they are fully developed and immediately adjacent to existing settlement boundary.</p> <p>Include area already fully developed areas at and around Oxlease Meadows within defined settlement</p>
Settlement Boundary	10352	<p>Land N of Oxlease Meadows and to W of Abbotswood. Sites around Oxlease Meadows have all been accepted as sustainable sites for housing with good access to town centre, service and employment. Local plan should recognise this by including developed areas within defined settlement boundary</p> <p>Include existing developed land around Oxlease Meadows, Romsey within settlement boundary</p>
Settlement Boundary	10450	<p>All higher ground water runs into the Romsey Barge Canal then into the meadows and into River Test- polluted water from construction sites and raw sewerage has been poured into the barge for the past 8 years threatening the watercourse if more development occurs.</p>
Omission site	10101	<p>Development sites within Broadland Estate's ownership can help achieve Council's aspirations by delivering residential and sustainable employment-led development in Romsey and and surrounding villages to meet range of needs and aspirations</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	11073	The extension of the SB for Romsey to the north to include the site would provide a natural rounding off of the boundary, in keeping with the prevailing character of development
Settlement Boundary	10796	Support the modification to the settlement boundary to include the Site and wider Whitenap allocation and the provisions of Policy SS1 which confirms the presumption in favour of sustainable development, including strategic allocations, within the settlement boundaries of Tier 1 settlements
Settlement Boundary	11032	Necessary that the existing settlement boundary North of Oxlease Meadows including the prevention of any speculative build West of Cupernham Lane.
Settlement Boundary	11010	Critical to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadow Nature Reserve (FMNR) over development along Cupernham Lane will harm the visual character of countryside around FMNR
Settlement Boundary	11008	Essential that existing settlement boundaries are maintained surrounding Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve as per the current and proposed plan
Settlement Boundary	10963	Critical to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadow Nature Reserve (FMNR) moving boundaries would allow overdevelopment along Cupernham Lane which will harm the visual character of countryside surrounding FMNR
Settlement Boundary	10990	Overdevelopment along Cupernham Lane will harm the visual character surrounding Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve, this should be prevented by maintaining current local plan boundaries
Settlement Boundary	10991	Critical to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadow Nature Reserve (FMNR) as overdevelopment along Cupernham Lane would harm the visual character of countryside surrounding FMNR
Settlement Boundary	10993	Critical to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve as per the current and proposed plan

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	10995	Encourage Test Valley to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve as it is a place of remarkable natural beauty and interest, overdevelopment is concerning as the area is used regularly and would harm the local attraction
Settlement Boundary	10868	It is critical to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadow Nature Reserve as per the current and proposed plan
Omission site	11144	There are no material constraints to the site's development for housing. The site is well-located on the southern edge of a Tier 2 settlement to which new housing allocations should be directed. this site Ref 255 should be formally identified as a housing site with capacity for circa 50 dwellings in the Review Local Plan
Omission site	10181	promoted site (by Highwood) at Jermyns Lane Romsey provides an opportunity to realise the aspirations set out in Chapter 3 of the draft plan
Omission site	11147	promotes land north of Botley Road, Romsey for a residential allocation - previously submitted for inclusion in the SHELAA through TVBC's Call for Sites under reference 282 in 2021
Omission site	11147	site promotor says land north of Botley Road directly adjoins Romsey and is within easy walking distance of two local schools, alongside has good access to local services and amenities and connectivity to an established cycle lane infrastructure, therefore can be considered as possessing a sustainable location for housing
Omission site	11147	whilst a Local Gap designation does not necessarily preclude development, the removal of the site from the Local Gap will allow my client's land to come forward, which represents a logical and sustainable location for development being immediately adjoining existing residential development, on the eastern edge of Romsey to help meet the housing needs of the Borough during the plan period, including the delivery of much needed affordable housing provision. The site is within easy walking distance of two local schools and can be

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		considered as being in a sustainable location having good access to local services and connectivity to the established cycle lane infrastructure.
Omission site	11147	Land north of Botley Road would be close to several employment opportunities and a range of services and amenities.
Omission site	11144	site promoted - ref 255 in SHELAA 2024 - could deliver around 50 dwellings
Omission site	10181	site promotion - Carterwood Analytics, a widely regarded industry tool, has assessed the site location for the appropriateness for a care home. The table below demonstrates how the figures led Highwood to conclude that the Bracken Wood site was the ideal location to accommodate a new 'best in class care home
Omission site	11073	Land to the rear of Esso Garage lies in a pocket of undeveloped land on the northwestern edge of Romsey adjacent to the defined settlement policy boundary
Omission site	11073	Provision of a church and community hub on the site would reduce rental costs but increase investment in services and facilities to be provided to the local community
Omission site	11073	The site presents an opportunity for Test Valley to allocate a small scale, sustainable site for community led development in the emerging Local Plan
Omission site	11073	Without allocation the site is guided by policies COM2 and COM9, however we believe that the site provides a great opportunity to contribute to Test Valley's religious, social and charitable needs and therefore believe it should be allocated through the Local Plan as a community led development site
Omission site	11073	Site is adjacent to existing built development in the form of commercial and industrial uses, to the south and west and care provision to the north. The extension of the SB for Romsey to the north to include the site would provide a natural rounding off of the boundary, in keeping with the prevailing character of development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Omission site	11073	<p>Would also maintain and enhance the sustainability of the settlement through the delivery of a community benefit.</p> <p>Review the SB as part of the next stage of the Local Plan to ensure that the most sustainable sites, with suitable development opportunities, are being included</p>
Omission site	11073	Proposed church and community hub on this site would bring clear community and spiritual benefits that fulfil the aims of policies and local initiatives intended to create a more sustainable community, it should therefore be allocated for such development in the local plan
Omission site	11073	Freedom Church has an obligation to ensure that funds are spent in accordance with their charitable aims, and that expenditure is both proportionate and sustainable. As such, Freedom Church is looking to ensure that expenditure on developing a site is not beyond the realms of what it can realistically afford
Omission site	11115	Proposed site for approx. 300 homes and two options: one includes a retail food store, one includes older persons housing. The site is PDL. Romsey is a focus for development and this site could meet increased housing needs. It is constraint free and accessible.
Omission site	11115	This site could accommodate older persons accommodation, as part of a residential scheme. Romsey is well placed within the Southern Test Valley area and wider South Hampshire area to provide such accommodation within close proximity to key facilities and services, and locally based employees
Omission site	11147	land north of Botley Road, Romsey would present a highly credible and deliverable site for residential development. The developable area - c.9.05ha and is capable of establishing

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		suitable vehicular access points capable of serving new development. offers a realistic option to deliver up to 170 new homes
Omission site	10181	promoting redevelopment of Bracken Wood in Jermyn's Lane, Romsey to provide specialist accommodation for older people at the site to meet the ever growing and critical need for such accommodation
Omission site	10181	previously site selection made it to 'stage 4' of process for market housing but not C2 use - now promoted for C2 use
Settlement Boundary	10450	Why has the Land North of Oxlease Meadows (the Horsefield) been included in this draft plan when planning permission was only recently refused on the same grounds?
Settlement Boundary	10450	The final approved version of the local plan should be strictly adhered to and there should be no extra sites and developments coming up as was the case with Cupernham Lane and Fish lake Meadows.
Spatial Strategy	10139	Surprised and disappointed there is no specific policy on the rural economy given the plan acknowledges the role the rural economy plays in Test Valley
Rural housing requirement	11014	The LP sets the minimum rural housing requirement until 2040 for northern Test Valley as 260 homes. No new houses are proposed for Chilbolton; it is for the community to describe its own needs
Spatial Strategy	10941	The spatial strategy of concentrated development exacerbates means less developed is proposed in rural villages, having a negative impact on the local infrastructure.
Distribution of development	10612	Equity - strategy appears to be enlarge urban areas, with effects including, urban areas losing evermore open green space; quality of life for residents in these areas disproportionately impacted; villages becoming less sustainable.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Allocation	10812 Romsey Town Council	Believe that rural settlements should take their share of new housing rather than no housing at all, in the interest of ensuring vitality of villages and fairness of allocation. Currently 20% of TV population is rural but only 5% of housing is allocated there. Object to the policy, it does not allocate housing to tier 3 settlements
Housing Requirement	10120	While a specific rural requirement may be helpful, the policy as drafted is ineffective as it fails to specify how the policy will be used and how it will impact the decision making process.
Housing Requirement	10082	The Plan does not address the need for housing supply and instead follows policies which are too restrictive to build homes, especially in rural areas.
Housing Requirement	10033	The policy does not address the housing needs of rural communities in the borough.
Housing Requirement	10768	Rural housing requirement for the Borough a minimum of 542 homes in the plan-period, equating to 27.1 dwellings per annum then subdivided into the North (260 homes) and South Test Valley (282 homes)
Housing Requirement	10768	Overall housing requirement of 27.1 dwellings per annum is set at a lower figure than the Adopted Local Plan, why the overall housing requirement for the rural areas is being reduced from a low baseline under COM1 is unjustified – particularly given the representations on housing needs that remain growing and unmet
Housing Requirement	10768	Policy SS4 rural housing is not positively prepared and justified. Housing requirement is arbitrarily defined and not informed by evidence of needs within the period to 2040. Constrained level of growth within rural areas, do not respond to the vision and objectives of the plan. The requirements do not accord with the NPPF and the PPG
Housing Requirement	10768	These figures are not evidenced other than they derived from the level of existing housing supply and the total to be met through Policy SS5

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10768	Equates to an additional 110 dwellings in the plan period above 'existing housing supply' Policy SS4 figures have not been derived in accordance with the NPPF and PPG, including how this will contribute towards maintaining or enhancing the vitality of the rural communities
Housing Requirement	11108	W1 is concerned that the level of housing proposed in the rural area would not fulfil the ambition to enable rural communities to thrive and does not provide a sufficient uplift to meaningfully address affordable housing needs.
Housing Requirement	10033	The policy should be reviewed and reflect a more positive approach to addressing the housing needs of the rural communities in Test Valley.
Rural housing requirement	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	The draft Plan appears to reduce housing land within villages. There is little provision for village young families or downsizing elderly people. If this is policy the evidence base should be exposed.
Settlement Hierarchy	10729	<p>Whilst importance of locating growth in sustainable locations is recognised, this needs to consider all elements of sustainability and the role that new development can play in enhancing and maintaining the sustainability of all levels of settlements for a variety of tenures</p> <p>Consider all elements of sustainability and role of new development</p>
Spatial Strategy	11108	W1 is pleased to see greater emphasis placed on a 'tailored' approach to enabling rural communities to address the specific challenges they face in terms of housing supply and

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		affordability but the extent to which the duty to cooperate has been realised has yet to be affirmed.
Spatial Strategy	10082	The paragraph proposes that other settlements will have less support.
Spatial Strategy	10082	In this paragraph, the Local Plan ignores and rejects the NPPF guidance on sustainability by not proposing a policy that sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. And thereby restricts development in rural areas.
Rural housing requirement	Barton Stacey Parish Council 10166 Barton Stacey Parish Council	BS PC encourages TVBC to review how the housing needs of village residents can be met
Rural housing requirement	10166 Barton Stacey Parish Council	Urge TVBC to review how small scale, quality design and environmentally friendly development can occur that enhances rural living and village life and helps maintain community businesses as viable
Rural housing requirement	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	While we support the identification of a rural housing need figure the justification for the numbers seems back to front and appears to be supply driven rather than objectively driven by specific local needs.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Rural housing requirement	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The additional rural housing quantum is a significant 542 dwellings and there is no clear evidence as to why this need cannot be met in rural settlements that offer a credible public transport choice or could provide one. Stockbridge stands out as a Tier 2 settlement that also offers secondary education, a variety of retail, employment and other services.
Rural housing requirement	10768	Minimum rural housing requirement for NTV and STV, which represents only 5% of the Borough-wide housing requirement and are expected to be delivered through community planning tools, only approx. 40% of the Parishes have commenced the NDP process (through designation) and only 20% are active
Rural housing requirement	10768	A reduced figure of around 75 new homes through a mix of infill and sites triggering affordable housing contribution could deliver up to 30 affordable homes (enabling needs of neighbouring parishes to be met) and boosting supply in a sustainable rural area offering very wide access to education and other services
Rural Strategy	10139	Disappointed that the plan doesn't pay much attention to the rural parts of Test Valley and the issues they face
NDP Housing Requirements	10801	The provisions set out within this policy are relatively small scale, this leaves a shortfall of 220 homes for NTV and 212 homes for STV as set out in Policy 4. Housing developments should therefore be facilitated in these settlements
Spatial Strategy	10083	Focussing most new development in key settlements will result in services and facilities in other settlements decline

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	
Spatial Strategy	10080	These paragraphs indicate that the plan seeks to support and sustain communities whilst recognising that the Borough is mainly rural-the draft plan has failed in this endeavour
Spatial Strategy	10364	In addressing the Spatial Strategy paragraphs 3.14 and 3.15 indicate that the Plan seeks to support and sustain communities whilst recognising that much of the Borough is rural. It is considered that the Plan fails in this endeavour
Spatial Strategy	10364	The strategy will restrict the opportunity for new development in the settlements which need to grow to prosper
Spatial strategy	10364	Plan recognises that the strategic new developments around Romsey will require the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS). However, the Plan makes no such allocations within its proposals
Omission site	10364	Fairbournes Farm is well placed to provide the much needed SANGS, BNG and nitrate mitigation required for the new housing allocations in the south of the Borough. It should be considered for this use
Settlement Hierarchy	10101	Fail to recognise 'satellite' function performed by smaller rural villages surrounding Romsey, where proximity to Romsey allows use of services and onward travel
Settlement Hierarchy	11076	Rural settlements which are close to other larger settlements should be looked upon favourably for the allocation of additional housing and it is important to encourage development in these locations to support local facilities and services so they remain viable. This in turn would create a better dispersal of housing and enable rural villages and settlements to not rely so heavily on Romsey and Andover which are further away

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10213	Self /Custom Build development should be added to the table at Policy SS1 under 'Scale of Development' for all tiers
Flooding	10068	Would need to see evidence that the flood risk sequential test has been undertaken and that any sites coming forward which have been identified as at risk of flooding have passed the exception tests. Justification should be provided within the Local Plan.
Employment Land Requirement	10812 Romsey Town Council	Demand for B8 space in STV seems high given there appears to be empty units on some industrial sites; if the requirement is correct how is the shortfall to be resolved?
Housing Requirement	10091 (2nd response)	Less sustainable sites have been allocated in favour of more sustainable ones
Housing Requirement	10816	Object to the spatial strategy for delivery of housing in Southern test Valley due to the lack a consistent and equitable site assessment process in the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the suitability of sites.
Housing Requirement	10803	object to the failure to demonstrate a consistent supply over the plan period and the lack of a consistent and equitable site assessment process in the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the suitability of sites
Contingency	11096	Encourage the Council to work with landowners and developers to bring sites forward on a regular basis, as well as working in partnership with Registered Providers (RP's) and the development industry, as well as liaising regularly with key infrastructure providers
Contingency	11096	Ensure regular communication with stakeholders to ensure that any potential issues are identified at the earliest opportunity to ensure that the Local Plan is delivered rather than waiting for issues in delivery before undertaking contingency measures

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10342	TVBC have consistently over-estimated the capacity of large sites to deliver the completions assumed in its housing trajectories in recent years. The local plan trajectory is similarly over-optimistic eg it assumes that two of the allocated sites at Ganger Farm and Romsey By-Pass will be delivering significant completions as early as 2026/27, that is in only two-year's time and assumes that Velmore Farm will be delivering completions in 2028/29
Housing Requirement	10342	The Trajectory also assumes high rates of completions on the large sites and that the rates would be maintained over a significant period of time. This approach is likely to result in an uneven supply of housing particularly in the early years of the local plan
Housing Requirement	10817	An alternative strategy to allocate smaller housing sites, dispersed amongst Tier1,2 and 3 settlements to bolster and help maintain a supply of deliverable housing sites especially in the short term would be more a sustainable strategy.
Housing Requirement	11152	Further small and medium sized sites should be allocated, such as Land at Lambourne Close (site being promoted), to ensure that there is sufficient diversity in the market in addition to strategic sites
Housing Requirement	11152	Small and medium sized sites not only support small and medium sized housebuilders, but they also support those seeking self-build plots. Small site delivery is declining as opportunities within existing settlements reduce and therefore, a policy tool providing scope for small sites adjacent to existing settlements within the Borough would help to maintain a suitable supply of small sites.
Housing Requirement	10201	<p>Ensure that sites of less than 1ha are identified as allocations in the local plan or in Brownfield Register, and not include small site windfalls as contributing to 10% requirement in NPPF para.70</p> <p>Include sites of less than 1ha as allocations</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10201	Small site as windfalls are distinct from 10% requirement in NPPF para.70
Housing Requirement	10201	Further clarification that 10% should not include windfall development is in glossary where windfall defined as 'sites not specifically in the development plan'.
Housing Requirement	10201	If Council considers appropriate to split the housing requirement (Policy SS3) then need to ensure 10% of housing in each area is provided on sites on less than 1ha. 10% of housing in each HMA on sites of less than 1ha
Housing Requirement	10201	Important to recognise allocation of small sites is priority for Government to support small housebuilders by having their sites identified for development either through local plan or brownfield register
Housing Requirement	10201	Allocation takes some of risk of development and greater certainty that small sites come forward
Housing Requirement	10201	Recognise that allocating small sites and supporting SME developers ensures stronger supply in short term and improves diversity and choice in housing market, supports supply chains, innovation and jobs
Housing Requirement	10201	Failure to allocate small sites will contribute to continued decline in SME housebuilders
Housing Requirement	10201	More allocations of small sites would ease burden on SME developers and provide more certainty schemes will be permitted, allowing securing of finance often unavailable until permission is granted

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10126	Smaller allocations capable of addressing acute affordable housing needs earlier in the plan period are likely to be needed to ensure this policy is effective.
Housing Requirement	11108	With the possible exception of land South of London Road, East Andover, none of the strategic Allocations in the northern HMA cater to SME housebuilders in accordance with p.70 of the NPPF.
Settlement Hierarchy	10091	Smannell is a settlement within the open countryside according to the policy, yet it has a school, pub and church. The village can support a small linear development on its eastern side and this would be in line with P.83 of the NPPF.
Omission site	10091	The draft local plan should positively densify the Estates land as appropriate for development
Spatial Strategy	10139	The lack of commentary in this section regarding spatial strategy is odd due to the statement later in the plan in paragraph 5.467
Housing Requirement	10729	As no certainty of delivery of specialist housing, housing requirements is not sufficient to meet all the needs identified for the Borough over the plan period and the numbers proposed are likely to only delivery standard housing
Housing Requirement	10729	Note that there are no policies addressing the increasing need for specialist housing for the elderly where strategic allocations are unable to provide this. Provision outside of strategic allocations
Housing Requirement	10729	Well connected, edge of settlement locations can meet need for specialist housing for the elderly. Therefore suggest that specialist housing is permitted on unallocated sites

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Permit unallocated sites
Housing Market Area	10776	Housing strategy seeks to ensure delivery of homes is suitable and sustainable to meet identified local needs. The split of homes between the southern and northern areas of the Borough with 57% of the housing requirement being met in the northern area is a decrease of the current split of 67% being provided in this area
Housing Market Area	11076	Proposes to split the 11,000-home requirement into Northern and Southern Test Valley, with 57% proposed for the former and 43% proposed for the latter. Apparent the split is based on population alone and does not take into account other factors, such as affordability, designations and constraints and the need to disperse housing into rural areas as well
Housing Requirement	10779	The plan accepts the need for housing is in the south (paragraph 3.61) but there is a 57%-43% North-South split for development; why?
HMA	10120	Object to the approach of splitting the housing requirement between the two housing market areas, which does not draw support from national policy, which in itself does not disaggregate housing needs within an authority. If this were to be a reflection of where unmet need from adjoining authorities were to be supported, this would make sense.
Reasonable alternatives	10126	There are reasonable alternatives to the split of the housing requirement between HMAs that ought to have been tested. Therefore this is not an appropriate strategy taking account of reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence, as set out in paragraph 35 of the NPPF.
Reasonable alternatives	10126	A housing split of 57%:43% deduced purely on the amount of population in each HMA is not likely to comprise the reasonable alternative.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
HMA	10126	Reserve judgement on the final split of housing between HMAs until further analysis is completed on factors (beyond existing population) and reasonable alternatives have been tested through the next iteration of the SA.
HMA	10126	Suggest there are benefits to revisiting there HMA boundary change, with a view to reverting to that current adopted and consistent with that agreed by PfSH. Adopting two differing approaches is not conducive to facilitating constructive and effective strategic planning.
HMA	10120	Fundamental concerns with proposing a split housing requirement across Housing Market Areas, particularly as the Council propose to continue to treat them separately in terms of housing land supply calculations.
Employment Land Requirement	10125	There is no sound justification to support a north/south approach to the Borough assessing and delivering economic growth
Housing Requirement	10082	The formula for housing provision is not made in the plan but determined independently. Unclear how it fits into the overall housing strategy.
Housing Requirement	10120	The standard method identifies the baseline housing needs and only represents the starting point for the consideration of housing needs.
Standard Method	10139	Figures in this policy are based on the SHMA Standard Method which we do not disagree with but do disagree that TVBC are bound by this
Standard Method	10139	Figures in this policy are based on the SHMA Standard Method which we do not disagree with but do disagree that TVBC are bound by this
Spatial Strategy	10845	It would seem sensible to focus new developments in the central part of the borough around Stockbridge for an even spread of development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Distribution of development	11151	The actual approach adopted to housing allocations does not match the strategy in that no allocations are identified in Stockbridge, as settlement identified as having the potential for a new strategic allocation. This is a significant failure of the current plan.
Distribution of development	11151	The failure to identify any development at Stockbridge is plainly irrational given the tacit acceptance that growth in the rural areas is needed alongside the identification of Stockbridge as a Tier 2 settlement.
Omission site	10727	We are working with, Highwood who control land around the school. We are working with them on a development masterplan the implementation of which would result in benefits for the school
Omission site	10727	Object to the failure of the 2040 Regulation 18 stage 2 Draft Local Plan to identify the land for development in accordance with the masterplan
Omission site	10727	Given the very pressing need to address the issues as outlined we strongly urge you allocate the land in accordance with the masterplan in the next published version of the plan
Housing Requirement	11151	Stockbridge sits within the transition zone between HMA boundaries there if can help meet the housing needs of both HMAs as well as some of the unmet needs of the South.
Housing Requirement	11151	Concerned that TVBC continue to contend that there are not 'exceptional circumstances' to justify a higher housing requirement. Stockbridge is suffering from a lack of growth and acute housing affordability challenges.
Settlement Hierarchy	10389	Stockbridge is listed as having access to a police & fire facilities within the settlement despite the police only having an office within the fire station which is not open to the public, and therefore this cannot be considered as criteria for a tier 2 settlement.
Settlement Hierarchy	10389	Stockbridge does not have a good level of public transport, a vital consideration for classifying a parish within the settlement boundary which has conveniently been removed by TVBC so that Stockbridge is within a higher tier.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10389	It is strange that the level of public transport has been removed as a consideration from being an appropriate bit of criteria for a tier 2 settlement, especially as Stockbridge is the only Tier 2 settlement not to have good access to public transport.
Settlement Hierarchy	10389	At clause 5.9 of Regulation 18 Stage 2 document, Stockbridge is described as having all the key facilities despite not having a secondary school
Rural housing requirement	11151	Promoter recognises need to allocation some housing in rural areas but the quantum and approach to the rural housing requirement is currently ineffective. The quantum should be reviewed and revised upwards and the plan should look to allocate sites within relatively sustainable locations like Stockbridge which is the only Tier 2 settlement in the rural area.
Settlement Assessment	10110 Stockbridge Parish Council	Would like to draw attention to inaccurate way facilities available to Stockbridge have been described. Stockbridge does not have a secondary school and there is no police station
Settlement Hierarchy	10110 Stockbridge Parish Council	Inaccurate to characterise a small community of 350 houses as on the same tier as Chilworth, Rownhams, North Baddesley or Charlton. These parishes have far more residents than Stockbridge and are considerably closer to large urban areas that can provide other services and support
Settlement Hierarchy	10110 Stockbridge Parish Council	Stockbridge is a small rural community and although it provides services to other rural communities that still does not make it anything other than what it is - a small rural community

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	11151	Support the inclusion of a settlement hierarchy policy and support Stockbridge's inclusion as a Tier 2 settlement. The Settlement Hierarchy Assessment paper shows of all the Tier 2 settlements, Stockbridge is the most sustainable with all key facilities and the most secondary facilities. Welcome the recognition to it's role serving the more rural settlements of the Borough. However, this should be given more prominence in the plan and elevate Stockbridge's position and importance beyond other Tier 2 settlements.
Settlement Hierarchy	11151	Figure 3.1 illustrates Stockbridge's unique position serving the whole central area. Every other Tier 2 settlement is essentially a satellite to Andover, Romsey or Southampton. Stockbridge is of greater importance to the wider sustainability of the overall Borough than the other Tier 2 settlements.
Settlement Hierarchy	10727	Note that the background papers identify Stockbridge as the most sustainable settlement outside of Romsey and Andover. In itself, that would surely be grounds to identify it as a location for new development.
Settlement Hierarchy	10389	The distance measurement between The Grange and the shop facilities is the wrong place to measure from, and therefore the facilities listed (Waitrose) are actually within the parish of Longstock and not Stockbridge.
Settlement Hierarchy	10389	The other settlements in Tier 2 have far more justification to be within this category, due to population and access to Tier 1 settlements. Stockbridge has a population of 579 and is 10 miles from Andover and Romsey, whereas all the others are within at the furthest 4 miles from either Andover, Romsey or Southampton and all have a larger population.
Settlement Hierarchy	10389	Stockbridge can also be compared to the Tier 3 settlement of Broughton which is almost double the population and has the exact same number of facilities (4 key and 8 other) and has better transport links including regular bus services to nearby cities and Tier settlements in the borough, yet Stockbridge is judged to be in the tier above.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial Strategy	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	This strategic approach does not seem to have been applied consistently across the borough, development in Stockbridge although in Tier 2 and with a full range of services and facilities is limited to being permitted provided that its size is appropriate to the scale and function of the local centre
Spatial Strategy	10083 Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	This respects the local character of Stockbridge and would not have a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the local centre, no new allocation for new development has been made for the next 16 years
Settlement Boundary	10389	Longstock and Stockbridge are separated by the River Test and Salisbury Hill geographically and in terms of access as Roman Road is residential with no facilities and thus residents have to access Stockbridge via car.
Distribution of development	11151	Whilst there are constraints in Stockbridge such as flooding and heritage considerations, there are deliverable and available sites, such as that at Test Valley School, that do not suffer from any overriding constraint. It is not clear if any of the 542 homes identified for the rural areas would be expected to come forward at Stockbridge as a key settlement serving the rural area and this would be the most logical location for a large proportion of the identified rural housing. Provision of housing should be plan led through a specific allocation of housing rather than in an ad-hoc manner dependent on local communities deciding to take housing.
Settlement Hierarchy	10389	Facilities that are in fact in Longstock have been allocated to Stockbridge, affecting the assessment of Stockbridge within the settlement hierarchy.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	10389	The inaccuracies as to the settlement boundaries separating the parishes of Longstock and Stockbridge should be corrected and rationale provided for these settlement boundary errors.
Settlement Boundary	10389	Does not accept the response of the Planning Officer, as Stockbridge and Longstock are two separate settlements defined by their parish boundaries.
Settlement Boundary	10389	The Planning Officer described the TV School as part of "built up village of Stockbridge" despite being adjacent to housing, kitchen showroom and vet practice in Longstock, whereas the Waitrose shop/café/nursery are deemed too far from Longstock despite being within the parish boundary.
Settlement Boundary	10389	There are significant inconsistencies in the settlement boundaries, as the agricultural land adjacent to Waitrose would be considered outside the settlement boundary of Longstock but within parish of Longstock for the purposes of the Local Plan.
Settlement Boundary	10389	There is a confusion within the plan of the difference between the settlement hierarchy and the settlement boundary, they are different and there is no reason for the settlement boundary to include Longstock other than that it was done before.
Settlement Boundary	10389	The settlement boundary needs to be altered as TVBC are aware of the separation between Stockbridge and Longstock as the settlement boundary is not drawn around the Stockbridge and the TV School/Roman Rd area in one boundary but the latter has a separate settlement boundary drawn but including on the settlement boundary map for Stockbridge.
Settlement Boundary	10389	TVBC are causing confusion by producing incorrect settlement boundaries as Stockbridge has no claim to the parish boundary and Longstock are understandably protective over the parish boundary. If Stockbridge were to produce an NDP, then there would be direct conflict between Local Plan and NDPs.
Settlement Boundary	10389	The Longstock NDP which must be in conformity with the Local Plan - currently contradicts it as it includes an area that the Local Plan has included as part of Stockbridge. The Local Plan

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		acknowledges that the Longstock NDP will cover the entirety of the parish including two areas outside of the settlement boundary, yet still attaches the area to Stockbridge and has not reallocated for it to be within the Longstock settlement boundary.
Settlement Boundary	10389	There is no justification for Waitrose Farm to not be included within Longstock purely because of distance, as Longstock residents have to drive to Stockbridge as well as Waitrose Farm. The assessment is incorrect as it is based on geographical distance, as distance measures are going to be drastically different over the same distance in a rural village compared to Andover.
Settlement Hierarchy	10389	Urge TVBC to correct their judgement on the facilities that are within Stockbridge and Longstock and to remove the area of Roman Road and Test Valley School from Stockbridge and correctly place this area within Longstock - this will ensure that the settlement boundary reflect the draft Longstock NDP.
Housing Requirement	10137	Fully endorse this strategic allocation. It is pertinent that the majority of the strategic housing allocations in Andover have over delivered against their original housing trajectories demonstrating the strength of the housing market.
Spatial Strategy	10137	The Sustainable Spatial Strategy omits any reference to the strategic housing and employment sites at the largest most sustainable settlements. It is expected that these sites would have been referenced in the spatial strategy.
NDP Housing Requirements	10905	<p>The text is unclear and could be read to imply that 'made' and emerging Neighbourhood Plans are appropriate mechanisms for the allocation of strategic sites.</p> <p>Amend para 3.83: "By their nature Neighbourhood Plans are 'non-strategic' but nevertheless can contribute to meeting housing need by contributing to the provision of new</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		homes. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan but can promote more development.”
Housing distribution	10661	There does not appear to be any evidence or discussion of what would comprise a balanced distribution which would best meet the needs of Southern Test Valley and how each scenario performs.
Housing distribution	10661	It is difficult to understand how the proposed housing allocations achieves a balanced distribution in Southern Test Valley.
Strategic sites	10343	Strategy is over reliant on two larger sites to deliver more than 85% of all draft site allocation dwellings in southern Test Valley. There are often significant delays in delivery of larger sites which can result in the backloading of sites to the latter stages of the plan period. A continuous supply could be to disperse sites amongst the tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements to bolster and maintain housing supply.
Monitoring	10201	Welcome that Council will monitor delivery and if plan is not delivering new homes as expected will implement appropriate action
Tier 1	10126	Support the inclusion of Andover as the top tier settlement in the hierarchy. This settlement's role and functions extend beyond just the needs of the borough, which has rightly been accounted for in this classification.
Employment Land Requirement	10757 Basingstoke and Deane BC	Welcome ongoing duty to cooperate meetings on distribution and location of employment land allocations to ensure appropriate mitigation and infrastructure requirements are secured through policy.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Employment Land Requirement	10757 Basingstoke and Deane BC	Welcome ongoing duty to cooperate meetings on distribution and location of employment land allocations to ensure needs are met across the sub-region
Employment Land Requirement	10757 Basingstoke and Deane BC	Noted that plan supported by Employment Needs Further Analysis Study DLP 2022, which builds upon Employment, Economic and Commercial Needs Study Stantec 2021. Local Plan proposes to meet its economic needs through the protection of strategic employment sites along with number of employment site allocations.
Spatial Strategy	10757 Basingstoke and Deane BC	No objection to proposed spatial strategy subject to identified housing need being met during plan period and ensuring any impact of the plan on Basingstoke and Deane is suitably mitigated
Employment Land Requirement	10757 Basingstoke and Deane BC	No objection to proposed spatial strategy in relation to distribution and location of employment land allocations at this stage
Standard Method	10757 Basingstoke and Deane BC	Noted plan proposes to meeting its housing requirement in full based on standard method calculations.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Employment Land Requirement	10757 Basingstoke and Deane BC	Noted in Southern Test Valley that employment need met overall, but specific unmet need for warehousing that will be reviewed before consultation on Regulation 19.
Settlement Hierarchy	10729	Support inclusion of a settlement hierarchy which ensure consistency of approach
Development in the Countryside	10963	The plan protects open countryside and should continue to do so
Delivery, monitoring and contingency	10137	Policy which will monitor the delivery of the policies in the LP is welcomed. A monitoring Framework should be included as an appendix in the LP. Specific targets for the delivery of dwellings would strengthen the monitoring framework by identifying targets and actions.
Development in the Countryside	10776	Policy SS2 seeks to allow appropriate development in the countryside. Criterion a) of this policy allows development outside of settlement boundaries if the proposed development is allocated or allowed in another policy of the Local Plan
Development in the Countryside	10776	Section 3.45 confirms that the Council is committed to creating and maintaining sustainable rural settlements
Development in the Countryside	10776	Support the Council's aim for the spatial strategy and policies to seek to support and enable appropriate development in the rural areas of the Borough to meet local needs whilst ensuring that proposals do not conflict with the policies which aim to respect the environment

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Buffer	10362 Eastleigh BC	Note that Council is proposing 10% buffer above the identified local housing need (LHN) to ensure its housing supply position is robust and a buffer above 10% will apply to Southern Test Valley.
Buffer	10362 Eastleigh BC	Support provision of buffer for purpose of accounting for unknown delays in delivery
Employment Land Requirement	10373	Overall support the Employment and related Policies within the Draft Local Plan 2040
Economic growth	10182	Support for strategy of economic growth. The council should target growth in the Industrial and Logistics sector to boost economic growth and provide employment opportunities.
Employment Land Requirement	11108	W1 consider it appropriate to factor in the considerations set out in p.3.111 and concur with the delineation of northern and southern FEMA
Employment Land Requirement	11108	W1 concur that the growth at Andover Business Park is significant and a positive indicator of confidence in the local economy.
Employment Land Requirement	11108	W1 concur with the observed trend towards flexible working including increased working from home, self employed, smaller businesses.
Employment Land Requirement	11108	W1 support the minimum employment land requirement of 71.7 ha, with a minimum of 31.3 in the northern FEMA to be delivered over the plan period

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Consider additional employment /mixed use allocations to bolster supply
Employment Land Requirement	11108	It is noted that Andover Airfield Business Park is identified as a strategic employment site and is proximate to Abbots Ann where the site promoters site Land East of Duck Street is located.
Housing distribution	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Two evidence base studies have been commissioned and published to inform the amount and distribution of housing in the plan which we welcome.
Employment Land Requirement	11081	No objection to identified employment land requirements as informed by Test Valley Employment Needs Further Analysis Study, DLP 2022 as provides a finer grain of analysis
Settlement Boundary	10397 Chilworth Parish Council	CPC appreciate the value of the settlement boundaries which we agree to be a planning tool to direct development to the most sustainable locations whilst protecting the character of the countryside
HMA	10243 Stagecoach South and Go	We welcome this review and support the conclusion made as an appropriate one.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	South Coast Limited	
NDP Housing Requirements	10391	The allocation of a minimum of 10 additional dwellings in the Parish of Grateley is reasonable.
NDP Housing Requirements	10393	The allocation of a minimum of 10 additional dwellings in the Parish of Grateley is reasonable.
NDP Housing Requirements	10394	The allocation of a minimum of 10 additional dwellings in the Parish of Grateley is reasonable.
NDP Housing Requirements	10395	The allocation of a minimum of 10 additional dwellings in the Parish of Grateley is reasonable.
NDP Housing Requirements	10769	The allocation of a minimum of 10 additional dwellings in the Parish of Grateley is reasonable.
NDP Housing Requirements	10770	The allocation of a minimum of 10 additional dwellings in the Parish of Grateley is reasonable.
NDP Housing Requirements	10771	The allocation of a minimum of 10 additional dwellings in the Parish of Grateley is reasonable.
NDP Housing Requirements	10772	The allocation of a minimum of 10 additional dwellings in the Parish of Grateley is reasonable.
NDP Housing Requirements	10773	The allocation of a minimum of 10 additional dwellings in the Parish of Grateley is reasonable.
NDP Housing Requirements	10774	The allocation of a minimum of 10 additional dwellings in the Parish of Grateley is reasonable.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
NDP Housing Requirements	10750	There is no need for the 10 dwellings allocated seeing that the calculated housing need will be met.
Monitoring	10114	site promotor advocates the importance of closely monitoring delivery of the Local Plan and actively promotes positive working relationships to ensure that schemes do not become stalled
Housing Requirement	11108	W1 support the whole plan viability testing and do not dispute the findings; specifically that the requirement for 40% affordable housing is achievable.
Housing Requirement	11108	W1 applaud the fact that the views of the development industry have been sought during the formative stages of the plan.
HMA	10126	Given the role and function of Andover, it seems likely a case for greater emphasis on NTV remains, particularly in attracting and retaining a skilled workforce to underpin the economic growth aspirations of the area.
Housing Requirement	11108	W1 support the identification of contingency measures, in particular to review the SHELAA to see if there are any additional sites that could come forward.
Housing Requirement	10362 Eastleigh BC	Observed that latest proposed housing figure reflects Government's standard method at 550 dwellings per annum.
Housing Requirement	11108	W1 support the proposed Policy 3 (SS3) including the minimum housing requirement of 11,000 homes over the plan period
Housing Requirement	10133	Support overarching strategic approach, in respect of identified Local Housing Need
Housing Requirement	10133	Use of standard method is supported and consistent with NPPF

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10133	Given alignment between the SHMA and standard method, this demonstrates that minimum requirement set out within Regulation 18 Stage 2 consultation provides an appropriate basis upon which housing delivery over the plan period should be defined
Housing Requirement	10133	Noted and supported that evidence base including Housing Topic Paper do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances that would justify an alternative approach to assessing housing need
Housing Requirement	10655	support well prepared plan that allocates sites for housing that goes beyond the minimum requirement
Housing Requirement	10119	Support proposed housing requirement as a minimum of 11,000 homes (550 dpa) over the period 2020 - 2040, which aligns with the local housing need calculated using the standard method, and as set out in the Housing Topic Paper (2024)
Housing Requirement	10777	Use of the Standard Method is supported and is consistent with the NPPF given its alignment with the SHMA figure it is considered this is a suitable basis on which to plan for housing delivery over the Plan period
Housing Requirement	11076	SS3 confirms the housing requirement for the Borough is a minimum of 11,000 homes delivered over the plan period of 2020 to 2040 with an annual average requirement of 550 homes. We are supportive of the term 'minimum' which is in line with the NPPF and PPG, which explains the outcome of the standard method is an advisory starting-point for establishing housing requirement for the area
Housing Requirement	11096	Agreed that meeting the future housing needs appropriately is one of the greatest challenges for the Local Plan and the Plan needs to provide for the right number of homes, of the right type and in the right locations. There is also a need to ensure that as part of the overall provision, that the needs of different household groups are met, including affordable homes and for those with specialist needs

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	11096	Also agreed that to calculate a local housing need, the Government's Standard Method provides the starting point and minimum amount for establishing a housing requirement
Housing Requirement	10194	The housing requirement is supported - the proposed requirement for 550 dwellings per annum accords with the Standard Method
Housing Requirement	10182	Support use of SM but note it will need to be recalculated ahead of reg19
Housing Requirement	10816	The overarching aims of draft Policy SS1; setting out the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' are supported.
Housing Requirement	10816	The recognition of Lockerley as a Tier 3 settlement , and therefore a sustainable settlement in Southern test valley is supported and is consistent with paragraph 83 of the NPPF
Housing Requirement	10091	The SHMA evidence on AH indicates that an uplift to the housing requirement to 730dpa is justified.
Housing Requirement	10098 Southampton CC	Welcome work undertaken to meet its full housing needs
Housing Requirement	10119	Supportive of the Local Plan housing requirement being based on the standard method, as set out in NPPF, as a minimum housing requirement and starting point, unless exceptional circumstances apply.
Housing Requirement	10660	Support for the minimum housing figure of 11,000 homes over the period 2020-2040 to encourage the Council to be ambitious in allocating a sufficient number and variety of sites to boost the supply of homes in line with para 60 of NPPF.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10033	Policy SS3 is supported
Housing Requirement	10125	The buffer embedded in the housing supply figure I supported and demonstrates the Councils ability to accommodate additional growth above the standard method figure of 550 units per annum.
Housing Allocation	10096	Representation supports the spatial strategy and Policy SS6 overall, including the proposed allocation of the Land South of Ganger Farm site, and confirms the suitability and availability of the site for development. The principle of the site allocation SA4 is fully supported.
Housing Requirement	10133	Support in principle identified local housing need
Housing Requirement	11108	W1 support the proposal to build in a contingency of 10% above the housing requirement
Monitoring	11108	W1 support the inclusion of a delivery, monitoring and contingency policy.
Housing Requirement	10758	Supportive of new and affordable homes being built across Hampshire
NDP Housing Requirements	11108	W1 welcome the suite of tools being deployed to increase support and awareness of the options available in bringing forward community led schemes.
NDP Housing Requirements	10320	The use of neighbourhood plans as a tool to deliver housing is a welcomed policy.
NDP Housing Requirements	10938	Neighbourhood Plans should always be considered during planning processes as they give the most up-to-date information on local areas.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Standard Method	10028 New Forest DC	Government's standard method is currently 500 dwellings per annum. Note that draft local plan proposes housing target of 550 dwellings per annum apportioned into 237 dwellings per annum in Southern Test Valley and 313 dwellings per annum in Northern Test Valley
Mapping	10696 New Forest National Park Authority	Welcome the New Forest National Park being illustrated on these Figures.
Rural housing requirement	10768	Support the identification of the housing requirements being a 'minimum' figure, which is consistent with NPPF and reflective of the role that neighbourhood planning can contribute towards housing growth
Housing Requirement	11096	Supportive of directing the majority of new homes (95%) towards the most sustainable locations within the Borough (within Tier 1 and Tier 2 Settlements). However, the policy is unclear and lacks clarity
Settlement Boundary	10124 Andover Town Council	There is general acceptance of the need for settlement boundaries
Settlement Boundary	10074 Upper Clatford Parish Council	Supportive of use of settlement boundary for Tier 3 settlements and recognise this as a valuable planning tool to protect the character of Upper Clatford

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	11108	<p>Support paragraph 3.47 as it recognises that settlement boundaries may need to be set aside or enlarged to allow for community led development</p> <p>Introduce 'select strategic allocations' where these would i) enhance the range of facilities on offer and (ii) are well connected to the main towns or neighbouring urban areas to the scale of development for tier 3 in Policy 1 (SS1)</p>
Settlement Hierarchy	10213	Support the recognition given to smaller settlements in providing development is required in rural areas to sustain rural communities
Settlement Hierarchy	10813	The spatial strategy focusses development on the larger (Tier 1 and Tier 2) settlements and settlement boundaries are proposed for them and for Tier 3 settlements. In terms providing a framework for the delivery of sustainable development the approach is supported
Settlement Hierarchy	10814	Overarching aims of draft Policy SS1 are supported, which sets out the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development', in accordance with the aims of the NPPF
Settlement Hierarchy	10803	overarching aims of Policy SS1 are supported
Settlement Hierarchy	11123	The approach is supported.
Settlement Hierarchy	11095	Support the principle of the approach to locating settlement in tiers based in access to range of facilities.
Settlement Hierarchy	11124	The approach is supported.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10323	The approach is supported.
Strategic sites	10098 Southampton CC	Support approach to allocating strategic sites as can cater for higher density development, particularly when close to existing and future public transport modes and facilities, and can be more viable to incorporate into existing and future bus networks
Employment Land Requirement	10098 Southampton CC	Support extensive analysis undertaken to identify need or employment land.
Spatial Strategy	11108	W1 welcome the thorough exploration and testing of spatial options.
Spatial Strategy	11108	W1 endorses the proposed spatial options in p.3.11
Spatial Strategy	11120	the promoter strongly supports the council's confirmation that they will be pursuing a strategy that includes directing development to areas including Romsey, Andover and other larger settlements with the widest range and number of facilities at the core of the spatial strategy will continue to be a focus for development.
Spatial Strategy	11147	supports the detailed approach to assessing several spatial options and welcomes the proposed spatial strategy with Romsey and Andover forming the core of the strategy continuing to be the focus for development as well as a wider distribution of development to a larger number of settlements

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial Strategy	10181	strongly support the Council's confirmation that they will be pursuing a strategy that includes directing development to areas including Romsey, Andover and other larger settlements
Spatial Strategy	10181	support acknowledgement and through the Settlement Assessment work undertaken that the market towns of Andover and Romsey as the highest tier settlements in the Borough, with the widest range and number of facilities, will be at the core of the spatial strategy and will continue to be a focus for development.
Spatial Strategy	10605	spatial strategy generally supported
Spatial Strategy	10655	spatial strategy generally supported
Spatial Strategy	10611	approach to spatial strategy generally supported
Spatial Strategy	10778	Support the inclusion of this text within the spatial strategy to support rural communities, as it recognises their important role to play in shaping the Borough to 2040, particularly given the predominance of the rural areas throughout the Borough
Spatial Strategy	10796	Support the strategy set out at Paragraph 3.14 of the DLP, which whilst promoting a wider distribution of development than in the Local Plan 2016, focuses on supporting an appropriate level of development at the largest range of sustainable settlements where there are key facilities. This includes Romsey as a Tier 1 settlement
Spatial Strategy	10219	Support the principle of seeking to maximise opportunities to redevelop brownfield (previously developed) land, as set out at Paragraph 3.12 of the Draft Local Plan and in the Sustainable Spatial Strategy. This approach is consistent with national planning policy and is therefore justified and sound

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial Strategy	10219	Support the Council's recognition at Paragraph 3.12 of the DLP, that it is also necessary to allocate some greenfield land for development. Amongst other things, this reflects the fact that brownfield sites are often more constrained in terms of having higher land use values, increased costs associated with site clearance and decontamination, which in turn affects their deliverability and viability including the delivery of affordable housing and biodiversity net gain
Spatial Strategy	10219	Support the strategy set out at Paragraph 3.14 of the DLP, which whilst promoting a wider distribution of development than in the Local Plan 2016, focuses on supporting an appropriate level of development at the largest range of sustainable settlements where there are key facilities. This includes Andover (including Picket Piece) as a Tier 1 settlement
Spatial Strategy	10115	support is given to the focus of development being at the principal town of Romsey within Southern Test Valley, linked to promoting its associated regeneration programme
Spatial Strategy	10115	Romsey will continue to have a vital role in the delivery of new homes of all tenures in the most sustainable location with access to services and facilities - principal Town
Spatial Strategy	10133	Support in principle overarching strategic approach
Spatial Strategy	11161	Support the spatial strategy and agree with the continued emphasis on the key and most sustainable settlements in the Borough (Andover and Romsey) which should continue to be the primary focus for strategic development.
Spatial Strategy	11146	Support the emerging development strategy as the most sustainable option for the District, including growth at Ganger Farm, which is considered to be a deliverable option and which builds on an already successful development at Kings Chase.
Spatial Strategy	10213	Support this approach and welcome the recognition that an appropriate level of development is required in rural areas to sustain them.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10660	Support for the settlement hierarchy set out in policy SS1 and the primary focus of growth within the two Tier 1 settlements of Andover and Romsey, where historic growth has been focused.
Standard Method	10181	use of the Standard Method to calculate housing need and the commitment to meet the need derived from the Standard Method is supported
Standard Method	11147	agree with the use of the Standard Method (as required by the NPPF) to calculate housing need and the commitment to meet the need derived from the Standard Method is supported
Standard Method	11147	agree with the approach adopted resulting in a minor uplift from 541 homes at the Regulation 18 Stage to 550 homes to account for demographic changes and based on the latest information available
Standard Method	10181	agree that the Standard Method calculation needs to be regularly reviewed based on the latest information (for example updated affordability data).
Standard Method	11095	Agree standard method should be the starting point for consideration of housing need to ensure test valley as an unconstrained area boosts the supply of homes
Standard Method	11151	Support standard method. This should be continually recalculated to equate for any update figures that may arise ahead of the plan's adoption.
Standard Method	11120	use of the standard method is supported that needs to be regularly reviewed.
Standard Method	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We agree there are no particular strategic infrastructure investments or housing growth funding that justifies a higher number than that set by the Standard Methodology

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Strategic Employment Sites	10373	Support the principle of Policy SS8 (Strategic Employment Sites) and the inclusion of Test Valley Business Park
Spatial Strategy	10794	Support the spatial strategy being promoted.
	10900	The draft Local Plan allocates 95% of housing to the urban areas despite 20% of TVBC residents living in the rural areas which leads to over development of Andover and Romsey
Support	10661	Locating development at Romsey is supported.
Monitoring	10120	Welcome that the Council will be monitoring delivery.
HMA	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We agree with the HMA apportionment.
Spatial Strategy	10133	Support approach to direct strategic allocations to Andover, consistent with role and function of settlement and reflects wide range of services and facilities, including employment and public transport available at top tier settlement
NDP Housing Requirements	10818	Support the Council in expressly seeking housing allocations within neighbourhood plans
Monitoring	11095	Support the aspiration to monitor and deliver development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
HMA	10818	Support the rural housing requirement and proposed distribution by HMA.
Settlement Hierarchy	10343	The overarching aims of Policy SS1 are supported, which sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development, in accordance with the aims of the NPPF.
HMA	10133	Support in principle continued split of Borough into two distinct housing market areas
Windfall	11150	support allowance for windfall development along with other types of development contemplated in the policy
Employment Land Requirement	10098 Southampton CC	Welcome any and all efforts made by Test Valley to bring forward new sites for B8 development and contribution this will make to supply in South Hampshire region
Housing Market Area	10799	Agree the revised boundary of the Housing Market Areas. This is now a much better reflection of the housing in the Borough
Housing Market Area	11108	W1 welcome the proposed realignment of the two HMA's and consider the proposed delineation along the route of the A30 sensible.
Housing Market Area	10776	Support approach to housing delivery in north and south areas of the Borough and also support the different approaches in each Housing Market Area (HMA) set out in Figure 3.2 of the Draft Local Plan
Housing Market Area	10776	Understand that this change in split is due to the change in HMA boundaries and therefore support this. We also support the council's approach to use HMAs for the purpose of calculating the five-year housing land supply
Housing Market Area	11077	Encouraged to see that 57% of the housing in the LP is directed towards NTV, resulting in a requirement for a minimum 6,270 homes, and an annual requirement of 313 homes. However, a large proportion of new allocations in NTV (1,500 out of 3,790 units) is directed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		towards Ludgershall, an isolated location with all key services/ facilities located in the neighbouring authority
Housing Market Area	11096	Broadly supportive of the continued identification of two Housing Market Areas (HMAs) and the shift in % distribution between them. As proposed, the split between the HMAs would be based on existing population levels
Housing Market Area	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	The approach taken by the Council to effectively separate the two parts of the Borough to consider differing housing markets is a sound approach to take.
Housing Market Area	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	The proposal to provide for more housing within Northern Test Valley is supported given its better rail links however Southern Test Valley does include a greater number of Tier 2 settlements.
Housing Market Area	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	Network Rail note the strategic allocations as defined by the split in housing market areas

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Market Area	11108	W1 support the proposal to continue to apportion growth based on the amount of population to be sensible
Housing Market Area	10660	Support the plan approach to housing delivery in north and south areas of Borough in each HMA. We support the HMA boundaries shown for the purposes of meeting the 5 year HLS.
Housing Market Area	10660	It would be useful if the Local Plan set out housing need figures for each individual HMA, locally, linked to housing allocations. Some of the HMAs are much larger than others and some which are larger have the same number of smaller tier settlements. Each HMA should be assessed on merits and should be allocated proportional growth (eg Penton Grafton HMA/Longparish HMA).
Housing Market Area	10125	The approach of splitting the borough into north and south is not supported-development should be assessed at a borough wide level and focused at the most sustainable locations not subject to a geographical divide
Housing Market Area	10133	Support overarching strategic approach, in respect of continued split of Borough into two distinct housing market areas
Housing Requirement	10605	borough wide approach to housing need warranted
Employment Land Requirement	10796	Table 3.5 shows a residual surplus supply of B1a/B1b and B1c/B2 for Southern Test Valley between 2020 and 2040. On the basis that the Draft Local Plan identifies a surplus, it is proposed that Policy LE3 should be amended to reflect the current planning application and carried forward into the Draft Local Plan
Housing Requirement	10652	The plan shows a surplus of identified supply, if this is predicted why build more than needed?
Rural housing requirement	10243	There are already 492 dwellings committed in the rural area, assuming the bulk of these actually come forward over the plan period, well over 1000 dwellings would be built in Tier 3

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	or 4 settlements most of which have no credible choice for mobility other than car use which is unsustainable. Patterns of development should be “actively managed” in pursuit of the sustainable transport objectives in the NPPF (paragraph 108) for the rural housing element of the plan to be sound. This approach is evidently entirely passive.
Spatial Strategy	10778	Support that development should take place in sustainable locations, that there is a recognition of empowering communities, and supporting the viability of local village centres
Spatial Strategy	10778	Support the recognition of sustainability of communities and have access to the right facilities and services, and fully support the opportunity to strengthen the sustainability of communities
Spatial Strategy	10082	The LP rejects the guidance given by the NFFP to favour sustainable development through balancing economic, social and environmental objectives in order to limit the development of rural areas.
Employment Sites	10373	SS8 includes the whole of the existing Test Valley Business Park. Policy wording must, therefore, acknowledge and provide for the range of uses that are permitted or may be sought in future
Employment Sites	10373	This includes expansion of the existing Draper Tools facility as has been permitted through various planning consents. It should also provide for Roman House and surrounding land which has the potential for intensification and diversification of uses
Employment Sites	10373	The existing Business Park consists of (approximately): 8.75 HA Land Area, 20,500m2 of Class B8 Warehouse, 1,260m2 of Class E Office Space and Circa 180 staff and employees
Employment Sites	10373	Capacity for the following additional development with no increase to the current allocation: 13,800m2 of Class B8 Warehouse, 2,500m2 of Class E Floorspace and parking to accommodate all of the above

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Employment Sites	10373	Roman House is an existing Employment site with a single existing building in Class E use. The existing building significantly under-utilises the site and represents an excellent opportunity for redevelopment and to meet Employment Needs of Test Valley South within an existing Employment area
Settlement Hierarchy	10854	Paragraph 3.30 and 3.37 state that Tier 3 settlements must have access to all 4 of a primary school, food store, outdoor sports facility and a community facility. There is no food store in Thruxton parish so this would indicate it cannot be a Tier 3 settlement.
Settlement Boundary	11081	<p>As currently worded policy does not acknowledge proposed allocation at Thruxton Aerodrome for employment (Policies NA9 and NA10). This results in inherent contradiction between Policy SS2 and Policies NA9 and NA10 which allocate land beyond a settlement boundary, and Policy SS2 which seeks to restrict development in the countryside. Imperative this conflict is rectified and plan is consistent and clear</p> <p>Inconsistency between Policy SS2 and allocations in countryside under Policies NA9 and NA10</p>
Settlement Boundary	11081	<p>Policies NA9 and NA10 should be explicitly referenced within Policy SS2 under Criterion a). Alternatively, land covered by Policies NA9 and NA10 should be removed from the countryside</p> <p>Reference Policies NA9 and NA10 under Policy SS2 or remove allocations from countryside</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10856	<p>Support the policy that ensures Thruxton village remains in Tier 3 of the settlement hierarchy and retains its settlement boundary.</p> <p>The settlement boundary will need to be redrawn to be more accurate and remove the current allotment site and large verge at the top of Stanbury Hill and the roadway by the bus stop along with the service road on Stanbury Rd.</p>
Settlement Hierarchy	10854	The inaccuracies for Thruxton should be correct but I do not wish for it to be re-designated as a Tier 4 settlement as it is beneficial for Thruxton to enjoy a settlement boundary.
Omission site	11152	site promotion at Lambourne Close, Thruxton - field adjoining north-eastern edge of village. 0.81ha site
Employment Sites	11081	Sound and robust approach. Supporting text that site allocated against context of no surplus need (over and above existing supply) within Northern Test Valley, in line with NPPF para.86 to encourage economic growth and build in flexibility
Employment Sites	11081	Support and welcome strategic allocation South of Thruxton Aerodrome for development for employment uses
Distribution of development	10133	Save for proposed allocations at Ludgershall, spatial strategy focuses significant scale of development at Andover which is supported and supports role and function of Andover as the top tier settlement within the Borough and the only Tier 1 settlement within NTV sub area
Distribution of development	10133	Support ongoing recognition that Andover remains a focus for growth and that strategic allocations are appropriate as extensions to the town.
Spatial Strategy	10119	Noted that the largest site allocations in the plan adjoin the Borough boundary (adjoining Valley Park and Ludgershall) which is contrary to the strategy and focus for growth and

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		settlement hierarachy assessment. Provided sustainable, deliverable and suitable sites are available within the Borough, such as Manor Farm, Andover, growth should be focused and maximised where possible towards the main settlements where the greatest range of services, jobs and infrastructure are present.
Spatial Strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Additional greenfield sites adjoining Andover and Romsey is broadly supported however, we have serious concerns that providing relevant public transport choices to some of these opportunities will be practically impossible. The only credible alternative to car use would be cycling and the topography of many areas adjacent to the largest towns makes cycling challenging.
Settlement Hierarchy	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	The identification of Andover and Romsey as Tier 1 settlements is supported and opportunities for development should continue to be maximised as part of the respective Masterplans
Settlement Hierarchy	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	Andover and Romsey are identified as Tier 1 settlements and this is supported given the access to public transport

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10101	Support primacy of Andover and Romsey in proposed spatial strategy
Settlement Hierarchy	10119	Support SS1 in rightly outlining the towns of Andover and Romsey as the most sustainable in the Borough, identified as Tier 1, each with a full range and number of services and a high level of accessibility by public transport.
Settlement Hierarchy	10776	Support the settlement hierarchy set out within Policy SS1 of the Draft Local Plan and support the primary focus of growth to be within the two tier 1 settlements; Andover and Romsey, where historically previous growth has also been focused
Settlement Hierarchy	10796	Romsey is a Tier 1 settlement where strategic allocations are considered an appropriate scale of development under Policy SS1. The designation of Romsey as a Tier 1 settlement is supported
Settlement Hierarchy	10814	Recognition of Romsey as a 'Tier 1' settlement, as the most sustainable settlement in Southern Test Valley is also supported, appreciating its range of employment, facilities, services and public transport to support the residents of the town and wider area and as a focus for strategic growth in the south of the Borough
Settlement Hierarchy	10219	Draft Policies Map for Northern Test Valley shows the Site and wider allocation incorporated within the settlement boundary where Policy SS1 applies. Spatial Strategy Policy SS1 confirms that, There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the settlement boundaries identified in Settlement Tiers 1 – 3. Andover (including Picket Piece) is a Tier 1 settlement where strategic allocations are considered an appropriate scale of development under Policy SS1
Settlement Hierarchy	10219	The designation of Andover as a Tier 1 settlement is supported. Macra also support the modification to the settlement boundary to include the Site and wider COM6 allocation and the provisions of Policy SS1 which confirms the presumption in favour of sustainable

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		development, including strategic allocations, within the settlement boundaries of Tier 1 settlements
Settlement Hierarchy	11076	Agree that Andover and Romsey rightly take most of the development as the main settlements, the rural areas of the borough clearly need development to ensure the towns and villages have a future economic life with new housing to bring in new families to support schools, shops and facilities, as well as housing people can downsize to
Settlement Hierarchy	10114	welcome the recognition that housing is key to sustainable development and healthy communities and support Romsey and Andover at the top of the hierarchy.
Settlement Hierarchy	10803	recognition of Andover as a 'Tier 1' settlement, as the most sustainable settlement in northern Test Valley is supported
Settlement Hierarchy	11147	support the reassessment of the settlement hierarchy and agree that Romsey and Andover should be categorised as the most sustainable settlements in the Borough, supporting the needs of the wider population in Test Valley and potentially beyond the Borough reflecting the high level of services available
Settlement Hierarchy	10137	Fully support the identification of Andover at the top tier of the settlement hierarchy. However, its predominance over Romsey, in terms of size and function, would warrant its own tier or at the very least recognition as the primary/principal settlement in the wider borough.
Settlement Hierarchy	11120	the promoter supports the identification of Romsey within policy SS1 one as a Tier 1 settlement.
Spatial Strategy	10133	Support market towns of Andover and Romsey as focus of development as the largest settlements in the Borough with the widest range and number of facilities at core of spatial strategy
Spatial Strategy	10133	Support overarching strategic approach, in respect of continued focus within Spatial Strategy to direct growth towards Tier 1 settlements of Andover and Romsey

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial Strategy	10119	Support the spatial strategy in principle as a sustainable approach to development in the Borough with the market towns of Andover and Romsey being the focus for development, as the largest towns where there is the widest range and number of facilities.
Spatial Strategy	10777	The spatial strategy confirms at paragraph 3.12 the market towns of Andover and Romsey, as the largest settlements with the widest range and number of facilities. As such these settlements continue to be a focus for development which is supported
Spatial Strategy	10133	Sound approach that Policy SS1 supports strategic allocations as being appropriate scales of development at Andover and Romsey as Tier 1 settlements
Spatial Strategy	11108	The intent of the strategy is supported but treating Andover and Romsey as discrete settlements with no reference to their immediate hinterland is seen as a missed opportunity.
Spatial Strategy	10133	Support in principle continued focus within proposed spatial strategy to direct growth towards Tier 1 settlements of Andover and Romsey
Distribution of development	10799	Under this development strategy new housing will be steered by the Local Plan to Andover, Romsey and the Tier 2 settlements. The latter are focussed in the south of the Borough. This development strategy does not fit with the statement: The strategy will restrict the opportunity for new development in the settlements which need to grow to prosper
Spatial Strategy	10976	The plan should extend existing developments rather than destroying small villages with limited and exhausted amenities and infrastructure
Housing Requirement	11096	Nursling and Rownhams is a Tier 2 settlement yet the Emerging Local Plan does not identify any residential-led allocations within this settlement; acknowledged that the Land at Upton Lane will support approximately 80 new homes as part of a much larger employment allocation. To meet the housing requirement, it is considered that the additional residential sites should be distributed across all Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements to accommodate sustainable growth across the Borough

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	11144	Tiers 1 and 2 should get strategic allocations directed to these settlements. It might be expected that, because of their location within these higher order settlements each of these settlements would be subject to at least some modest new housing allocation level,
Settlement Hierarchy	11144	it is surprising that no new housing allocations whatsoever are proposed in three of the six Tier 1 and 2 settlements, which are the only settlements identified as being of sufficient size and sustainability to merit taking new development
Spatial Strategy	10988	Test Valleys strategy of allocating large scale development in Andover and Romsey is impacting the quality of life for residents disproportionately and villages are becoming less sustainable
Spatial Strategy	10004 Valley Park Parish Council	Test Valleys strategy of allocating large scale development in Andover and Romsey is impacting the quality of life for residents disproportionately and villages are becoming less sustainable
Spatial Strategy	10004 Valley Park Parish Council	Test Valleys strategy of allocating large scale development in Andover and Romsey should be changed to a positive allocation of housing in all settlements including those in Tier 1 and 2
Spatial Strategy	10986	Test Valleys strategy of allocating large scale development in Andover and Romsey is impacting the quality of life for residents disproportionately and villages are becoming less sustainable
Rural Strategy	11147	we consider it would be more appropriate to introduce an additional criterion to draft Policy SS2 that allows the release of additional and suitable land adjoining land of Tier 1-3 settlements in the event that the housing trajectory is not met

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	11108	W1 support the identification of settlement boundaries for tier 1-3 settlements
Settlement Boundary	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	Welcome the retention of settlement boundaries in Tiers 1-3. PC supports the retention in these tiers and that the principle of development is permitted within these boundaries
Settlement Boundary	10775	SS1 defines settlement boundaries for those towns and villages identified as Tier 1-3 settlements
Distribution of development	11151	It is illogical that smaller settlements with limited facilities and services have been given a housing requirement but no such requirements is provided to the most sustainable Tier 2 settlement at the centre of the Borough.
Settlement Hierarchy	10812 Romsey Town Council	Wellow and King's Somborne should be Tier 2
Settlement Hierarchy	11077	Only Stockbridge and Shipton Bellinger are freestanding settlements outside of both the New Forest buffer zone and the National Landscape. Overall, opportunities to deliver sustainable growth through the plan period in 'Tier 2' are very limited
Settlement Hierarchy	11144	However, three of the five Tier 2 settlements i.e. Chilworth, North Baddesley and Wellow receive no additional housing allocations whatsoever. This distribution of new housing thus fails to meet one of the key objectives of the Emerging Plan, and is not considered to be sound in terms of the good planning of the area

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial Strategy	10813	The SA and site selection process has resulted in the non-allocation of the site which adjoins a Tier 2 settlement with no over-riding constraints. Its omission means that there are no small sites proposed for development despite paragraph 3.53 of the local plan identifying the need for a sufficient supply and mix of sites
Settlement Hierarchy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We strongly agree that Tier 2 settlements are appropriate for strategic allocations.
Housing distribution	11141	It is important to ensure sustainable development across the borough by advocating equal distribution of houses among other tier 2/3 settlements. A borough-wide assessment should be conducted, as suggested by Paragraphs 27 and 48 of the Inspector's Report.
Settlement Hierarchy	11077	Clear that the majority of 'Tier 2' and 'Tier 3' settlements are highly limited in their potential to deliver sustainable growth through the plan period
Spatial Strategy	10799	objection to The absence of any allocations for development in Tier 3 settlements
Settlement Hierarchy	10818	Question how smaller suitable market and affordable housing sites can come forward in tier 3 villages, such as Broughton, without plan led allocations. Tier 3 are identified as settlements in the plan that may be suitable for windfall development - but there are very few

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		opportunities without a neighbourhood plan. NPPF highlights importance of smaller to medium sized sites in delivering housing and requires 10% of sites to be no larger than a hectare.
Distribution of development	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	We are supportive of changes made in the draft Local Plan namely retention of the settlement boundaries, lack of allocations in Tier 3 and focus on siting development in the most sustainable locations
Distribution of development	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	In the main TVBC has more successfully balanced the need for development with maintaining the more rural nature of the Tier 3 villages
NDP Housing Requirements	10832	Awbridge should only take the arbitrary 10 dwellings if all other Tier 3 settlements take the same minimum allocation and not just those with Neighbourhood Plans
Settlement Hierarchy	10660	Tier 3 settlements are considered to be non strategic in the plan and do not have allocations, but we encourage the Council to encourage more proportionate growth in smaller settlements beyond existing settlement boundaries, to meet local needs and support the rural economy.
Rural Strategy	11149	As set out above in light of the higher status of West Tytherley in the settlement hierarchy, it is noted that no allocations are currently identified in the draft Local Plan nor were there any in the Made Neighbourhood Plan. It is considered that there is therefore an absence of sites for the sustainable development of the identified key service rural village.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	10080	There are no development allocations to meet local needs in the Tier 3 villages-presuming that NPs will provide for new development
Settlement Boundary	10606	tier 3 settlements are sustainable and their settlement boundaries should be reviewed
Settlement Hierarchy	10080	Object to the absence of any allocations for development in Tier 3 settlements
Settlement Boundary	10801	No provision has been made for strategic allocations within Tier 3 settlements as they are considered 'non strategic'-the Council should support growth in smaller rural settlements beyond the settlement boundary.
Settlement Hierarchy	11122	Regulation 18 Stage 1 showed some support for growth in rural areas, but the current proposals have refined this so that only neighbourhood plans or community led schemes will be considered. It is considered that the decision to exclude allocations in Tier 3 settlements has not been adequately justified.
Settlement Hierarchy	11108	Object to the policy as the scale of development set out for tier 3 settlements is not sufficient to 'enable' growth.
Settlement Hierarchy	10101	Support recognition of Borough's rural villages as viable development locations in Tier 3
Settlement Hierarchy	10660	Suggest that Tier 3 settlements are ranked in more detail, with proportionate growth supported in more sustainable settlements. Weyhill is considered to be a tier 3 settlement but is very well related functionally and physically to Andover (a tier 1 settlement) and as such it should be ranked as a higher tier 3 settlement which can accommodate proportionate growth.
Settlement Hierarchy	10101	Support provision of Tier 3 Rural Villages as distinct category within proposed Settlement Hierarchy

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10812 Romsey Town Council	Tier 3 settlements should be given strategic allocations unless constraints make it impracticable. Parish councils have been invited to allocate housing by way of NDPs, it is feared this will be inadequate to achieve dispersal that maintains or improves village vitality and fairness of housing allocation
Settlement Hierarchy	10113	Do not think it would be beneficial to subdivide the rural villages into two separate tiers. This could potentially lead to more pressure to accommodate housing development in settlements which are considered 'more sustainable' and have been placed in the higher tier, while villages which fall into the lower tier will be deemed 'less sustainable' and less suitable for further development
Settlement Hierarchy	10778	Welcome the tiered approach to categorising settlements. Within Tier 3 settlements, Policy SS1 states that within settlement boundaries there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The scale of development appropriate for Tier 3 is listed as including windfalls
Settlement Hierarchy	10778	Support the scale of development considered appropriate for Tier 3 settlements. This will help achieve the Council's aspirations to sustainably grow the rural settlements, maintain their communities and support existing facilities
Settlement Hierarchy	11077	All Tier 3 settlements have an extensive Conservation Area which in most cases defines a large proportion of the built-up area and extends into the wider setting. Accompanying this are large numbers of important listed buildings
Settlement Hierarchy	11077	All Tier 3 settlements are valley floor settlements affected by extensive areas of flood risk, and ecological considerations around the river systems are also important constraints
Settlement Hierarchy	11150	tier 3 locations should also be the subject of small scale housing allocations to allow for planned growth in these more sustainable rural locations

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	11152	although SS1 states that Tier 3 settlements are suitable for a range of small-scale development including windfalls and community-led development, opportunities for such development are limited within the settlement boundaries, and as such the Local plan should include a mechanism whereby small-scale, sensitively designed proposals that are well related to the settlement boundary are able to be brought forward
Settlement Hierarchy	10606	further development should be provided around tier 3 settlements to achieve more balanced and sustainable development and avoid burdening Andover and Romsey
Spatial Strategy	11152	the Spatial Strategy should provide a policy tool to allow small-scale development in the countryside where it can be demonstrated that the location is sustainable in terms of access to local facilities such as a location adjacent to a Tier 3 (or above) settlement, and that development would be in keeping with the character and pattern of existing development
Spatial Strategy	10343	Recognition of Ampfield as a Tier 3 settlement and a sustainable settlement in southern Test Valley is supported, appreciating that it has a range of local services and facilities and that there is a need for some modest growth to support the village, in line with paragraph 83 of NPPF.
Spatial Strategy	11108	The role of tier 3 settlements should be recognised and encompassed within the list of tier 2 settlements as they enjoy a range of services and exhibit a degree of containment with proximity to the main towns
Settlement Hierarchy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We agree that Hurstbourne Tarrant and Ibthorpe, Shipton Bellinger and Wellow are now in Tier 3.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Development that would be considered appropriate in Tier 3 is anticipated to be small scale and justifiable to meet immediate local needs which we broadly support.
Rural Strategy	10612	Plan has no positive allocations for housing sites across all settlements, other than Tiers 1 and 2. Relying on rural parishes to draw up Neighbourhood Plans that include housing. Some parishes have no intentions for Neighbourhood Plans while others resist housing development. Villages and rural areas contain 29% of residents but told that less than 5% of planned new dwellings need to be in those areas.
Rural Strategy	10760	Rural settlements have largely been left out when allocating housing, yet those villages with schools and shops and communities could benefit from more residents. If major rural communities were linked to Andover, Romsey, and Winchester and the health services via regular bus routes this could fill in the missing transport links for a large part of the borough.
Settlement Boundary	10113	Object to the splitting of rural settlements into two separate Tiers as this could result in a disjointed approach and see some existing settlements lag behind others in terms of appropriate levels of growth
Settlement Boundary	10113	There is a clear benefit in providing for rural villages to include modest growth, relative to the scale of the village, which would meet the Vision and Objectives of the Reg 18 plan
Settlement Hierarchy	10101	Gap between Tier 3 and Tier 4 that could be filled
Settlement Hierarchy	10776	Encourage that the whilst the settlement hierarchy seeks to ensure proportionate growth is directed to the most sustainable settlements, small scale growth should be encouraged in

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		smaller villages to assist in sustaining the rural community and the existing facilities and services in these areas
Settlement Hierarchy	10113	Is our view that there is a significant difference between existing settlements with a moderate level of built-form and existing services and Open Countryside; the settlement hierarchy needs to reflect this
Settlement Hierarchy	10113	Disregards the fact that carefully conceived new development at an appropriate scale could enhance the sustainability of the settlement. Rather, we would prefer the settlements identified as part of Tier 4 to be included in Tier 3, with Tier 4 being reserved for Open Countryside
Spatial Strategy	10113	Would vitally ensure that the necessary housing, services and facilities can be provided to settlements in Tiers 3 and 4 over the plan period in a sustainable manner rather than prejudicing the sustainability and long term viability of settlements by adopting the tiered hierarchy currently proposed in the consultation draft plan
Development in the Countryside	11096	The underlying principles of the policy are generally supported. However, given the need to deliver new homes and jobs, it is considered that the principle of development should also be supported within Tier 4 settlements where the site is situated within the settlement boundary
Settlement Hierarchy	10818	Removing nine Tier 4 village settlement boundaries from settlement hierarchy will further reduce windfall housing opportunities in rural villages, where there is a need for housing in the rural area.
Settlement Hierarchy	10082	The plan recognises that the difference between Tiers 3 and 4 as marginal but still removes them from the hierarchy to countryside where housing development is restricted.
Rural Strategy	10799	the decision to remove the Tier 4 settlements which now lose their settlement boundaries. Strong objection is made to this proposed change which serves to further undermine the many rural communities on Test Valley.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Rural Strategy	11150	At present, the plan as drafted does not go far enough to ensure rural villages (particularly those which are proposed to be placed in Tier 4) can grow and thrive.
Settlement Boundary	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	The boundaries for Tier 4 settlements should be retained in order that a future opportunity for new dwellings can be considered in accordance with policy. Those villages may prefer to have options.
Spatial Strategy	10080	The councils strategy to remove settlement boundaries from Tier 4 villages will erode opportunities for development within the current Tier 4 settlement boundaries
Spatial Strategy	10080	The review of settlement boundaries has removed Tier 4 settlements that have since lost their settlement boundaries -strongly object to this as it further undermines the rural communities of Test valley.
Spatial Strategy	10080	Object to the removal of the settlement boundaries in Tier 4 settlements
Settlement Boundary	10113	Tier 4 settlements with existing settlement boundaries would have these boundaries removed as part of the proposals. We strongly object to this approach as this would jeopardise the vitality of these rural settlements and runs contrary to the Local Plan's Vision and Objectives to ensure the vibrancy of rural villages
Settlement Boundary	10113	While the approach to considering existing settlement boundaries is a useful starting point, we would object to an approach that defaults to the existing settlement boundaries as this would prevent and stifle the well-conceived and sustainable growth of rural villages, including the provision of housing and services to meet existing and future needs

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial Strategy	10364	Council is looking to remove settlement boundaries from Tier 4 villages. This will erode the opportunity to bring forward development within the currently defined settlement boundaries of the Tier 4 villages thereby depriving them of development opportunities
Spatial Strategy	10364	Arising from these changes to the review of the settlement hierarchy comes the decision to remove the Tier 4 settlements which now lose their settlement boundaries. Strong objection is made to this proposed change which serves to further undermine the many rural communities on Test Valley
Settlement Boundary	10314	It is wrong in principle to abolish the settlement boundary for the 9 Tier 4 settlements
Settlement Boundary	10314	Council proposed to restrict development within the existing settlement boundaries of these 9 settlements, so that windfall development would no longer be possible. The existing settlement boundary, and existing Local Plan was adopted on the basis that the suite of policies would afford adequate protection to the countryside
Settlement Boundary	10314	This has been the position for many years, leading to the reasonable certainty of planning outcomes referred to in paragraph 3.41 in the draft Local Plan, and creating a legitimate expectation as to those outcomes amongst communities, landowners and developers. The existing boundaries were developed following consultation with communities as to the precise boundaries which should exist
Settlement Boundary	10314	Council proposes a way which applies in blanket terms to 9 separate settlements without evidence demonstrating why windfall development in those settlements would have an unacceptable impact on the countryside
Settlement Boundary	10314	This change would prejudice the ability of rural settlements to grow and thrive and in an organic manner. The council was content that those developments were acceptable in terms of their impact on the countryside. This shows that small scale development can be accommodated in the village without unacceptable impact

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundary	10314	Wrong in principle to alter the established approach to these 9 settlement simply on the basis of an alleged failure to satisfy four prescriptive criteria, particularly where a) the consultation materials are misleading; and b) the methodology has been inconsistently applied with some villages able to rely on schools in other settlements, and some reliant on proximity to a larger settlement. There is a lack of robust evidence as to the need for this change and a lack of clear reasoning set out
Settlement Boundary	10799	remove settlement boundaries from Tier 4 villages. This will erode the opportunity to bring forward development within the currently defined settlement boundaries of the Tier 4 villages thereby depriving them of development opportunities.
Settlement Boundary	10799	objection to removal of the settlement boundaries in Tier 4 settlements
Settlement Hierarchy	10213	Settlement boundaries should be drawn around each settlement as with tier 3 settlements including those that have been classed in a rural cluster as Kimpton, Fyfield and Thruxton have.
Settlement Hierarchy	10101	Consider introducing additional flexibility to Tier 4 Countryside
Settlement Hierarchy	10101	Proximity of Lee, Ashfield, Abbotswood, Embley, Shootash and Woodington to Romsey makes them suitable locations for proportionate windfall development, over and above scale afforded to Tier 4 Countryside
Settlement Hierarchy	11001 Kimpton Parish Council	These proposed sites do not fit with the profile of a Tier 4 Countryside settlement like Kimpton

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	11001 Kimpton Parish Council	Concerned for the long term consequences on Kimpton and the hamlets of Great Shoddesden and Little Shoddesden brought about by the change in population distribution should this land be developed
Settlement Hierarchy	10113	The proposed hierarchy combines Tier 4 settlements with the open countryside. We do not support this approach as it does not differentiate the status of an existing built-up area, with a settlement boundary, and open countryside and would accordingly restrict the potential growth of Tier 4 settlements
Settlement Hierarchy	10113	Would like to ensure that the policy wording allows for housing and services and facilities to be delivered in settlements within Tier 4 where they can contribute to meeting the NPPF's aim of sustainable development and the vision and objectives for Test Valley
Settlement Hierarchy	10113	Urge the council to prepare a draft policy in time for the Stage 2 Regulation 18 consultation later this year, that is flexible and does not unnecessarily constrain the scale of development in Tier 4 settlements due to the current lack of services and facilities
Spatial Strategy	11001 Kimpton Parish Council	KPS do not understand how policies NA7 & NA8 have been proposed in direct contradiction to SS1 which states strategic allocations would be made in Tier 1 or 2 and not Tier 4
Settlement Hierarchy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	There is no credible justification for development in Tier 4 settlements apart from the smallest scale of infill, and individual dwellings needed to support locally based businesses. It is perverse to make provision for affordable housing in these settlements when each adult credibly will need to have access to a car at all times to participate meaningfully in society. We object to the proposed approach to Tier 4 settlements.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing distribution	10816	It is considered that an alternative strategy to allocate smaller housing sites, dispersed amongst Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements to help maintain a supply of deliverable housing sites, especially in the shorter term would be more sustainable strategy and improve consistency with the NPPF.
Settlement Hierarchy	10776	To provide and maintain a robust housing land supply, the Council should look to all settlements both in the hierarchy and in the countryside in sustainable locations to deliver homes through a range of small, medium and strategic sites
Settlement Hierarchy	10213	Object to policy SS2 as it overly restricts development in 'other settlements' outside tiers 1-3 and without a settlement boundary-rural clusters and the designation of settlements within a cluster as tier 3 settlements would overcome this as it would help support shared services and facilities
Rural housing requirement	10818	With the local plan as drafted, villages without a coordinated group to bring forward community led development or without a neighbourhood plan will have very limited opportunities to enable housing.
Rural Strategy	10729	Welcome acknowledgement that different tiers can accommodate arising scales of development, this policy is somewhat at odds
Settlement Hierarchy	10729	Welcome opportunity for settlements at Tiers 2-4 to deliver appropriate sites for housing in suitable locations.
Housing Requirement	10091	The Plan is unsound in particular in respect of meeting housing needs and the plan period.
Housing Requirement	10314	NPPF is clear that when relying upon such sites, there must be clear evidence that completions could begin on these sites within 5 years. No such evidence has been set out, and this must be rigorously tested at examination

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	11074	SHELAA indicates the majority of the large, strategic sites will not start providing completions until the latter end of the proposed plan period (years 3-6) and some will not be fully complete until next plan period
Housing Requirement	11150	The Council is relying upon sites with planning permission, allocated sites and 'identified capacity sites' as part of its deliverable supply. The NPPF makes clear that in order to be considered 'deliverable', there must be clear evidence that completions could begin on these sites within 5 years. No such evidence has been set out, and this must be rigorously tested at examination. 492 sites is 90% of the rural requirement over the full plan period – it is imperative that this element of supply is shown to be deliverable
Housing Trajectory	11096	Considered unrealistic to expect 90 homes to be delivered on two new site allocations in 2026/27. As this assumes the sites will obtain planning permissions, discharge planning conditions and obligations and construct the new homes within an incredibly short period of time
Housing Requirement	11074	Unclear how the proposed sites being considered for allocation in the Local Plan will assist in delivering the identified housing requirement in the timescales envisaged. This is important, especially when considering the requirements of paragraph 60 of the NPPF
NDP Housing Requirements	10750	The proposal of ten dwellings on this land in Grateley will have a negative impact on the traffic flow in the area.
Housing Trajectory	10201	Recommend Council set out in its evidence trajectories for all key sources of supply expected to contribute towards housing supply over plan period. Housing trajectory included in evidence, but no document setting out delivery expectations on committed sites, as well as allocations.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Housing trajectory and explanation to include details on delivery on committed sites, as well as allocations
Housing Trajectory	10729	Housing trajectory is skewed and majority of housing likely to be delivered towards end of plan period
Housing Requirement	10120	The Council must set out evidenced trajectories for all the key sources of supply that are expected to contribute to the housing supply over the plan period. There is no evidence accompanying the trajectory setting out delivery expectations of committed sites and allocations. Such trajectories are essential in ensuring that stakeholders, and the Council, can scrutinise the delivery assumptions and realities effectively.
Housing Requirement	10120	Question how effective monitoring can take place without a trajectory being included in the plan. Does not accord with paragraph 75 of the NPPF as the trajectory is not within the plan.
Spatial Strategy	10813	TVBC have consistently over-estimated the capacity of large sites to deliver the completions assumed in its housing trajectories in recent years. The proposed local plan trajectory is similarly over-optimistic e.g. it assumes that two of the allocated sites at Ganger Farm and Romsey By-Pass will be delivering significant completions as early as 2026/27, that is in only two years' time and assumes that Velmore Farm will be delivering completions in 2028/29
Spatial Strategy	10813	The Trajectory also assumes high rates of completions on the large sites and that the rates would be maintained over a significant period of time. This approach is likely to result in an uneven supply of housing particularly in the early years of the local plan
Spatial Strategy	10813	The proposed allocation at Upton for 80 dwellings, which is the smallest site is not projected to deliver any completions until 2036/37. Its delivery appears to be tied to the that of the employment allocations

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Spatial Strategy	10661	The Council have consistently over-estimated the capacity of large sites to deliver completions assumed in its trajectories in recent years. The proposed trajectory is similarly over-optimistic. For example, it assumes that two of the allocated sites (Ganger Farm and Romsey Bypass) will be delivering significant completions as early as 2026/27, that is only two years' time, and assumes that Velmore Farm will be delivering completions in 2028/29.
Spatial Strategy	10661	The trajectory assumes high rates of completions on the larger sites and that the rates would be maintained over a significant period of time. This approach is likely to result in an uneven supply of housing, particularly in early years of the Local Plan.
Spatial Strategy	10661	The proposed allocation at Upton is not projected to deliver any completions until 2036/37. Its delivery appears to be tied to that of the employment allocations.
Housing type	10937	Balance of 2,3,4 bedroom houses amongst large homes in rural communities needs to be restored. Include more locally driven controls on smaller homes when plans submitted to the LPA for extensions.
North Wessex Downs National Landscape: typo	10405 North Wessex Downs National Landscape	Downs' is missing from name in key add reference to 'Downs' e.g. North Wessex Downs

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Windfall	10139	Windfall allowances are low given past data for completions on unallocated sites, over the last 10 years completions on unallocated sites have averaged 228dpa in the north and 184dpa in the south.
Windfall	10139	The underestimation of windfall allocations leads to the unnecessary allocation of greenfield sites. If TVBC had a realistic windfall allocation and a more rational overall housing target, they would need a fraction of the greenfield sites being proposed.
Unmet Need	10120	Do not consider the Council's approach to be appropriate in that no unmet needs are to be factored into the assessment above the standard method.
Duty to cooperate	10126	Under the Duty to Cooperate, the engagement does not start with requests regarding unmet need. The absence of such a request does not absolve the authority of the legal duties. If such a request arrives late in the plan production process, and the Council have not tested reasonable alternatives to meet additional growth beyond the minimum local housing need figure, the Council have very little evidence to determine whether they can or cannot assist.
Unmet Need	11141	<p>Provision is needed in the local plan to ensure that the unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities are provided for.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.60 highlights important interaction with Havant Borough Council who have a shortfall of 2,603 dwellings - a portion of this should be incorporated into Test Valley's housing requirement. A State of Common Ground should be produced with Havant and NDFC.</p>
Housing Requirement	10181	will need to be reviewed ahead of Regulation 19 to ensure that sufficient housing land supply is planned for to meet the revised housing requirement arising from changes that will need to

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		be made to the plan, not least meeting unmet need from neighbouring authorities and an extension to the plan period.
Housing Requirement	10374	No allowance is currently provided within the Policy SS3 housing requirement to contribute towards meeting these unmet needs, including those that may be requested as part of responses to this consultation
Housing Requirement	10374	An additional buffer should be applied to the Borough-wide housing requirement to take into account the likelihood that more than one other local authority will identify unmet needs and request these be met within the Test Valley Local Plan
Housing Requirement	10655	plan should take into account additional need from neighbouring authorities
Housing Requirement	10119	Para 3.59 states there is no clear evidence of the level of unmet need in neighbouring authority areas, due to the slow progress of plan making and potential unmet need is not known. This is contrary to the Duty to Cooperate Topic Paper which sets out a formal commitment sought by Havant BC to meet 2000 homes, in Test Valley. There is no mention of discussions with other neighbouring authorities such as Wiltshire, Basingstoke and Deane and West Berkshire on any unmet need. This should be explored and set out in the Topic Paper to clarify. The level of housing requirement must be set at an absolute minimum with flexibility provided through site allocations over and above the requirement to help address unmet need and identified housing affordability issues.
Housing Requirement	10660	Plan refers to 2 evidence studies undertaken to inform housing number using standard method. We support this, but believe the Council should be more ambitious with its housing number, and also look to ensure, that unmet need is accommodated from neighbouring areas.
Housing Requirement	11096	Considered that the Local Plan as currently drafted has not been as positively prepared as it does not comprehensively address the level of housing need that exists within the Borough.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		There are unmet housing needs within the wider area that should be considered, and additional provision made to meet through this plan; and the plan does not appropriately respond to affordable housing needs
Housing Requirement	11096	Council must ensure that they engage with neighbouring planning authorities effectively and take into account any of their unmet needs when considering the number of homes to be planned for
Housing Requirement	10794	Query whether the proposed allocation at Velmore Farm, Valley Park (SA6) is to assist with the overall buffer and provide some resilience, or to help address unmet needs in accordance with the PfSH Spatial Position Statement and Statement of Common Ground - it cannot be both. As drafted the Local Plan and Sustainability Appraisal suggest it is for resilience, therefore what happens if the Council are asked to assist in meeting unmet needs of adjacent authorities.
Housing Requirement	11000	Test Valley seem to be adding developments in places where shortfalls manifest in other Council areas which is irresponsible planning and detrimental to those communities bordering Test Valley who have no rights other than to make a written comment. The use of such tactics seems undemocratic.
Housing Requirement	10660	Para 61 of the NPPF confirms the standard method is an advisory starting point and PPG suggests it is a minimum. To be positively prepared (NPPF, para 35a) the plan should go further to prepare to meet unmet needs from neighbouring areas.
Housing Requirement	10125	The approach taken by the Council to allow authorities with a shortfall to progress their own Local Plan reviews prior to accommodating any growth from them is not sound and does not assist in helping to meet unmet needs
Housing Requirement	10125	The draft LP sets out that the position on unmet need may change but it is not clear how the Council could go through the review of the draft with a set housing figure per annum and then increase it at a later stage.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10125	<p>The annual figure does not take into account the shortfalls identified in neighbouring authorities and should be updated to address this shortfall as the plan will not be sound if evidence is not provided as to why Test Valley cannot accommodate additional growth.</p> <p>Recommend increasing overall housing figure to accommodate unmet needs of neighbouring authorities</p>
Housing Requirement	10125	The policy should be reviewed to ensure that it is addressing both the housing need of the Borough and the shortfall from neighbouring areas
Housing Requirement	10125	It is concerning that there is only a 10% buffer planned for that doesn't consider unmet needs from neighbouring authorities, affordable housing need and need for a longer plan period to accord with the NPPF
Reasonable alternatives	10126	Given there are acknowledged unmet needs in adjoining Local Planning Authorities, it would be prudent for the Sustainability Appraisal to test higher growth options as reasonable alternatives. This will enable the Council to effectively respond to such requests prior to finalising and submitting its Local Plan over the next 12+ months. At the very least, it will demonstrate continued ongoing cooperation with adjoining authorities over such matters, in accordance with Section 33 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
Unmet Need	10776	The council must also look to and ensure that unmet need for neighbouring authorities is being accommodated with the Borough
Unmet Need	11076	Concerned that the draft Local Plan states that there are no exceptional circumstances that exist to justify increasing the local housing requirement. Meeting unmet housing need from neighbouring authorities can be one such exception

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	11076	Considered the draft Local Plan does not sufficiently demonstrate TVBC have undertaken their duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities or thoroughly reviewed whether they can assist with the unmet housing need in the area. This goes against paragraph 61 of the NPPF, the draft Local Plan in its current form is not positively prepared
Unmet Need	11096	Plan is not sound as the housing provision does not address the unmet housing needs within the region. To address this unmet need, more sites should be identified in sustainable locations and allocated for residential development within the Local Plan
Unmet Need	11120	TVBC should be meeting some of this significant unmet housing needs arising from their neighbouring authorities.
Unmet Need	11120	Test Valley have an opportunity to help address some of this need being an adjoining authority with no national constraints unlike New Forest District Council. Southampton have requested TVBC explore options for a higher housing number. Havant borough council have made a formal request for TVBC to help meet their unmet need of around 2000 homes. All of this points to an exceptional need for housing in the area which is continuing to remain unmet. There is insufficient evidence not TVBC has engaged and collaborated with its neighbours on how to address this cross boundary strategic matter.
Unmet Need	11120	Test Valley is the least constrained of all the PFSH authorities. The PFSH Statement of Common Ground identifies 2 potential areas of growth within test valley. This demonstrates that test valley is the most sustainable and suitable location for meeting a reasonable proportion of South Hampshire's unmet need.
Unmet Need	11151	The promoter maintains that TVBC should be meeting some of the significant unmet housing needs arising from the neighbouring authorities. The NPPF, paragraph 35 requires plans to be positively prepared and 'informed by agreements with other authorities so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated.'

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	10606	unacceptable to rely on possibility of review for unmet need at later stage undermining plan making process
Unmet Need	10605	discussions with neighbouring authorities regarding the extensive unmet housing needs must be undertaken at the earliest opportunity
Unmet Need	10655	discussions with neighbouring authorities regarding the extensive unmet housing needs must be undertaken at the earliest opportunity
Unmet Need	10611	discussions with neighbouring authorities regarding the extensive unmet housing needs must be undertaken at the earliest opportunity
Unmet Need	10096	Unmet need is changing because at present the adjoining authorities to south of Borough have not sufficiently progressed their Local Plan reviews. It is clear there is likely to be a need. This will evolve during the Local Plan Review process.
Unmet Need	10606	Objectively assessed need and cross boundary working (e.g. unmet need) must be taken into account to meet forecasted requirements over plan period.
Unmet Need	10606	current approach to ignoring unmet need of neighbouring authorities is flawed
Unmet Need	10606	inevitable that housing need will increase as a result of unmet need from surrounding authorities and work should be done to address this
Unmet Need	10605	concerned whether consideration given to potential unmet needs of neighbouring authorities
Unmet Need	10605	it is considered likely that LP will need to make provision to address some of Hampshire's unmet need within sub region
Unmet Need	10655	concerned whether consideration given to potential unmet needs of neighbouring authorities
Unmet Need	10655	it is considered likely that LP will need to make provision to address some of Hampshire's unmet need within sub region

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	10611	concerned whether consideration given to potential unmet needs of neighbouring authorities
Unmet Need	10611	it is considered likely that LP will need to make provision to address some of Hampshire's unmet need within sub region
Unmet Need	11147	TVBC has significant potential to contribute towards the supply necessary to overcome the yet unmet needs within their boundaries
Unmet Need	10201	Council must take into account any unmet needs that cannot be met in neighbouring areas when considering number of homes to be planned for Must take into account unmet needs in neighbouring areas in considering housing requirement
Unmet Need	10201	There are unmet needs in neighbouring areas that the Council must also take into account
Unmet Need	10729	Local plan confirms that it does not address the anticipated need from neighbouring authorities. Consider this position unsound
Unmet Need	11117	Council must consider neighbouring unmet housing needs in establishing housing req'
Unmet Need	10094	The plan does not properly consider how it could positively respond to help address unmet needs in the PfSH region. A review mechanism is not effective or positive, and could result in a delay to the plan's adoption if an Inspector considers that insufficient.
Unmet Need	10094	The council should engage with neighbouring authorities and agree a level of unmet need that will be accommodated in this plan.
Unmet Need	10094	Development to meet unmet needs should be located closest to where the need arises. This applies equally with a single HMA.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	10126	The Local Plan acknowledged unmet needs from other adjoining LPA areas. While the final quantum of unmet need is in a state of flux due to plan production stages, it is beyond reasonable doubt that there will be unmet needs.
Unmet Need	10201	Together shortfalls from Eastleigh and New Forest are over 8,000 homes between 2023 and 2036
Unmet Need	10201	Whilst expected delivery may increase in Eastleigh; Gosport, Havant, Portsmouth and Southampton are constrained by geography and borders drawn tight to urban edge, or for New Forest constrained by national park.
Unmet Need	10201	Essential to start planning now to increase supply of homes to address some of unmet needs from South Hampshire Essential to plan now for unmet needs in South Hampshire
Unmet Need	11117	Concerned about limited approach to identifying and assessing a higher housing target based on unmet needs
Unmet Need	11117	There are significant levels of unmet need in the PfSH region as identified in the Spatial Position Statement 2023. In addition to this Southampton will struggle to meet it's urban uplift requirement. TV could accommodate unmet needs in settlements such as North Baddesley.
Unmet Need	11117	Unmet needs should be assessed and planned for now, not delayed for a future review. This is unsound. The failure to seek to deliver unmet needs through the Duty to Cooperate means that the plan is not positively prepared and may not be found sound at examination. It would not be appropriate to review unmet needs through a light-touch review mechanism that wasn't subject to Examination.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	11117	In addition to current levels of unmet there is evidence of historic unmet needs in some neighbouring authorities (e.g. Southampton, New Forest, Wiltshire, Havant). The council should consider making additional allocations to address these needs.
Housing Requirement	10112	Council has published an SHMA which found here is no justification for increased housing numbers about the minimum standard method figure of 11,000 homes to 2040, or 550 dpa. However, at para 3.60 it is confirmed that Havant BC have formally contacted the Council to request help within meeting housing need. PfSH have also set out that in a PfSH Spatial Position Statement (December 2023) an unmet need of around 12,000 dwellings up to 2036, demonstrating a shortfall in the region. TVBC do not propose to seek to address any unmet need from neighbouring LPAs in this version of the local plan (para 3.62). The Plan is almost wholly reliant on proposed allocations to meet the identified housing need. This emphasis the importance of the Ludgershall site (Policy NA7) to help deliver 11,000 homes over the plan period.
Housing Requirement	10798	PfSH position statement - stage 1 requirement is set out in TVBC LP. The LP only meets its housing requirement (does not exceed it) and no justification for this is provided
Housing Requirement	10137	To assist with meeting unmet housing need from neighbouring authorities may result in a higher housing requirement
Unmet Need	11120	East Hampshire District Council does not make any contribution towards meeting the identified unmet need either. If every authority across PFSH takes this approach the shortfall will never be addressed.
Unmet Need	10362 Eastleigh BC	Would like to see it recognised that buffer could help meet unmet housing needs. With wider unmet housing need extending across the wider housing market area, all Councils in area will need to consider extent to which they may be able to meet these needs, recognising also national and other important local designations and issues.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Recognise that buffer could help meet unmet housing needs across wider housing market area
Unmet Need	11076	TVBC received a formal request from Havant Borough Council to help meet their unmet housing need. In addition, the PfSH latest Spatial Position Statement (December 2023) highlights that there remains a shortfall of 11,771 units across the PfSH Authorities. New Forest has the biggest deficit, totalling 5,652 units
Unmet Need	11096	Havant Borough Council submitted representations at the Regulation 18 Stage 1 consultation which sought a formal commitment from Test Valley Borough Council to provide 2,000 additional homes to assist in delivering the required number of homes within the PfSH
Unmet Need	10606	Havant BC acknowledged as approaching with request for assistance to meet unmet need but no provision in LP for this
Unmet Need	10605	Havant's unmet need should be incorporated into TV housing requirement
Unmet Need	10611	Havant's unmet need should be incorporated into TV housing requirement
Unmet Need	10655	Havant's unmet need should be incorporated into TV housing requirement
Unmet Need	10605	statement of common ground with Havant and NFDC should be produced to demonstrate how effective cooperation on key strategic matters has been undertaken, particularly in reference to housing
Unmet Need	10655	statement of common ground with Havant and NFDC should be produced to demonstrate how effective cooperation on key strategic matters has been undertaken, particularly in reference to housing

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	10611	statement of common ground with Havant and NFDC should be produced to demonstrate how effective cooperation on key strategic matters has been undertaken, particularly in reference to housing
Unmet Need	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	New Forest District clearly cannot meet its assessed need to 2036. Southampton City's formal assessment to meet needs to 2036 requires some substantial leaps of faith. We disagree the Council should assume no contribution to meeting the needs of these two authorities is likely to be required.
Unmet Need	10028 New Forest DC	Paragraph 3.63 commitment should be strengthened and elevated to policy status either within Policy SS3 Housing Requirement or Policy SS9 Delivery, Monitoring and Contingency. Strengthen para.3.63 to policy within SS3 or SS9
Unmet Need	10028 New Forest DC	Amended Policy SS3 Housing Requirement or Policy SS9 Delivery, Monitoring and Contingency, should require Council to specifically consider need to commence review of its local plan where a quantified unmet housing need has been established in a recently adopted local plan in a neighbouring local authority area. This will ensure appropriate mechanisms are provided within local plan to enable Council to respond positively to how unmet needs from neighbouring authorities should be addressed Amend Policy SS3 or SS9 to require specifically consider need to commence review of plan if quantified unmet need established in recently adopted local plan of neighbouring authority

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	10028 New Forest DC	Draft local plan acknowledges PfSH Spatial Position Statement (December 2023) setting out current level of housing needs and supply in South Hampshire, which identifies a current shortfall in meeting housing needs across South Hampshire.
Unmet Need	10028 New Forest DC	PfSH Spatial Position Statement (December 2023) indicates a significant current housing supply shortfall in PfSH area of c.11,770 dwellings
Unmet Need	10028 New Forest DC	Draft local plan explains national policy on unmet needs and current position as relevant to Southern Test Valley and evidence on any unmet need subject to position on neighbouring authorities progressing with their local plans
Unmet Need	10028 New Forest DC	PfSH Spatial Position Statement (December 2023) indicates a current housing supply shortfall for New Forest district against the Government's standard method of c.5,630 dwellings in the period to 2036. New Forest DC has commenced a local plan review. At this stage, extent to which local plan will be able to meet future housing needs is not clear, particularly when considering need for minimum 15 year period from adoption
Unmet Need	10028 New Forest DC	Acknowledge that, at this time, unmet need arising from South Hampshire has not yet been fully quantified and recognises difficulty for Test Valley in considering this fully in local plan at present time
Unmet Need	10028 New Forest DC	Welcomes paragraph that committed to undertaking a future review of Local Plan 2040 which can address this if needed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	11077	Directly neighbouring authorities, such as New Forest District, are currently showing a significant shortfall in the SPS, New Forest has identified a shortfall of 5,652 homes, likely to result in significant unmet housing need
Unmet Need	10201	Constraints faced by New Forest due to national park will require neighbouring authorities such as Test Valley to identify further land to help meet these needs
Unmet Need	10696 New Forest National Park Authority	At this stage, New Forest National Park Authority are unable to confirm whether there are any unmet housing needs. The New Forest National Park Authority will be commissioning work to evidence local housing need in the review of the New Forest National Park Local Plan Review.
Housing Requirement	10126	This paragraph is factually incorrect. Paragraph 14 of the Inspectors Report for the New Forest National Park Local Plan confirmed an unmet need of 460 homes existed. The Council confirmed it unable to assist, in part relating to the stage of their Local Plan production at the time. This has clearly changed and this should be taken into account through the SA as a reasonable alternative growth option.
Housing Market Area	11096	There is a need to apply a further consideration to Southampton, which is identified as a location for enhanced growth. This is a clear policy intent of Government and should be considered not just for Southampton City but also to those areas that are directly related to it. This should be the subject of assessment, and in our view would support testing of a 45/55 and 50/50 level splits, or a specific additional contribution
Housing Requirement	10243 Stagecoach South and Go	Notwithstanding comments on the plan period and the need to await evidence on unmet needs within the City of Southampton, we note and welcome the plan intends to meet the borough's housing needs in full.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	South Coast Limited	
Unmet Need	10098 Southampton CC	Note intention to meet housing needs in full and not seeking to export unmet need to neighbouring authorities.
Unmet Need	10098	Southampton has challenging housing target, including 35% uplift as one of 20 largest urban areas in England. Given tightly constrained boundaries continues to work on approaches such as increasing density and identifying opportunities for taller buildings in order to meet as much of city's housing need as possible
Unmet Need	10098 Southampton CC	If any unmet need identified Southampton CC will work with its partners at Partnership for South Hampshire, including Test Valley to find an appropriate way forward for resolving this in future update to Spatial Position Statement
Unmet Need	10120	Note table 1 of the PfSH Spatial Position Statement states the unmet need for Southampton is zero. Recognise the shortfall results from the 35% uplift which should be accommodated where it applies but it is still possible to meet the needs in locations that are adjacent to Southampton. Test Valley should be prepared to consider this.
Unmet Need	10243 Stagecoach South and Go	The plan is clearly not being progressed with a view to consider the undoubtedly difficult matter of how far unmet needs arising from Southampton (or indeed New Forest District) exist within the plan period. While we accept these needs are not yet demonstrated, it is clear

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	South Coast Limited	they are likely to be before this plan reaches Examination in Public, and quite possible prior to submission.
Unmet Need	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	we urge the Council to wait until the submission of the Southampton City Vision Regulation 19 draft and a formal indication as to whether or not an unmet need for housing requires accommodation within Test Valley
Unmet Need	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Southampton City's pre-submission consultation intended for Summer 23 yet to take place suggests the evidence behind the numbers in the SPS may not be dependable. We consider it to be premature to progress the plan further until there is clarity as to what supply can be relied on within the city of Southampton where its plan review to 2040 is advanced and where it is reasonable to expect this clarity to emerge at the publication of the pre-submission (Reg 19) version and its evidence base in the relatively short term.
Unmet Need	11096	Southampton City Council recommended that Test Valley should test a higher amount of housing than the Local Housing Need through the Sustainability Appraisal
Housing Market Area	10768	Important to note that their emerging Local Plan identifies overlap between the Andover HMA and the proposed Salisbury HMA. Within the Salisbury HMA the Wiltshire Local Plan is unable to meet the housing needs of that area, with 9,410 dwellings identified against an assessed need of 11,016 dwellings

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet Need	11108	The emerging Wiltshire LP states that any future need to further develop into Test Valley will be reviewed in future development plans an indication that the proposed allocations in the LP have not yet been fully considered or accounted for.
Unmet Need	11108	W1 is therefore concerned that the LP has not been positively prepared and is inconsistent with the NPPF. And P 61-022 of the NPG.
Unmet Need	10768	No allowance is currently provided within the Policy SS3 housing requirement to contribute towards meeting these unmet needs. Paragraphs 3.59 to 3.64 do not consider Wiltshire Council
Unmet Need	10768	Alternative approaches to deliver this unmet need of 1,606 have been suggested to Wiltshire Council, which include meeting this unmet need in Test Valley Borough Council; for instance, through the contribution of proposed allocations at Policy NA7 and NA8
Unmet Need	10768	The causality of any unmet needs for Wiltshire being met in the Borough will require a replacement quantum of development allocated to meet the minimum needs identified in the SHMA, and the upward adjustments previously described.
Unmet Need	10817	Paras 3.59 to 3.64 do not consider Wiltshire Council whose emerging Local Plan identifies an overlap between the Andover Housing Market Area and the proposed Salisbury (best-fit) HMA. With the Salisbury HMA, the Wiltshire LP is unable to meet the housing needs of that area. The alternative approach is to meeting this unmet need within Test Valley. Meeting Wiltshire's unmet needs will require a replacement quantum of development allocated to meet the minimum needs identified in the SHMA.
Unmet Need	10210 Winchester City Council	Winchester City Council supports delivering housing in excess of need however would encourage the Borough Council to confirm that any housing delivered in excess of identified need for the Borough will be available to meet unmet needs arising elsewhere in the PfSH area. This reflects the PfSH Spatial Position Statement which indicates that TVBC is an

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		<p>authority that should be able to meet and potentially exceed its standard method-based housing need</p> <p>Winchester City Council suggest that the supporting text could be altered to specifically state that surplus should be retained and if possible increased and allocated to meet unmet needs from adjoining PfSH areas.</p>
Unmet Need	10210 Winchester City Council	Winchester City Council understands there are no unmet housing needs arising from either authority (Winchester and TVBC).
Unmet need in STV	10120 Winchester City Council	In relation to the scale of housing requirement for Southern Test Valley, the proposed approach is not effective or appropriate. There is significant uncertainty over the level of unmet housing needs arising from the PfSH area which needs redistribution between the PfSH authorities. Test Valley will almost certainly need to accommodate unmet need from neighbouring authorities, and this should be factored into the assessment once greater certainty is provided over the quantum of unmet need Test Valley will need to accommodate.
Housing Requirement	10816	The draft plan is inconsistent with the tests set out in P.35 of the NPPF and at risk of being found unsound.
Spatial Strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go	<p>The draft spatial strategy should be amended.</p> <p>“Supporting where necessary, delivery of new or improved infrastructure and services which positively responds to its setting, local needs, and our changing climate, and facilitates</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	South Coast Limited	carbon mitigation, in particular for local mobility. Promoting access to the countryside and conserving and enhancing the Borough's diverse landscape character. Providing developments that secure substantial mode shift towards active travel and public transport and invest in infrastructure and services that robustly and credibly secures the highest possible use of low and zero-carbon travel modes both from existing and new developments
Settlement Boundary	10119	<p>The settlement boundaries outlined in the northern and southern policies map should be updated to reflect sites with existing planning permission (not only commenced permissions) and the new draft allocations. Failure to include allocations (most are located outside existing settlements) would lead to the spatial strategy being out of date at adoption and it is also unclear whether allocations are restricted by countryside policies.</p> <p>Amend all proposed settlement boundaries to include sites with planning permission and all draft site allocations.</p>
Additional sites in NTV	10126	There is justification to explore and test a higher housing requirement across the district, and particularly in NTV. There will be a consequential need to allocate additional sites to help meet evidenced need within the plan period. There are suitable opportunities to allocate additional sites around the largest tier settlement of Andover, where there opportunity to promote sustainable patterns of development is greatest, in line with paragraph 11a of NPPF.
Affordable housing	10120	Affordable housing needs are significant and the Council should consider an uplift to meet affordable housing needs, even if they are not met in full. This approach has been proposed and examined through the East Riding of Yorkshire Local Plan Review - recommend a similar approach is taken here to increase the supply of market and affordable homes.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Reasonable alternatives	10126	Reference the housing need and reasons for going higher than the standard method, having regard to the PPG and the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), do not agree with the conclusions reached. In relation to affordable housing, over the proceeding ten years, the median workplace-based affordability ration for the borough has grown indicating worsening affordability. The SHMA paragraphs 5.66, 5.96 and 37 consider the level of need. It is apparent from the SHMA that there is an acute need for affordable housing, that is unlikely to be viably met from the minimum local housing needs figure alone. It would be far from it having regard to the thresholds in policy HOU1.
Reasonable alternatives	10126	The Council indicates there is a lack of demand for the level of market housing needed to address the absolute need for affordable housing, by way of reference to the SHMA. Rather than assess reasonable alternatives to this, as a means to meet some, rather than all such need, the Council has concluded 1222dpa is an unreasonable alternative and used this to justify not exploring any uplift.
Housing Requirement	10126	The approach of not exploring any uplift to help meet affordable housing needs is unjustified. The Council have precluded meaningful comparison being made between other 'reasonable alternatives' that could assist with meeting some of the shortfall. Acknowledge there will be a tipping point before such uplift becomes unreasonable, based on market demand, viability and other evidence. However, to assert no reasonable alternatives to meet some of the needs is unreasonable and does not accord with the SEA/SA guidance set out in the PPG (Reference ID: 11-018-20140306).
Reasonable alternatives	10201	Surprising Council consider not justified to increase number of homes to meet affordable needs, when need for 437 affordable homes to be delivered each year
Reasonable alternatives	10201	To meet affordable housing need in full would be significant uplift to 1,222 homes per year and may not be justified, but must be recognised that need for affordable housing would justify an increase in the housing requirement even if did not meet the affordable need in full

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Uplift housing requirement due to affordable housing need
Affordable housing	10194	The overall (and acknowledged) shortfall in affordable housing that will be delivered by the current strategy suggest the requirement may need to be increased so housing requirement may need to be increased
Affordable housing	11095	Housing supply should be increased in Test Valley to significantly increase the level of affordable homes that will be provided.
Affordable housing	10094	The need for affordable housing justifies a higher housing requirement
Affordable housing	10094	Test Valley has experienced a worsening trend in relation to affordability so should boost housing supply to help meet affordable housing needs, at least in part if not in full.
Housing Requirement	10126	There is a compelling case for further land to be allocated to meet evidenced housing need at Andover.
Housing Requirement	11151	TVBC should carefully consider whether a 10% contingency buffer to their housing supply is sufficient to help make sure their requirement is met. The preferred approach relies disproportionately on new, larger, strategic sites, 81% of which are 800 units or more. Strategic sites are more complex, take longer and require significant infrastructure resulting in risk of delays in delivery.
Economic growth	11115	The case for economic growth should be set out more clearly in the local plan. Currently it is difficult to tell if any uplift is justified on economic grounds

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Employment Land Requirement	11119	A proactive and positive approach would be to use the higher Stantec Study figures. There is no justification for moving away from the Stantec study, approved at sub-regional level. There is no commentary on how sub-regional employment needs are being addressed.
Employment Land Requirement	11119	The Council is planning to take forward the lower employment need figure from the DLP study. This is not considered a positive approach. Question if the supply set out in table 3.5 is robust as this concludes there is no need for additional employment land to be identified in the Borough to 2040 and only one new site in Northern Test Valley is being delivered.
Employment Land Requirement	11119	The plan states that 5.9Ha of new employment development has been delivered since 2020. Support the notion that approach to employment needs will need to be flexible. However, this is not reflected within the wording of policies as currently drafted nor in the proposed employment allocations.
Affordable housing	11076	SHMA (2022) has assessed the affordable housing need as 437 affordable homes for rent and 215 affordable home ownership per year, meaning a total annual need of 652 affordable dwellings. The need for affordable housing has also risen by almost 50% since the last SHMA (2013), when the total annual need for affordable homes for rent was 292, therefore it is evident the need for affordable housing in TVBC is an increasingly significant and worsening issue which must be addressed
Housing Requirement	10817	The site promoter sets out why the Council should consider increasing the housing requirement above the LHN. 1. Responding to growth strategies that identify the NTV geography as an economically successful area resulting from strong population growth. These past levels can be sustained in the future through allocation of the site in Policy NA8. 2. Responding to unmet affordable housing needs that have grown between 2013 and 2022 SHMAs which can be boosted through a higher need. 3. Addressing unmet needs as Policy NA8 is located to compliment the emerging Policy 40 allocation in the Wiltshire LP.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	11078	The 550dpa figure adopted by the Council is derived from the Governments Standard Method for Assessing Local Housing Need and is reflective of the minimum number of homes needed. However, this figure is not reflective of the needs for specific groups, such as those who require affordable housing
Housing Requirement	11078	There is a need for 652 affordable homes per annum, of which 437dpa should be rented and 215dpa should be affordable home ownership. Once estimates of those in need currently in assisted accommodation are discounted there is an “affordable need for 292 homes per annum”
Housing Requirement	11078	292dpa equates to an annual requirement of 730dpa. This is based on the policy requirement for 40% affordable homes from market housing developments. This would suggest that the Council should be planning for at least 14,600 homes, split 8,920 in NTV and 5,680 in STV (maintaining the proportions of the eLP). The eLP should be revised to include additional site allocations to meet local needs including for affordable housing
Housing Requirement	11108	W1 fully supports the Councils approach in applying the standard method as a minimum housing requirement , but concerned that the planned level of growth is unambitious and does not reflect low affordability as identified in the SHMA 2022
Housing Requirement	11108	W1 fully supports the Councils approach in applying the standard method as a minimum housing requirement , but concerned that the planned level of growth is unambitious and does not reflect unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities as flagged by PsfSH SPS for the southern HMA
Housing Requirement	11095	Test Valley has capacity, in unconstrained and has excess suitable and available sites to boost housing delivery in the area. The evidence indicates housing supply should be boosted in the area. The Council choosing to not do this, is a lack of positivity.
Housing Requirement	10094	There should be an uplift to the housing requirement in the STV area to support economic growth and prevent economic growth in Southampton being suppressed.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10120	The Council have not considered it necessary to increase the housing requirement to increase the quantum of affordable housing delivered to the area.
Housing Requirement	11141	<p>Currently a deficit in dpas across Test Valley, 3 dpa behind the LPDF's 'standard method of assessing housing need' which suggests that Test Valley should be delivering 553 dpa.</p> <p>Should be factored into 'Table 3.1: Housing Market Area (HMA) Housing Requirements (Rounded Figures)'.</p>
Housing Requirement	10794	The delivery of affordable housing in 2022/23 is well below the annual requirement set out in the SHMA. While not advocating that the plan looks to deliver 1630dpa to meet the affordable need in full, there is a need for an uplift of the local housing need figure to boost the supply of open market housing and affordable homes to help address the affordable housing needs of the borough.
Housing Requirement	10794	Reflecting paragraph 37 of the SHMA, reviewing the local housing need would reflect strategic objective 13 of the Local Plan.
Plan period	11115	Changing the plan period to 2023/24-2040/41 would reduce the requirement to 9,900 but would also reduce the supply to 10,287, leaving only a 3.9% buffer. Supply should be increased to provide a 10% buffer.
Housing Requirement	11148	The plan should make provision for at least an additional 550 dwellings for the plan period, considering the potential of additional strategic allocations to meet this additional need within and potentially beyond the plan period.
Housing Requirement	10606	object as plan does not allocate sufficient land for housing development across Borough

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10606	Council has a duty to ensure sufficient land for housing will be allocated to meet the forecasted requirements over the plan period
Housing Requirement	11117	The council has demonstrated (through the HDT) it is capable of high levels of housing growth and therefore has the ability to accommodate unmet needs from neighbouring authorities
Rural housing requirement	10374	There is a clear requirement for Test Valley to take a more permissive approach through plan-making to deliver more affordable homes. A key way in which affordable needs can be met, at scale, is through an uplift in the housing requirement and widening the choice of allocations, particularly in the rural areas
Rural housing requirement	10314	The housing requirement (and specifically the rural housing requirement) needs to be increased, to ensure that the plan period looks forward 15 years from adoption. Furthermore, it is questionable whether the proposed rural housing supply is 'deliverable'
Rural housing requirement	11076	Draft Local Plan appears to simply acknowledge the affordable housing supply issue but has not gone far enough to address it. A successful method of facilitating greater affordable housing delivery is by increasing the overall housing requirement, particularly in the rural areas, which will allow additional affordable housing to come forwards through market-led developments
Rural housing requirement	11076	Critical that housing delivery is increased within the rural areas, including Houghton, to address the severe and worsening affordability issues. SS4 goes some way in setting out the rural housing requirement – a total of 542 homes, which equates to just 5% of the Borough-wide requirement
Rural housing requirement	11076	Policy should be allocating higher minimum housing numbers to address the current socio-economic issues in these areas. This will not only assist in reducing the barriers to rural home ownership, but also facilitate sustainable growth in the rural areas of the Borough to ensure they do not get left behind

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Rural housing requirement	11076	SS4 sets out the rural housing requirement, which is just 5% of the Borough-wide requirement and should be increased to make a meaningful contribution towards these strategies. In addition, it is not clear if any of the 542 homes identified for the rural areas would be coming forwards in Houghton (or Stockbridge), which are in close proximity to each other, and with Stockbridge being a key settlement serving the wider rural area. Hence this would be a logical location for some of the identified rural housing requirement and the draft Local Plan should be more specific in this regard
Rural housing requirement	11150	The housing requirement in the rural area should be increased and the purported supply needs to be shown to be deliverable
Rural housing requirement	11150	rural housing requirement for Northern and Southern Test Valley should be increased to address housing affordability issues in the rural area and to allow for rural villages to grow and thrive.
Rural housing requirement	11150	A significant portion of the borough is classified as rural, and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2022 makes clear that the rural area has contributed significantly to housing completions over the current Local Plan period
Housing Requirement	10655	several factors can render sites allocated as undeliverable and incapable of meeting housing targets
Housing Requirement	10655	physical constraints such as environmental sustainability, infrastructure deficiencies and legal issues like land ownership disputes can impede development progress
Housing Requirement	10803	although we support the inclusion of a buffer in the total housing supply identified at Table 3.3, to provide flexibility, it is not considered that the level of buffer identified actually exists and housing supply should be increased.
Settlement Hierarchy	10814	Policies SS1, SA4 and SA6 failing to adequately assess development constraints to propose sufficient housing land to meet the Borough's needs, the failure to demonstrate a consistent

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		supply over the Plan period and the lack of a consistent and equitable site assessment process in the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the suitability of sites
Housing Requirement	10374	Policy SS3 housing requirement should be greater than the minimum set by reference to the LHN using the standard method. The housing requirement is not positively prepared and justified taking into account the need to significantly boost the supply of housing
Housing Requirement	10374	An uplift to the housing requirement for the Borough is justified to take into account the high levels of in-commuting and the past successful role of economic growth being hand-in-hand with significant growth in population
Housing Requirement	10374	An uplift to the housing requirement for the Borough is also justified to give proper consideration towards how boosting the supply of housing above the LHN can contribute towards the demonstrable unmet local needs for affordable housing
Housing Requirement	11151	TVBC need to recognise the significant need for housing in the area and should seriously consider an uplift to their housing requirement to meet the combined challenges of unmet housing need and the affordable housing crisis. Failure to do this, risks accelerating the housing crisis in the district.
Housing Requirement	10605	object due to underestimation of housing need and requirement over plan period
Housing Requirement	10655	object due to underestimation of housing need and requirement over plan period
Housing Requirement	10611	object due to underestimation of housing need and requirement over plan period
Housing Requirement	10181	TVBC should carefully consider whether a 10% contingency buffer to their housing supply to help make sure their requirement is met is sufficient

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	11120	the outputs of the standard method should be updated and the minimum number of homes to be provided uplifted to reflect a later end to the plan to ensure 15 years from the date of adoption consistent with paragraph 22 of the NPPF.
Housing Requirement	10803	object to the policy failing to adequately assess development constraints to propose sufficient housing land to meet the Borough's needs
Housing Requirement	11147	TVBC should be ambitious and plan for a higher number of homes as it is vitally important for TVBC to "support the Governments' objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes" as enshrined in paragraph 60 of the NPPF. concerned that the timetable set out for the plan's production would delay the Council's ability to do so as set out
Housing Requirement	11147	TVBC should be ambitious and plan for a higher number of homes as it is contended that TVBC should be accommodating some of the unmet need of the wider sub region, particularly the South Hampshire region which has an established unmet need overall approaching 12,000 homes
Housing Requirement	10181	continue to be very concerned that TVBC continue to contend that there are no 'exceptional circumstances' to justify a higher housing requirement
Housing Requirement	10181	The factors resulting in our argument at the Reg 18 stage 1 consultation remain not just valid, but have worsened, making the imperative of increasing the district housing need higher
Housing Requirement	10768	Precise funding gaps are not yet known at this stage and may themselves indicate that an uplift in the housing requirement is required as these improvements are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally
Housing Requirement	10768	Noted that an overall housing requirement of 1,220 dwellings per annum is unlikely to be feasible, the evidence does not conduct a sensitivity analysis to establish the appropriate balance above 550 dwellings per annum that may be feasible; in doing so would contribute towards meeting the affordable housing needs

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10768	Policy SS3 housing requirement should be greater than the minimum set by reference to the LHN using the standard method. Housing requirement is not positively prepared and justified taking into account the need to significantly boost the supply of housing and the PPG
Housing Requirement	10768	Additional buffer should be applied to the Borough-wide housing requirement to take into account the likelihood that more than one other local authority will identify unmet needs and request these be met within the Local Plan
Housing Requirement	10768	An uplift to the housing requirement for the Borough is justified to take into account the high levels of in-commuting and the past successful role of economic growth being hand-in-hand with significant growth in population
Housing Requirement	10768	Uplift to housing requirement also justified to give consideration towards boosting supply above the LHN can contribute towards the unmet local needs for affordable housing. Evidence-base has not tested various scenarios except the absolute need, not a justified way to explain why the plan has been prepared positively
Housing Requirement	10768	Uplift in the rural areas is moreover required to address the matters raised for Policies SS4 and SS5 thereby increasing the housing requirements for the designated neighbourhood areas
Housing Requirement	10776	Two studies together with the standard method provided by the Government have been used to calculate the housing need over the plan period. Supportive of this method, as it is consistent with NPPF para 62 which requires strategic policies to be informed by a local housing need assessment when determining the minimum number of homes needed, we believe that the council should be more ambitious with its housing numbers
Housing Requirement	11096	Given the historic undersupply of housing and growing affordability issues within the region. This plan provides an opportunity to help address unmet housing needs in a relatively unconstrained location, where there are substantive opportunities to accommodate development in a sustainable way

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	11096	Calculated local housing need, based on the Government's Standard Method to establish the minimum housing requirements which equates to 550 dpa. To fully address the affordable housing needs, the level of growth required would need to be increased to 1,222 dpa, a clear indicator that assessments of higher delivery are necessary
Housing Requirement	11096	considered that the housing provision should be revised upwards. Exceptional circumstances justify the need to increase the housing requirement above what has been set out under the standard methodology. This should be the subject of testing in advance of the next stage of the Local Plan.
Housing Requirement	10182	The council should plan for higher than SM due to unmet need in the region, and due to the borough being less constrained than others.
Housing Requirement	10978	The annual requirement should be increased to at least 730 to address affordable housing needs
Housing Requirement	11115	555dpa will only deliver around one third of affordable housing need. There is a strong case to uplift LHN and it should be set higher, with further allocations made
Housing Requirement	11120	This policy will need to be reviewed at a regulation 19 to ensure that sufficient housing land supply is planned for to meet the revised housing requirement arising from changes that will need to be made to the plan to address meeting unmet need and an extension to the plan.
Housing Requirement	10137	The promoters assessment of economic growth suggest that housing delivery above the LHN figure would be justified.
Housing Requirement	10137	Making a more meaningful contribution to addressing affordable housing needs may justify a higher housing requirement.
Housing Requirement	11120	promoter is concerned that TVBC continued to contend that there are no exceptional circumstances to justify a higher housing requirement.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10119	Strongly support the provision of a minimum 10% supply in housing above the minimum housing requirement, which will help provide a sufficient supply of homes and maintain a resilient housing land supply across the plan period.
Housing Requirement	11161	The standard methodology is the starting point, setting out a minimum number of homes. However, as the Local Plan recognises there is a need to boost the supply of homes in NPPF. However, past delivery has been well above 550dpa, and an average of 709 dwellings have been delivered each year across the Borough from 2020-2023. As a relatively unconstrained area, Test Valley Borough should perform a greater role in helping to meet housing needs and the plan should be more ambitious.
Housing Requirement	11161	Housing requirement should be higher in order to both increase the level of affordable homes and make a meaningful contribution towards meeting the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.
Housing Requirement	10816	The policies fail to assess adequately development constraints to propose sufficient housing land to meet the Boroughs needs
Housing Requirement	10091 (2nd response)	The Housing Requirement is too low
Housing Requirement	10091 (2nd response)	The annual housing figures comply with the standard method output for LHN district and take into account the 2023 affordability adjustments but have overlooked reasonable adjustments for elements of additional need which may remain unmet by the plan.
Unmet Need	11095	The Local Plan is not positively prepared as does not address the level of housing need that exists.
Unmet Need	10817	In accordance with the PPG the standard method is a minimum starting point. There will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		the standard method. The conclusions in Paragraph 3.18 of the Housing Topic Paper are agreed that the Council should not reduce the requirement.
Unmet Need	11120	Test Valley should be proactively planning to meet the already identified shortfall. Failure to do this will undermine the soundness of the plan.
Housing Requirement	11095	Past high levels of supply of housing should not be used as a reason to stifle housing supply in this Local Plan. This shows there is a pent up demand.
Housing Requirement	11161	The SHMA has considered the level of affordable housing need, for example, with an estimated annual need for 437 rented affordable housing homes. This is notionally 79% of the current minimum LHN of 550 dwellings per annum. Para 63 requires plan making authorities to set a target for homes needed by different groups, as acknowledged in para 3.7 for the Housing Topic Paper. The Plan indicates that the level of affordable need is limited by that which can viably be delivered through the LHN target. However, an increase in total housing would result in an increase in affordable homes (as described in PPG). The affordable housing need is significant and should be a target for the plan through a raised minimum requirement.
Housing Requirement	11095	The evidence provided provides a sound justification to increase the supply of homes and enhance the buffer between housing needs and supply. Without which there will be substantial ongoing shortfall of housing and affordable homes.
Housing Requirement	10119	Note there are housing affordability issues identified in the Borough (SHMA 2022) and a further uplift in the requirement may be appropriate to address this need.
Housing Requirement	10794	It is important to note that the local housing need figure is a minimum starting point and does not produce the housing requirement as set out in the PPG (Housing and Economic Needs chapter). The PPG is not exhaustive in its list of examples for considering an uplift. Matters such as a high affordability ratio that is following a rising trend, significant affordable housing need, adequate buffer, are all sound reasons to consider an uplift.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10194	The Standard Method is based on the 2014 projections which have proven to underestimate population growth in Test Valley, as such there is likely to be a need for more housing than proposed by the Standard Method to support demographic growth so housing requirement may need to be increased
Housing Requirement	10125	Policy should be amended and include further strategic allocations at the key higher tier settlements
Housing Requirement	10798	although TVBC intending to make a significant contribution towards the unmet need in the sub-region through strategic allocations in their own local plan there remains an important role for emerging Local Plans to continue to set out to allocate sufficient land to ensure the delivery of the Standard Methodology housing requirement as a minimum
Housing Requirement	10126	Given the affordable housing needs are not likely to be met, and there is strong evidence of worsening affordability, there are compelling grounds to suggest and upward adjustment to the local housing needs figure.
Housing Requirement	10794	The reasons for uplifting the local housing need should be set into two categories, firstly those indicating an uplift is required for the borough itself, and secondly any uplift that may arise from meeting unmet need from neighbouring authorities.
Housing Requirement	10794	Considering lack of affordability, increasing affordability ratios, and how levels of affordable housing delivery there are clear and rational reasons as to why there should be an uplift in the local housing needs. This is compounded by the issue of unmet housing needs with the wider PfSH area.
Housing Requirement	10794	In order to ensure the Local Plan is soundly based, at the least the Local Plan should provide for the local housing need plus a 10% buffer - this would lead to an annual housing requirement of 605dpa. This would significantly improve the affordability situation, help deliver affordable homes, and help address the unmet housing needs of the PfSH area. Note

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		that the delivery of 10% more than the local housing need in the Local Plan is a different matter.
Housing Requirement	10342	The proposed allocation at Upton for 80 dwellings would be expected to be phased early in the plan period given its size. However, the Trajectory does not include any completions until 2036/37 which suggests there is significant uncertainty regarding its delivery, one assumes due to its constraints and relationship with the proposed employment allocation
Omission site	10120	Land at Flexford Road, Valley Park is available for development and is deliverable. Not expected to be any insurmountable constraints to the development of the site. Site promoter has a proven track record in ensuring delivery of sites. Welcome the ability to meet with the local planning authority to discuss.
Settlement Hierarchy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Valley Park is a highly sustainable location by virtue of services and facilities directly across the boundary, this is recognised by allocations within the draft plan.
Spatial Strategy	10080	Village design statements are not intended to be vehicles for proposing housing development, they make no provision for new development.
Spatial Strategy	10799	Village Design Statements are not intended to be vehicles for proposing development such as housing, shops or industry. They provide a useful indication as to what local people consider to be important in their community, but they make no provision for new development. They are usually pre-occupied with the history of the settlement and might offer some guidance on design aspirations

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Monitoring	10729	Important that plan tested for viability purposes, to ensure deliverable, with policy requirements refined accordingly depending on the outcome of assessment work
Site delivery	10655	financial viability concerns, changes in planning policy or market conditions may further hinder the delivery of housing on allocated sites
Development in the Countryside	10778	Council importantly note that much of the Borough is rural in nature, which further emphasises the importance of the Plan meetings its vision and objectives to maintain the vibrancy and diversity of the rural areas
Settlement Boundary	10799	the review of the boundaries of Tier 3 settlements has resulted in a reduction in the extent of the settlement boundaries. The review has seen very modest changes to include more land, but a greater number of reductions in the settlement boundaries as areas of open space, recreation ground, allotments and school playing fields are now excluded. It is only by permitting some growth in the settlements that their viability and vitality can be assured and they may be sustained in the longer term.
Settlement Hierarchy	11076	Consider the proposed settlement boundary and tier 3 status should remain, but also the proposed settlement boundary should be expanded. Including all three sites within the settlement boundary would be a simple 'rounding off' to the village with none of the sites protruding beyond existing built form
Settlement Hierarchy	11077	Although Abbots Ann, Upper Clatford and Anna Valley have good access to services in Andover, significant development allocations could involve 'rolling back' the gap, whilst new residents would be as likely to support facilities in Andover as in the villages themselves
shop provision	11150	rural shops - Government's change to permitted development rights, allowing change of use from Class E to C3 (via Class MA of the GPDO) has resulted in significant numbers of conversions in recent years. These rights have just been further relaxed, in March 2024, so there is even greater risk that local commercial services and facilities in the rural area will be lost

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10004 Valley Park Parish Council	The LP has no positive policies to maintain viability of villages nor any improvements for the villages struggling to maintain schools, shops and public transport.
Spatial Strategy	11161	Support proposed settlement hierarchy as set out in SS1 based on appropriate and proportionate evidence which is consistent with emerging proposals at Regulation 18 (stage 1). Ludgershall is not identified in Settlement Hierarchy or in Policy SS1 or on page 39.
Spatial Strategy	10777	Tier 1 settlements remain the most sustainable settlements and perform a key role in supporting the needs of the wider population in Test Valley. Set out within SS1 which supports strategic allocations as being appropriate scales of development at these settlements. This approach is supported
Spatial Strategy	10777	Spatial Strategy and distribution of growth within the NTV sub area is informed by an assessment, within the Interim Sustainability Appraisal, of reasonable alternative growth scenarios. The land south of Forest Lane, Andover is identified in the 'preferred pool' of sites for NTV for assessment
Spatial Strategy	11150	In general support the approach of ranking settlements based on their sustainability and directing the majority of development towards more sustainable settlements with more facilities and services. This does, however, need to be supplemented with small scale growth in the rural area
Spatial Strategy	10817	Reading Policy SS1 in isolation does not reference the locality of the allocated sites and as written does not support the scale of development in this location, or reference the functional links between Andover and Ludgershall. This issue would be resolved with a new category identified within the hierarchy designation to define broad areas of search confirming that the

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Ludgershall allocations are appropriate. This would be consistent with the Spatial Strategy Topic Paper that confirms Scenario 1 is the preferred growth option.
Spatial Strategy	10612	No positive policies to maintain the viability of villages, not to improve the viability of those struggling to maintain their schools, shops and public transport. Allocations could be made which are appropriate to individual settlements, led by community needs.
Settlement Hierarchy	10986	The LP has no positive policies to maintain viability of villages nor any improvements for the villages struggling to maintain schools, shops and ublic transport.
Settlement Hierarchy	10988	The LP has no positive policies to maintain viability of villages nor any improvements for the villages struggling to maintain schools, shops and ublic transport.
Employment Sites	10490	The proposal of Walworth Road playing fields as an area for employment is disappointing as the fields offer a safety barrier from the industrial site, as shown by the Ocado fire.
Employment Sites	10291 National Highways	Lies adjacent to A303 junction with A3093
Omission site	10605	Land Adjacent to Purbeck, Whinwhisle Road, East Wellow should be considered for residential development
Omission site	10120	Land off Romsey Road, West Wellow is available for development and is deliverable. Not expected to be any insurmountable constraints to the development of the site. Site promoter has a proven track record in ensuring delivery of sites. Welcome the ability to meet with the local planning authority to discuss.
Omission site	10120	Land at Lodge Farm, Romsey should be considered as an additional site that can help meet unmet needs as well as local needs in a suitable, sustainable location. The site scores

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		comparably with the chosen allocations through the Sustainability Appraisal and therefore should be selected ahead of the Regulation 19 draft plan.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Point 3.30 states that access to a community facility is a requirement for Tier 3 - there is only one bus for East Wellow residents to take to West Wellow which runs every 2 hours, and not in the evenings or Sundays in order to access a community facility.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Point 3.30 states that access to a community facility is a requirement for Tier 3 - it is a minimum 20 min walk along busy, unsafe roads for pedestrians to the nearest community facility.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Point 3.30 states that access to a community facility is a requirement for Tier 3 - whilst St Margaret's of Antioch church is situated in East Wellow, West Wellow residents have far better access via footpaths than East Wellow residents and driving is also safer from West Wellow. The lack of access to the historical church also impacts tourism in the area.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Point 3.30 states that access to a food store, such as a village shop is a requirement for Tier 3 - there is no access to a pharmacy or Doctors' service in East Wellow, whereas West Wellow has a pharmacy.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Point 3.30 states that access to outdoor sports facilities is a requirement for Tier 3 - there is only one bus for East Wellow residents to take to West Wellow which runs every 2 hours, and not in the evenings or Sundays in order to access an outdoor sports facility.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Point 3.30 states that access to outdoor sports facilities is a requirement for Tier 3 - it is a minimum 20 min walk along busy, unsafe roads for pedestrians to the nearest outdoor sport facilities.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Para 3.35 states Wellow has been reclassified as Tier 3 from Tier 2 which should only apply to West Wellow, whereas East Wellow should be reclassified as Tier 4 due to a lack of services and facilities.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Point 3.30 states that access to a primary school is a requirement for Tier 3 - the bus stop nearest to East Wellow is dangerous to access for school children who are travelling to local grammar schools when crossing the A36 which has no pedestrian crossing.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Whilst level of public transport has been removed from the methodology, the fact that East Wellow residents can only access a bus that runs once every two hours is reasonable justification that it should be placed in Tier 4.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Whilst level of public transport has been removed from the methodology, West Wellow has access to the National Express services connected directly to London Victoria which East Wellow does not, showing that East Wellow should be placed in Tier 4.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Whilst level of public transport has been removed from the methodology, walking to West Wellow from East Wellow is a minimum 20 min walk along busy, unsafe roads for pedestrians and the bus stop nearest to East Wellow is dangerous to access for school children who are travelling to local grammar schools when crossing the A36 which has no pedestrian crossing, showing that East Wellow should be placed in Tier 4.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Whilst level of public transport has been removed from the methodology, alternatives such as driving along Whinwistle Rd to access West Wellow can be extremely busy and dangerous, meaning East Wellow is further isolated and another reason it should be given Tier 4 settlement status.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Point 3.30 states that access to a primary school is a requirement for Tier 3 - East Wellow does not have its own primary school and children have to be driven to West Wellow to attend the primary school there.
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Point 3.30 states that access to a food store, such as a village shop is a requirement for Tier 3 - there is only one bus for East Wellow residents to take to West Wellow which runs every 2 hours, and not in the evenings or Sundays in order to access a food shop.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Point 3.30 states that access to a food store, such as a village shop is a requirement for Tier 3 - it is a minimum 20 min walk along busy, unsafe roads for pedestrians to the nearest shop in West Wellow.
Settlement Boundary	10839	<p>Became aware in the Wellow Neighbourhood Plan that a settlement boundary had been drawn across our land. Advised by Senior Neighbourhood Planning Officer SH that was approved as part of the adoption of the revised local plan 2016. OS maps physical boundaries not physical boundaries - installed fence in line with the azure line on the second map so the OS map is correct. However, the settlement boundary does not follow the OS map contrary to what was told by TVBC.</p> <p>Request that the settlement boundary is redrawn so that it does not segment our land. Suggest that the boundary redrawn as shown in black in section 3 of the attached document.</p>
Settlement Hierarchy	11121	Object to the fact that West Wellow has been reclassified as a Tier 3 settlement, despite being regarded as a Tier 2 settlement at Regulation 18 Stage 1 which has not been properly explained or justified in the draft plan or SA. Maurys Mount would otherwise have been included in the Stage 5 assessment.
Settlement Hierarchy	11121	Failure to allocate housing through the LP process where a Neighbourhood Plan is in place or being prepared will mean an under provision of housing in these areas. Identified need for new housing in Wellow.
Settlement Hierarchy	10120	In the absence of robust evidence to support the change in methodology, consider that Wellow should be reconsidered as a Tier 2 settlement to reflect the current level of sustainability and facilitate the growth required to ensure the continued vitality and viability of the settlement.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
NDP Housing Requirements	10120	Only 20 dwellings at Wellow is contrary to paragraph 83 of NPPF.
NDP Housing Requirements	10120	The emerging housing requirement, significant potential for unmet needs arising from neighbouring authorities and demographic analysis justifies a change in circumstance; therefore an uplift in the housing requirement for Wellow.
NDP Housing Requirements	10120	If Wellow had remained a Tier 2 settlement (as it is considered it should), this would justify a higher level of growth in accordance with the settlement hierarchy status.
Wellow housing figure	10120	The use of a flawed and unjustified methodology has resulted in the Neighbourhood Plan requirement for Wellow being replicated and no due consideration to the actual needs of the settlement.
Wellow housing figure	10120	A top-down apportionment of housing need can be conducted for Wellow parish using various approaches and data. Three scenarios have been tested based on apportionment of the Rural Test Valley figure, adopted Northern Test Valley requirement, and emerging Northern Test Valley figure.
Wellow housing figure	10120	For Wellow, using a top down apportionment using the Rural Test Valley requirement to 2040, allowing for the parish population, a fair share approach and accounting for past completions, the minimum requirement would be 87 dwellings for the plan period.
Wellow housing figure	10120	For Wellow, using a top down apportionment using the adopted Northern Test Valley requirement up to 2040, maintaining Wellow's settlement status, the parish population, a fairshare approach, and an allowance for an annual completion rate, 260 dwellings would be needed over the plan period.
Wellow housing figure	10120	For Wellow, using a top down apportionment using the emerging Northern Test Valley requirement to 2040, the parish population, and a fair share approach, 235 dwellings would be needed over the plan period.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Wellow housing figure	10120	The Wellow Neighbourhood Plan requirement for 20 dwellings is contrary to the housing needs evidence and should be reconsidered. Also, the figure is based on the minimum housing requirement of 11000 dwellings before the consideration of unmet needs, therefore once such needs have been considered the number may be higher. The Wellow housing figure should be recalculated using the latest housing needs assessment and considering Wellow as a sustainable settlement either within the rural housing needs or the housing needs for Northern Test Valley.
Omission site	10082	The Norman Court Estate would be a modest housing scheme - the site is relatively well screened from the road and impact on character of area is minimal.
Omission site	10082	The Norman Court Estate would be a good settlement for some employment uses which would greatly assist the village - the site is relatively well screened from the road and impact on character of area is minimal.
Settlement Assessment	11149	West Tytherley is tier 3 and is in a Tier above thirty-eight less sustainable settlements (in Tier 4 and 5).
Settlement Assessment	11149	west tytherley was classified as a rural village in Local Plan 2016 and the changes proposed are a really important distinction being made by the Planning Policy team and we fully endorse their approach to undertaking a more relevant study of the services provided in rural locations and seeking to identify the most sustainable locations in line with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework
Settlement Boundary	11149	The extant settlement boundary to the north and west of Land at Church Lane, West Tytherley is considered to be artificially located given that the site is also bound to the south by the village cemetery and not open countryside.
Settlement Boundary	11149	The recent planning consent for 13 new houses 16/01607/FULLS to the east boundary of Land at Church Lane, West Tytherley changes the use of the land to the east from

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		agricultural to residential which in settlement terms effectively also changes the settlement area.
Settlement Boundary	11149	The new development to the east of Land at Church Lane, West Tytherley also connects to existing residential properties to the southeast which benefit from protection under the Conservation Area allocation and the immediate dwellings are Listed Buildings
Settlement Boundary	11149	request that the Land at Church Lane, West Tytherley is included as an allocation and as such the SBR be undertaken to include the proposed site.
Settlement Boundary	11149	the permitted site is only 42 metres from the settlement boundary, which is significantly less than the housing which is in a separate parcel of land allocated as part of the settlement boundary to the southwest of west tytherley, whereby there is a gap of 65 metres
Settlement Boundary	11149	requested that the proposed site allocation Land at Church Lane, West Tytherley is included in the Settlement Boundary subject to these representations and further review of the local plan following the consultation period.
Settlement Boundary	11150	it is important the settlement boundary is appropriately drawn, to ensure that there are small scale opportunities for windfall development in the more sustainable rural settlements, to ensure they can grow and thrive
Omission site	11149	Owners of the Land at Church Lane, West Tytherley in relation to the Test Valley Local Plan 2040 – Regulation 18, Stage 2, Consultation. The site falls within the Conservation Area boundary of West Tytherley
Omission site	11149	Land at Church Lane, West Tytherley is bounded by the settlement on three side. With the approved housing to the east and existing village to the north, the southeast and southwest in terms of existing residents.
Omission site	11149	In addition to the contiguous boundaries of the site to the extant settlement boundary on two sides and a newly approved housing development on a third side, the village of West

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Tytherley as part and parcel of the new methodology of settlement hierarchy is now in Tier 3 which separates West Tytherley from other rural villages (26no) in Tier 4, which had previously in the extant local plan been grouped together. As such it is considered that West Tytherley is a sustainable location for supporting a rural village housing site.
Omission site	11149	It is considered that whilst the majority or a large proportion of the housing for the Borough can be directed towards Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements, that a proportionate level of allocations should include the Tier 3 serviced villages in order to maintain the longevity of the settlements and to meet the current and future needs of these villages.
Settlement Boundary	10800	the Weyhill (West) settlement policy boundary should be extended to include the Land at Fyfield to allow new development to come forward to meet the rural housing requirements of the plan period
Settlement Boundary	10800	object to The omission of their land from the proposed settlement boundary for Weyhill (West);
Settlement Boundary	10660	<p>The settlement boundary for Weyhill should be extended to ensure that the most sustainable sites are being included within the settlement boundaries for existing settlements.</p> <p>Review/amend of Weyhill (east) settlement boundary to include land at Motely Mill, Weyhill,</p>
Settlement Boundary	10801	Support the inclusion of Weyhill as a tier 3 settlement but suggest tier 3 settlements are ranked in more detail as Weyhill is more sustainable than other settlements within tier 3.
Settlement Boundary	10801	Weyhill should be ranked as a higher Tier 3 settlement as it is well related to Andover

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Hierarchy	10660	Support the identification of Weyhill as a Tier 3 settlement in the hierarchy.
Omission site	10660	Site specific comment promoting land at Motely Mill, Weyhill for development as a smaller part brownfield site, for a mix of housing tenures, through allocation and/or through settlement boundary review. Without this amendment to the plan, it could be developed for affordable housing, but the site offers an opportunity for a mix of housing types and tenures, including market and affordable.
Omission site	10801	The Ridings in Weyhill is a partial brownfield site that is available, suitable and deliverable of up to 20 dwellings and would help meet Test Valleys housing need in a sustainable way.
Omission site	10801	Further expansion of the settlement boundary for Weyhill West to include Shelaa site 83 would be encouraged.
Site Allocation	10796	If planning permission has not been granted prior to the publication of the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan, it is considered that the provisions of Policy COM3 should be carried forward into the Draft Local Plan as a Strategic Housing Site Allocation for Southern Test Valley. This would provide certainty in terms of developer requirements, setting the parameters for development and ensuring that appropriate infrastructure is delivered alongside new homes
Site Allocation	10796	Land at Whitenap is still expected to deliver 1,300 dwellings under Policy COM3. This means that the current planning application will under-deliver 200 homes against this expected supply from existing allocations. The proposed residential development of the Site will help to address this
Site Allocation	10796	In the event that Policy COM3 is carried forward into the Draft Local Plan, Metis propose two additional requirements (vi and vii) to Policy COM3 Part f)

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Site Allocation	10796	Would support amendments to Map A which accompanies Policy COM3 to include these new pedestrian, cycle and vehicle accesses. In addition, Map A currently shows the Site, indicatively, as open space
Site Allocation	10796	In order to facilitate the delivery of up to 200 homes to address the shortfall set out at paragraph 3.6 of the representations, this should be allocated for residential development, as shown in Figure 2 below. The removal of the Open Space designation (purple triangle) from Map A is proposed to reflect on-going discussions with officers who have indicated their support for such an amendment
Housing Requirement	10094	There is significant doubt over the timetable for delivery of the existing allocation at Whitenap, and other allocations in STV.
Housing Requirement	10114	site promotor encouraged to see Whitenap included within the housing delivery and is in full support of this
Settlement Boundary	10101	Settlement boundary should be adjusted accordingly so it can accommodate level of planned growth across plan period, allowing for windfall sites to come forward, such as in and around Romsey
Settlement Boundary	10101	<p>Redefine settlement boundary of Romsey and its satellite villages, to allow for proportionately sized housing and employment sites to come forward as site allocations or small windfall sites</p> <p>Amend settlement boundary of Romsey and its satellite villages to allow housing and employment site through either allocations or small windfall sites</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Rural housing requirement	10119	No disagreement with the principle of accommodating opportunities for community led development, for example, where it accords with para 70 and 73 of NPPF. But if sites are not identified then this should be separate to, and not part of, the minimum housing requirement. Rural sites included in the requirement should be identified in the plan and though consultation with local communities, to ensure the plan can be found to be sound (NPPF paras 23 and 69).
Housing Requirement	11141	<p>The increase in allowance of windfall sites is a positive as they help to create a robust housing delivery pipeline and buffer against land supply shortages, due to their efficiency in using land integration within existing infrastructure.</p> <p>TVBC should comply with the Duty to Cooperate and increase the Housing requirement figures, thus allowing windfall sites to address the unmet housing need.</p>
Housing Requirement	10119	<p>The total windfall allowance of unidentified development from small sites anticipated to come forward is 818 homes over the plan period. However, the Housing Topic Paper (2024) sets out the average annual completions on windfall sites in the last 10 years as 30.2 dwellings for NTV and 37.6 for STV. It is unclear why the latest Housing Trajectory sets out a different and lower proposed annual windfall allowance for both HMAs (29 and 22 dwellings respectively). Justification for the anticipated windfall allowances should be clearly set out within the evidence base.</p> <p>Update/provide evidence base to support windfall allowance set out in Table 3.3</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10606	object as plan does not make sufficient allowance for windfall development
Housing Requirement	10606	Housing Implementation Strategy sets out there are 51 windfall dwellings per annum but windfall figure over plan period is below this
Housing Requirement	10606	windfall allowance should be increased to at least 51 dwellings per annum to reflect previous delivery of windfall sites
Housing Requirement	10606	windfall sites have ability to have a substantial cumulative benefit to housing delivery
Housing Requirement	10605	insufficient provision has been made for inclusion of windfall sites across borough
Housing Requirement	10605	increase in allowance of windfall sites would be beneficial and not impact overall spatial strategy of the plan
Housing Requirement	10605	relying solely on allocations for housing development may introduce uncertainties due to factors such as delays in planning approval, land availability, viability and policy changes
Housing Requirement	10605	windfalls are efficient use of land integration with existing infrastructure making them valuable assets in housing delivery strategies
Housing Requirement	10605	by acknowledging role of windfall sites and increasing the allowance the LP can provide a buffer against potential land supply shortages and ensure more robust housing delivery pipeline
Housing Requirement	10605	borough historically benefitted from supply of windfall sites have been and will continue to be important to the overall housing supply and should therefore be awarded significant weight as a benefit

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10605	borough wide figure for windfalls should be increased to at least 51 dpa if not more given that windfall sites can have substantial cumulative benefit to housing delivery
Housing Requirement	10655	insufficient provision has been made for inclusion of windfall sites across borough
Housing Requirement	10655	increase in allowance of windfall sites would be beneficial and not impact overall spatial strategy of the plan
Housing Requirement	10655	windfalls are efficient use of land integration with existing infrastructure making them valuable assets in housing delivery strategies
Housing Requirement	10655	by acknowledging role of windfall sites and increasing the allowance the LP can provide a buffer against potential land supply shortages and ensure more robust housing delivery pipeline
Housing Requirement	10655	every new house must command substantial weight as a benefit and an equal cumulative benefit given to small sites
Housing Requirement	10655	borough historically benefitted from supply of windfall sites have been and will continue to be important to the overall housing supply and should therefore be awarded significant weight as a benefit
Housing Requirement	10655	borough wide figure for windfalls should be increased to at least 51 dpa if not more given that windfall sites can have substantial cumulative benefit to housing delivery
Housing Requirement	10611	insufficient provision has been made for inclusion of windfall sites across borough
Housing Requirement	10611	increase in allowance of windfall sites would be beneficial and not impact overall spatial strategy of the plan

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Requirement	10611	relying solely on allocations for housing development may introduce uncertainties due to factors such as delays in planning approval, land availability, viability and policy changes
Housing Requirement	10611	windfalls are efficient use of land integration with existing infrastructure making them valuable assets in housing delivery strategies
Housing Requirement	10611	by acknowledging role of windfall sits and increasing the allowance the LP can provide a buffer against potential land supply shortages and ensure more robust housing delivery pipeline
Housing Requirement	10611	borough historically benefitted from supply of windfall sites have been and wil continue to be important to the overall housing supply and should therefore be awarded significant weight as a benefit
Housing Requirement	10611	borough wide figure for windfalls should be increased to at least 51 dpa if not more given that windfall sites can have substantial cumulative benefit to housing delivery
Housing Requirement	11095	No evidence provided to support windfall allowance therefore with a lack of evidence the windfall rate cannot be relied upon.
NDP Housing Requirements	11161	Total windfall allowance shown in table is too high. NPPF (para 72) states that the Council should provide compelling evidence that any allowance is realistic, based on historic delivery rates and expected future trends. It cannot therefore be relied upon.
Spatial Strategy	10139	TVBC have destroyed the attractive surroundings of Andover and Romsey by underestimating the contribution of windfall completions to the housing supply
Settlement Hierarchy	11108	The terms 'rural areas' and 'countryside' are not interchangeable in the LP and this is likely to confuse most readers

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Scale of development	10814	Plan relies on two sites (of 340 and 1,070 dwellings) to deliver more than 85% of the total number of draft site allocation dwellings in Southern Test Valley, with the Land at Velmore Farm accounting for the vast majority

Policy SS9: Delivery, Monitoring and Contingency
Paragraphs 3.121-3.133

Key Issue	Officer Response
Policy is ineffective, it should include measures/actions expected to be taken if delivery is failing	The Regulation 18 stage 2 document identified a policy on delivery, monitoring and contingency. This will be reviewed and consulted on as part of the final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage).
Councils' slow decision making should be considered as a factor that causes delay	The Regulation 18 stage 2 document identified a policy on delivery, monitoring and contingency. This will be reviewed and consulted on as part of the final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage).
Review should be undertaken regularly and not wait until delivery is stalling. Prevent issues arising in the first place	The Regulation 18 stage 2 document identified a policy on delivery, monitoring and contingency. This will be reviewed and consulted on as part of the final draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 stage).

Chapter 4 - Overview

Paragraphs 4.1-4.11

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage draft local plan.
Site Assessment	The process undertaken to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal. The Spatial Strategy and development allocations including the overall scale of development and Andover reflects this status, alongside the outcome of the site assessment process.
Flood Risk	Development would be subject to a FRA, as required. Flood risk was included within the site selection process as set out in the Site Assessment Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal.
Small Sites	It is accepted that small sites will make a contribution towards meeting local housing need over the plan period and an allowance for this is included within the housing requirement and supply calculation within existing commitments and future windfalls. Reflecting the revised NPPF (December 2024) the draft Local Plan Revised Regulation 18 now includes a wide range of sites including smaller sites.
Infrastructure - Health	Developments would make a financial contribution towards enhancement of local primary care provision based upon existing capacity and increase in population

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - health	10763	high level assessment of sites provided by ICB hasn't fed into the site assessment process
Preferred pool for NTV	10126	There are grounds for reviewing a revised pool of preferred sites with a view to drawing down additional sites to help meet unmet needs in locations that promote sustainable patterns of growth in line with the NPPF (paragraph 11a). In this regard, recommend land east of Smannell Lane is considered in this context.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Small sites	10052	Note that the housing site assessment excludes sites put forward for housing for less than 10 houses; however, these are often appropriate sites for rural locations, and taken together may contribute a good proportion of the houses required.
Flawed approach	10126	The site assessment process is based on incomplete or out of date information, and has not accounted for evidence provided on the promoted site of land east of Smannell Road. The outcomes are derived from it are therefore flawed as a consequence. This is particularly evident at Appendix IV of the Sustainability Appraisal that accompanies the Local Plan, with the assessment of land east of Smannell Road incorrectly informed and needs updating.
Infrastructure - surface water	Hampshire County Council 10099	Some sites do not have clear options to drain surface water to, which is required to make the site viable. This could be to a watercourse, surface water sewer or via infiltration. Viable infiltration cannot be assumed but must be demonstrated by infiltration tests and groundwater monitoring. If there is not a backup alternative option for them to drain to, either a watercourse or surface water sewer, then the County Council strongly recommend that the site should not be allocated before a possible option for drainage the site has been established. Link to HCC guidance provided
site assessment HIA	Historic England 10049	In terms of methodology for a HIA, Historic England Advice Note 3 on 'The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans' recommends a 5-step approach (link provided)
	Historic England 10049	highlight the need for proportionate heritage assessment when considering sites submitted for consideration as part of the Local Plan process, including potential impacts on heritage assets and their settings
	Historic England 10049	when considering sites submitted for consideration as part of the Local Plan process the Council should also consider the impact of sites on heritage assets in adjoining local authority areas as appropriate.
	Historic England 10049	HE have advice notes available to use when assessing sites (links provided)
Housing Site Assessment	11108	Object to stage 4 of the site selection process as 'all sites in the rural area have been excluded from the Local Plan site selection process
	11108	There is no guarantee that communities will elect to bring forward a Neighbourhood Plan.
	11108	The TVLP fails to draw distinction between well performing tier 3 settlements (particularly those well connected to main towns) which still fall within the rural areas, and countryside.
	11108	The reliance on a limited number of strategic large-scale allocations fails to reflect the desired 'tailored' approach to enabling housing in the rural areas, as conveyed at p. 3.14-3.15 of the LP
	11108	W1 is concerned about the feasibility of sites in Ludgershall that are dependent on a new bridge across a rail line in use by the MOD

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11108	As majority of growth around Andover is focused on the northern and eastern edge of the existing built up area, an allocation at Abbots Ann on the south west would complement the proposed distribution.
Infrastructure - health	10763	information provided by ICB should have been included in this section
	10763	information provided by ICB should have been included in this section
Level of growth in Ludgershall	10126	Have concerns with the site assessment process that led to a preferred pool of sites for NTV, specifically the level of growth directed to the lower tier settlement of Ludgershall, versus more sustainable and reasonable alternatives around Andover.
Methodology	10025	We believe TVBCs methodology to development sites has been too much developer led through the SHELAA with no proper planning policy on how they would like the borough to look and function. There should be a vision of the areas that the Council want to achieve then ask land owners of the areas they want to expand
	10025	What area can be expanded without villages on the borders becoming part of neighbouring town or city while also preserving local gaps between communities. The plan should be to expand Andover and Stockbridge a lot more as they are large service centres away from the borders
Site Policies	New Forest National Park Authority 10696	Welcomes the relevant site allocation policies that fall within the recreational impact zone of the New Forest SAC/SPA and Ramsar include criteria requiring appropriate mitigation measures to be put in place.
Not appropriate strategy	10126	Cannot conclude that the spatial distribution strategy is an appropriate strategy, when considering reasonable alternatives. This includes the availability of reasonable alternatives around Andover, including land east of Smannell Road.
Site location	11141	Suggested site at Land at Anna Valley Trout Farm, Salisbury Road is suitable to accommodate 4/5 dwellings which would fit into the plans for sustainable development. The site should be included within the settlement boundary.
Site Promotion- Alternative Sites Land at Littlebridge	10125	The site is being promoted as it is suitable to support a number of development options including both residential, mixed use and strategic employment.
Site Promotion- Alternative Sites	10125	The site promoter has provided a promotional document for the land at Littlebridge which includes a masterplan for how a mixed-use scheme or a strategic employment development can be delivered

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Land at Littlebridge		
Southern Water	Southern Water 10022	Southern water will need to work with site promoters to understand the development program and to review whether delivery of network reinforcement aligns with the occupation of the development
Sustainable patterns of growth	10126	Absence of a railway station at Ludgershall and consequent greater reliance on road-based trips to Andover, raises questions on whether the current strategy is an appropriate one versus the reasonable alternatives. Concerned that the approach will not contribute to fostering more sustainable patterns of development (NPPF paragraph 11a) versus the reasonable alternative options, including for example at Andover. Particularly given the availability of reasonable alternative options for growth at Andover.
Flood risk & climate change	Environment Agency 10068	SFRA includes some analysis for climate change impacts where detailed modelling is not available. If any of the allocated sites fall within areas that may be sensitive to increases in water levels, it is recommended that a level 2 SFRA is undertaken so a more accurate picture of climate change is obtained.
Flooding - sequential test	Environment Agency 10068	Indicated that the sequential approach has been taken for a number of sites to reduce the risk of flooding but there does not seem to be any accompanying information on exactly how this has been done.
FRZ3	Environment Agency 10068	Where allocated sites are likely to have areas of flood risk zone 3, would advise that a level 2 SFRA is undertaken, which may require further modelling.

Chapter 4 - Northern Test Valley

Paragraphs 4.12-4.20

Key Issue	Officer Response
Andover Allocations	In the settlement hierarchy, Andover is a Tier 1 settlement and consider the most sustainable, due to its range and number of facilities and accessibility by public transport. The Spatial Strategy and development allocations including the overall scale of development and Andover reflects this status, alongside the outcome of the site assessment process.
Infrastructure - Health	Developments would make a financial contribution towards enhancement of local primary care provision based upon existing capacity and increase in population
Infrastructure - Schools	Developments would make a financial contribution towards the enhancement of local schools as required based on existing capacity and need to accommodate additional pupils.
Water requirements	A Water Cycle Study has been undertaken as part of the evidence base, and the Council is working with water companies on the provision of water supply and wastewater infrastructure and water quality alongside the delivery of new development. This will be updated to inform the Regulation 19 stage.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	10954	The land alongside Walworth Road should be used to deliver the safe footpaths so necessary on foot, bicycle or horse riders.
Access for new developments	10662	Overall concerns over the density of the proposed new housing developments and access for cars and other vehicles. Recent developments around Andover have access roads that are too narrow with insufficient space for parking and no room for manoeuvre-something the new developments should learn from

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Allocations around Andover a long distance from facilities and services.	11094	The three designated allocations around Andover are significant distances from the two key hubs in Andover, being the railway station and the supermarkets at the retail park.
Andover Allocations	10830	TVBC is again using Andover to meet housebuilding targets which is unsupportable without consultation or supporting infrastructure improvements. As an Andover resident I am appalled by the blatant discrimination shown by TVBC
Andover allocations will pressure infrastructure, plan does not explain how educational needs will be met.	11094	The allocations will add another 6,000 people into an already large town (Andover) and will inevitably cause greater delays in seeking medical assistance, dental appointments and access to services generally. There is no explanation of where the new population of children will be educated.
Andover allocations will require significant education infrastructure.	11094	The additional 3 allocations around Andover would fill a new 3 form entry primary school and create demand for 425 early years places and 320 secondary school places. Inevitably, it would not be ideal to have to transport children from Manor Farm to attend new facilities in the east or south east of the town.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Archaeology	11024	Avoid the destruction of valuable buildings and protect historic areas such as Knights Enham and the old town at the top of the high street with the importance of creating adequate buffer zones
Buffer Land	10954	The land at Walworth Industrial Estate was invaluable buffer land during the fire at Ocado and should be retained.
Employment	11024	Emphasis on attracting employees to the area through higher education institutions and incentives for higher technology to come to north Test Valley.
Focus on Andover	10133	Para.4.14 recognises that Andover is highly a highly sustainable settlement, providing a range of services and facilities and has been focus of growth in recent years. This is supported by Preliminary Transport Assessment
Infrastructure - Dentists	11009	The town cannot support that number of new developments, services such as dentists are well over subscribed
Infrastructure - GPs	11009	The town cannot support that number of new developments, services such as doctors are well over subscribed
Infrastructure - hospitals	11024	Sufficient hospitals and surgeries within Test Valley, not becoming reliant on these increasingly limited services in Winchester.
Infrastructure - Roads	11009	The town cannot support that number of new developments, the roads around schools are a nightmare at peak times
Infrastructure - schools	11024	Need for there to be enough secondary schools.
Need	10830	Housebuilding sites should be based on need and not sites of 'least resistance', the balance/requirement between areas to the north and south of the A30 should be re-defined
Priorities for NTV	10817	Para. 4.15 should be amended to reference the functional links between Andover and Ludgershall. Suggested adding wording: ... "the edge of Ludgershall.." after "...growth at Andover..."

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Suggested adding wording: ..."the edge of Ludgershall.." after "...growth at Andover..."
Settlement Boundaries	10954	Northern Housing Requirements are met by the preferred sites listed, so there is no reason the settlement boundary at Picket Piece should be expanded.
Water requirements	11024	Need for studies of the water requirements on the Test.

Policy NA1: Andover Town Centre
Paragraphs 4.21-4.26

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Infrastructure	Future developments would make a financial contribution towards the enhancement of infrastructure including local primary care provision and the expansion of local school places
Infrastructure - Transport	Development would include provision of pedestrian and cycle allowing for improved links to and from the town centre to the station and surrounding areas, including improvements to the bus station as part of the Andover Town Centre Masterplan
Regeneration - Lights Theatre	The new venue will be transformational for the town centre, supporting local businesses, bringing communities together, providing a range of entertainment and celebrating creativity. The intention is for existing building will return to being part of the Andover College campus
Regeneration - Town Centre	The Adopted Andover Town Centre Masterplan identifies a number of objectives which highlight how the town centre can be adapted, enhanced and regenerated, to help it meet the future needs of residents, businesses and visitors. This policy identifies the importance of development being in accord with the Masterplan
Residential development	The policy identifies the opportunity for mixed use development to come forward in the town centre which would see new residential dwellings which would be in close proximity to and well served by a range of facilities and services, which would contribute to the viability, vibrancy and sustainability of the Andover. There are several brownfield sites in the town centre which can be redeveloped for residential or mixed use development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Andover development	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	Given its role as one of the two Tier 1 settlements within the Borough, opportunities to maximise development within Andover should be pursued
Andover Masterplan	10049 Historic England	Where will 367 homes be located
	10049 Historic England	Given 367 is not an insignificant number of dwellings, greater clarity is merited in this policy on where such development is expected, helping to ensure that heritage impacts and opportunities have been adequately and appropriately considered.
	10049 Historic England	Noting policy SA1 connects directly with the relevant masterplan, stating “South of Romsey Town Centre Masterplan Area will accommodate appropriately [sic] 30 homes”, could a similar approach be taken here?
	10049 Historic England	Ideally the policy would specify key housing sites within the town centre, and perhaps through the evidence underpinning the masterplan, help to demonstrate that the plan is not over- or under-allocating capacity
	10762 Andover C of E Parish	Pleased to see that the Local Plan will be fully aligned and integrated with the Andover Town Centre Master Plan.
Andover rail station	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	The presence of the rail station would act as a key attractor for people wishing to locate to Andover and this provides a sound basis for focusing development.
	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	Network Rail control land around the station that could be utilised for development, including the current freight site that sites immediately to the north of the London-bound platform in Andover
	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	Maintaining flexibility around its usage will allow the site to respond to market demands and maximise its potential - Andover current freight site

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	The current car park at Andover station has been decked due to demand for its use and retaining the ability to provide an additional deck of car parking, should this be required, would future proof the car park and allow for additional usage
	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	Network Rail wish to ensure that potential future decking of the car parking at Andover station would not conflict with any design or character guidance.
Andover Town Centre	10762 Andover C of E Parish	Support these objectives, pleased to see The Guildhall and St Mary's being recognised as importance centres for civic life within the town – and the need for these to be preserved.
	10762 Andover C of E Parish	Agree that an increase in the residential population within the Town Centre will support the wider objectives of the Master Plan. Be interested to better understand how 367 homes has been calculated
	10762 Andover C of E Parish	Specifically interested in how these additional homes will contribute to an improvement in variety, quality and cultural vibrancy of Andover's nighttime economy.
	11014 Stop Chilbolton Over Development	Note the ambitious plans to develop Andover, which remains an important centre for Chilbolton residents. Endorses these aims but recognises the task TVBC has in identifying a different image and purpose for Andover if successful regeneration is to occur
Current regeneration proposals	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Current regeneration proposals prejudice the bus station access and egress is a very serious manner. While the broad objectives of the vision for the area on the west side of the town centre is supported, it is inappropriate and unsupportable that this should compromise safe and efficient access by bus to the town centre. We will continue to work in dialogue with the Council to resolve these tensions in a satisfactory way.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Identified capacity	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The nature of regeneration and redevelopment means the capacity and timing of delivery of the identified capacity is likely to be hard to accurately establish, we urge the Council to ensure the housing trajectory takes a suitably well-evidenced and prudent view of this.
Infrastructure	10656	The Council continues to build large housing estates with no facilities incorporated such as surgeries, schools, shops and playing fields
Lights theatre	10662	The theatre plan for 'The Lights' in Andover is likely to face problems with filling it to capacity if the seating is increased from 200 to 400 and is likely to be half empty and therefore not generate sufficient revenue to cover the additional costs.
	10662	Moving the Lights theatre to the town centre has merit but does not meet the value for money requirement if spending with taxpayer revenue
	10662	There is no coherent plan for what is going to be done with the current Lights theatre venue
	10656	Why is it necessary to destroy a perfectly adequate building such as the Lights, because the Council has been granted finance?
Support	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Maximising the capacity of appropriate residential opportunities in Andover town centre is supported as it is highly accessible by sustainable modes. It is likely to be necessary to identify gaps in timetabled provision for key shift change times to support sustainable access, a wider strategy to achieve this, supported if necessary, by necessary proportionate revenue support contributions should be agreed with bus operators.
Town centre	10656	TVBC has wasted money on improvements and facilities that seat beside ,for example, what was previously Wilko
	10656	Why is it necessary to destroy the roof over the Chantry Centre which gives relief to shoppers and passers through just because the Council has been given finance ?
Town centre Regeneration	10656	The roads in Andover are poorly maintained and full of potholes and the greater priority for the Council should be updating the state of buildings on the High Street and not destroying two of the better ones.

Key Issue	Officer Response
Design	Design policies DES1-2 will apply to development proposals in the town centre and will for example consider architectural interest and a positive relationship between the ground and upper floors of buildings. Where possible, buildings in the town centre should aim to open onto the street, providing activity, interest and natural surveillance onto the public realm, which can in turn help places to feel safe
Green infrastructure	Green infrastructure such as the use of green roofs and walls will be encouraged in appropriate locations, where they are sustainable and where longer term maintenance and management is deliverable
Heritage	Development would be subject to a heritage study taking account of the conservation area appraisal, nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets as well as any potential archaeology
Natural environment	The town centre masterplan includes enhancements to the waterways running through the town centre and encourages the creation and enhancement of green spaces in the centre of Andover, this would provide benefits not only for wildlife and the natural environment but also for residents and visitors

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Andover town centre	10049 Historic England	broadly support this policy, and suggest minor amendment to criterion a.
Andover town centre	10762 Andover C of E Parish	Of the strong opinion that any new housing design needs to be of a high standard within the town centre in order to support the wider regeneration objectives.
Design guide	10049 Historic England	The text states that a draft design guide will be prepared. Presumably one could say that a design guide will be prepared, informed by public consultation i.e. the intention is not to stop at the draft stage?
Green Infrastructure	10223 The Woodland Trust	support the requirement for the creation of appropriate, sustainable new green spaces or green infrastructure and biodiversity throughout the town centre.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Green Roofs	10977	Strongly suggest more emphasis is made on implementation of green roof, these will be valuable in combating the effects of extreme weather from climate change
Listed building	10049 Historic England	should make clear that considerations include the significance of listed buildings (rather than views to/from those buildings) and the criterion should focus on what is required, rather than what the CAAMP contains.
Listed building	10049 Historic England	We recommend adding reference to the numerous listed buildings within Andover and its locally important buildings (non-designated heritage assets).
Rail Station	10842 Network Rail and South Western Railway	Andover station - how people access station by cycle and should be considered as part of any linked site allocations or other development
River Anton	10047 Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Renaturalising the River Anton provides a great opportunity for nature recovery, especially as the town centre has one of the nutrient rich sites of the headwaters and is under pressure from plastic pollution.
Support	10047 Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Welcome the inclusion of the enhancement of waterways in the key design considerations.
Wildlife benefits	10047 Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Recommend that when designing the proposal, the benefits for wildlife are not just encouraged but are a priority and run off and drainage into the river is kept to a minimum.

Key Issue	Officer Response
Residential development	The policy identifies the opportunity for mixed use development to come forward in the town centre which would see new residential dwellings which would be in close proximity to and well served by a range of facilities and services, which would contribute to the viability, vibrancy and sustainability of the Andover

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Proposed Development Sites	10954	Better use of unused sites around the Station Hotel, e.g. the Old Bingo Hall, Safeway Store, Wilkinsons for housing as the need for large retail areas is diminishing.
Town Centre Housing	10036 Thruxton Parish Council	Significant residential opportunity in zone A on upper floors of all buildings. Could be key element in revival of town centre which has become increasingly run down. Understand the recently announced levelling up funds would be linked but wish to state mixed dwellings need to form part of any development to be successful with access to facilities and transport
Town Centre Housing	10036 Thruxton Parish Council	Well thought out residential development that encourages commuters utilising the train station can help transform town centres and reduce anti-social behaviour. Incumbent to push for development that benefits the town centre. Recommend this is added as a key component for town centre uses and merits its own housing policy

Chapter 4: Strategic Housing Allocations Northern Test Valley

Paragraphs 4.45-4.48

Key Issue	Officer Response
Health	Reference is made to LTP4 and 'healthy streets' is Para.5.488. Further references are made throughout the plan including: to healthy places under the Design Objectives and Para.2.56; healthy and active movement in Para.3.7 in the context of the Spatial Strategy; and Policy DES1 Sustainable and High Quality Design and Para.5.315 on healthy and sustainable places.
Infrastructure - Health	<p>Policy COM1, Para.5.96 and Appendix 3 cover the provision of infrastructure, including the issue the phasing of its implementation. An amendment is proposed to Appendix 3 to additionally specify that "Development should ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure and minimise disruption to neighbouring communities during construction"</p> <p>The Council is engaging with infrastructure providers including the ICB on the provision of healthcare and will seek financial contributions towards enhancements of provision where this is justified. However, such provision is outside of the direct control of the Council.</p>
Infrastructure - Sewage	The Council has undertaken a Water Cycle Study which includes the assessment of water supply and wastewater capacity to accommodate the delivery of new development set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 document, and in line with protecting the environment and water quality. This will be updated to inform the Regulation 19 stage. The Council is also engaging with local water companies including Southern Water on these matters including on the phasing of future development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Health	10099 Hampshire County Council	To address planning for health, sites should seek to consider the 10 indicators of Healthy Streets (see LTP4) and healthy design principles as set out within Building for Healthy Life.
Infrastructure - Sewage	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	Drainage and sewage facilities are not coping with existing housing development, cannot have more development without a robust sewage and drainage system. This includes Fullerton being capable of coping with additional sewage with no excess flow into the Test or Anton

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - Health	10197 Goodworth Clatford Parish Council	Believe policy COM1 must be strengthened to ensure there are adequate facilities such as GP surgeries and pharmacies to provide necessary services in areas of significant new development and must be delivered at the same time and not some point in the future

Policy NA4 Land South of London Road, Picket Twenty
Paragraphs 4.49-4.55

Key Issue	Officer Response
Active travel/sustainable transport	The site is in a sustainable location, close to existing cycle, pedestrian and public transport links. Additional wording has been added to the supporting text requiring integration with existing active travel and public transport links.
Infrastructure - education	The site would make a financial contribution towards the expansion of school places at Winton Secondary School, as well as the existing day nursery at Picket Twenty
Infrastructure – green space	The site provides an opportunity to extend the neighbouring Harewood Common green space. It provides a buffer between development and Middleway, which has a more rural character. It would continue the existing settlement edge.
Housing numbers	Capacity reflects the density and character of neighbouring development to the south and allows for an appropriate layout and provision of open space.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Active Travel	10842	This site is within a reasonable 15 minute cycle to Andover rail station and therefore could support improved walking and cycling links. Network Rail would encourage inclusion of this within the draft Policy to allow for improved access.
Andover rail station	10842	The potential for increased use of Andover station because of the development would also justify this development contributing towards improvements at the station to ensure it can accommodate the increased usage.
Constraints	10803	only constraint identified is its location outside the settlement boundary, which is addressed by its allocation for development
Environmental constraints	10068 Environment Agency	No environmental constraints identified.
Green space	10803	The eastern part of the draft allocation - green space is considered unnecessary due to the significant levels of over provision of open space within Picket Twenty and that green space in this location would perform no function of significant value, as an extension to the Harewood Common green space is not necessary and furthermore the northern extent of the Harewood Common green space could offer additional residential development capacity (shown on the development concept plan in the enclosed vision document).

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10803	reference to green space on Figure 4.4 should be removed. This change would further recognise the importance of this site to deliver sustainable development in the short term.
	10223	support the requirement for provision of green space in the east of the site to extend Harewood Common
Active Travel	10099 Hampshire County Council	Additional wording to be added to include requirement for the site to link to existing cycling walking and public transport networks: "Access to the development via Picket Twenty way and Eddery Road / Pollard Road, and integration with existing pedestrian, cycle and public transport links"
	10099 Hampshire County Council	The Countyside Access Plan shows demand for cycle access on Andover FP1 (highlighted in yellow above right), which becomes an Restricted Byway; this would only be achievable with landowner permission. This would provide a beneficial cycle link between Picket Twenty and Bere Hill sites.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Good cycle links should be provided linking to the existing network to enable active travel to this site.
Infrastructure - education	10099 Hampshire County Council	The catchment secondary school is Winton Secondary School
	10099 Hampshire County Council	To mitigate the planned growth, applicants will be expected to contribute towards enhancing education capacity in accordance with Policy COM1- by contributing towards the expansion of Winton Secondary School, as well as the existing day nursery at Picket twenty
Public Right of Way	10099 Hampshire County Council	A comprehensive approach is needed to enhancing access from this site to the wider Rights of Way and access network. This may include contributions to improvements to Andover Footpath 1 and Restricted Byway 67 (Forest Lane) in accordance with IDP NA4.
Housing deliverability	10803	the site allocation is principally controlled by Persimmon Homes and as such represents a deliverable form of development
	10803	the SHELAA has recognised that the site could deliver housing in the 1-5 year period, as such contributing to the housing supply early in the plan period

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing numbers	10803	object to this policy as it fails to allocate a sufficient level of development to make best and most efficient use of this site and proposes a significant area of open space which is unjustified and unnecessary in this location
	10803	The site has been promoted for development in the SHELAA and confirmed by the Council as suitable and available for development without any significant constraint for around 160 dwellings
	10803	As a highly sustainable location, where development has been identified as achievable in the SHELAA and is deliverable through its control by a developer, it is not considered that the draft allocation for 'approximately 90 dwellings' sufficiently recognises the important contribution that this site could make to the housing land supply
	10803	to make the best use of this land it is considered that at the very least Policy NA4 should be amended to reference a 'minimum of 90 dwellings' to be consistent with the 'minimum' wording in the Borough's housing requirement at Policy SS3 but preferably a 'minimum of 160 dwellings' to reflect the capacity set out in the SHELAA
Infrastructure - Education	10762	Would like to better understand what is meant by 'off-site financial contributions' to Pilgrims Cross Primary School. How will this school cope with the additional demand placed on it's catchment area by this development?
Pedestrian connections	10243	We welcome this requirement which ought to make specific reference to pedestrian connections to new/improved bus stops on London Road.
Picket Twenty	10803	support the principle of allocating land south of London Road, Picket Twenty for residential development, seeking to reallocate the remainder of land included within Policy COM6A of the Revised Local Plan that has yet to come forward for development.
	10803	the eastern extent of the allocation does not represent the edge of Picket Twenty, with this marked by the woodland at Houndshott Copse to the east and the eastern side of The Middleway site (as acknowledged at Paragraph 1.1.109 of the Council's Landscape Sensitivity Study)
Site omission	10243	We note application 23/03022/FULLN, we consider this site highly supportable and question its omission as a draft allocation, it lies within an extant allocation and accords entirely with the existing and draft spatial strategy in this plan.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - water	10022 Southern Water	southern water have undertaken a preliminary assessment of the capacity of our existing infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for this proposal.
	10022 Southern Water	Proposal for 90 dwellings on site will generate a need for reinforcement of the water supply network to provide additional capacity to serve the development. This reinforcement would be provided through New Infrastructure charge to developers
	10022 Southern Water	connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to water supply low pressure issues unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation
	10022 Southern Water	Add criteria e) stating 'occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of water network reinforcement, in consultation with the service provider'
Support and current services	10243	The allocation is strongly supported. The site is within relatively immediate reach of the P20 service running every 30 minutes, accessible from stops on Picket Twenty Way and service 76 runs on London Road every hour (with uplift to every 30 minutes committed for later in 2024) immediately to the north, maximising the convenience of access to both these services is important.
Sustainable location	10803	site to east of Andover (the most sustainable settlement in the Borough) and is well located in terms of access by sustainable modes of travel to facilities and services in Picket Twenty and public transport to Andover town centre. promotes the presumption in favour of sustainable development and is a sound basis for a housing allocation
Tree cover	10223	Walworth Business Site and Picket Twenty have some of the lowest tree cover in the district, source - UK Tree Equity map (link provided). Urge setting a specific target for tree cover in policy, to be pursued through the retention of important trees, appropriate replacement of trees lost through development, ageing or disease and by new planting to support green infrastructure

Policy NA5 Manor Farm
Paragraphs 4.56-4.69

Key Issue	Officer Response
Sustainable travel, transport, access and infrastructure	Site is at a sustainable location within close proximity to Andover, subject to active and sustainable transport improvements and connections being provided on and around the site, particularly to the south of Saxon Way. It is noted that Network Rail have stated that a financial contribution towards facilities at Andover Station would be appropriate to mitigate a potential increase in passenger numbers. The IDP will cover this. The public right of way network and multiple footpaths on and around this allocation offer good opportunities for pedestrian and cycling connectivity to the wider area, which is covered by the supporting text and topic based development management policies.
Infrastructure, facilities, services	Some community infrastructure may be delivered on site, subject to further evaluation of local need and provision. Financial contributions may be appropriate towards infrastructure provision off site, including to enhance capacity at existing local schools. Financial contributions are anticipated towards healthcare provision. Works would be required to enable connections to water, sewage and energy networks. Further work will establish whether a local food store and early years provision may be delivered within the development. Public open space, greenspace, play and recreational provision should be provided on site.
Ecology and biodiversity	The site contains some mature trees and hedgerows and there is an ecologically important designated area of ancient woodland outside the site, at least 300m to the north east. There will be opportunities to provide green infrastructure within the site and to seek to retain and enhance wildlife corridors and trees, whilst allowing for a generous buffer/space to the designated ancient woodland.
Heritage and design	A heritage impact assessment will be required and there will be a buffer and set back from the heritage assets at Knights Enham hamlet. Archaeological investigations and evidence will be appropriate to support masterplanning.
Employment provision	The draft policy requires some employment use within the allocation, to form part of the masterplan and to deliver a sustainable development with opportunities for residents to work locally and to deliver a degree of mixed use. This scale of land use is unlikely to impact wider employment land provision.
Landscape sensitivity, landscape character and impact	It is recognised that the site has a relationship to the North Wessex Downs National Landscape and that there is a degree of landscape sensitivity. The allocation and policy criteria respond to this sensitivity and topography and the policy seeks to deliver a substantial area of greenspace to the north of the allocation, towards the countryside and NL designation. Masterplanning for the site, including layout and the landscape strategy must respond sensitivity to the landscape constraints identified. The site is wholly outside the existing Local Gap.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	11155	What about road access - Enham Arch/Chantry?
	10841	Potential improvements for the access at Manor Farm would have to be mandatory as the volume in traffic would cause considerable gridlock, access onto Enham Lane would have to be considered to be one way
Active Travel	10842	This site is within a reasonable 15 minute cycle to Andover rail station and therefore could support improved walking and cycling links. Network Rail would encourage inclusion of this within the draft Policy to allow for improved access.
ancient woodland	10223	request an additional requirement for an appropriate buffer for the ancient woodland to the north of the site at Little Belgrove Copse.
Andover rail station	10842	The potential for increased use of Andover station because of the development would also justify this development contributing towards improvements at the station to ensure it can accommodate the increased usage.
Brownfield Sites	10841	Object to the Manor Farm proposal as there are many industrial units and office space that could be converted into low cost housing close to facilities within the town and transport links
Crematorium Buffer	10841	The crematorium buffer at Manor Farm needs to consider that increased parking spaces may need to be developed at the crematorium
deliverability	10119	Andover is one of the Boroughs two major urban centres and a suitable location for residential development. Manor Farm is adjacent to the settlement in close proximity to public transport connections and local services, and there are no technical obstacles to the development of the land.
deliverable and unconstrained	10119	Site is unconstrained and deliverable, as defined in NPPF. Technical work has identified no fundamental constraints to prevent delivery of housing.
delivery of housing over plan period	10119	Land At Manor Farm site offers the opportunity to secure a sustainable plan led development in accordance with the over arching spatial strategy to deliver much needed housing across the plan period to help the Borough maintain a housing land supply position.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Developer Contributions	10762	Will any Civic Infrastructure Levy generate out of this development, and if so, is there a way the church could be part of the conversations about how this could be applied to the benefit of the local community?
Employment Provision	10841	Object to the Manor Farm proposal as there are numerous units on West and East Portway, Walworth, North Way and in Andover town centre that could provide office and manufacturing space
Environmental constraints	Environment Agency 10068	No environmental constraints identified.
Financial Contribution - Schools	10841	What does off-site financial contributions towards local schools mean? There are existing schools a short walk away from the Manor Farm site
Flooding	10841	Object to the Manor Farm proposal due to the mass flooding in in fields and rivers around Charlton, building on green space will create further problems
General	11155	Glad to see that the hamlet of Knights Enham will remain untouched
Active Travel	10099 Hampshire County Council	The policy should make reference to access to the site and through the site using sustainable modes. Suggest addition of the following criterion: "h. The provision of high quality active travel infrastructure to provide links through the site and safe walking, wheeling and cycling connections to existing facilities south of Saxon Way"
Infrastructure - education	10099 Hampshire County Council	To mitigate the planned growth, applicants will be expected to contribute towards enhancing education capacity in accordance with Policy COM1- contributions towards Harrow Way Community School, and potentially Knights Enham Infant & Junior School. These are the catchment secondary and primary schools respectively.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	There is currently some capacity at Knights Enham Infant & Junior School, but the situation would need to be assessed at the planning stage. This site, as well as Land to the South and East of Ludgershall would result in the expansion of Harrow Way Community School, and the contributions would be proportionate based on the numbers of dwellings and pupil yield.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Also in accordance with policy COM1 one additional classroom for special educational needs and disability (SEND) provision at primary and secondary phase is required at an appropriate nearby maintained or special school.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Consideration needs to be given to providing a safe crossing point into the Junior School.
Public Right of Way	10099 Hampshire County Council	Enham Alamein Footpaths 723, 726 and Restricted Byways 755, 757 and 758 all cross the site.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Local priorities include Surface/improve Enham Alamein RB 757 (Restricted Byway through the centre of the site including Bilgrove Copse); Countryside Access Plan research notes "Restricted Byway - deep mud in middle portion. This is a good alternative to A343 northwards"
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Local priorities include Surface/improve Enham Alamein Restricted Byway 755 (which runs along eastern edge of the development site); this is an important and already well-used link from Enham to Andover cycle network.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Local priorities include Surface/improve Enham Alamein FP, 757 which links Enham to Smannell and is very well used
	10099 Hampshire County Council	There is a sizeable disabled population in Enham - any improvements should aim to give as much Disability Discrimination Act compliant access as possible
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Contributions may be sought towards maintenance and enhancement of the wider Rights of Way and access network including enhancement of Enham Alamein RB 757, RB 755 and RB758 in accordance with IDP NA5 and for Andover Wood Millenium Woodland
Heritage Assets	10762	As this development will run very close to such an important heritage asset (St Michael's & All Angels Knights Enham – Grade I listed), we wish to register a special interest in this proposed development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10762	Who will be conducting the Heritage Impact Assessment? Can we be reassured they will act independently from the developers? Will the residents of Knights Enham and others with knowledge of its history have access to the Assessors?
	10762	Initiative to be adopted to ensure protection of Knights Enham without any significant impact on the proposed capacity. The indicated size and scale of the heritage buffer is inadequate and something far more substantial is required on the scale and magnitude of the 'Significant Green Space' at the north end of the same field. To maintain the unique heritage of Knight Enham and the setting for St Michael's church and its graveyard.
Heritage Buffer	10841	The buffer for the heritage assets at Manor Farm needs to consider that potential development of the Church yard may be needed
	10723	I hope the buffer around the church in the Manor Farm proposal will be extended further to retain the sanctity of the building and environs, it should be protected
	10684	Knight Enham is a distinct hamlet with exceptional historical importance and it is understood that a Heritage Impact Assessment will be carried out to determine how the layout and design of manor Farm will respond sensitively to the unique significant of heritage assets in Knights Enham
Heritage Impact	10684	It is noted that a heritage buffer between Knights Enham and Manor farm development is proposed to protect the historical heritage of Knights Enham
heritage impact assessment	10049 Historic England	We consider HIA is particularly needed for the site, informed by liaison with the Council's conservation team and its archaeological advisers
	10049 Historic England	do not object to development of this site in principle, but recommended proportionate heritage impact assessment (HIA) to inform the allocation. Given the highly graded nature of the church, we re-assert our recommendation for HIA at this stage to inform the allocation, to verify that the site is not under- or over-allocating housing and confirm how important rurality is to the church.
	10049 Historic England	word missing from criterion b.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
housing numbers	10803	In the event that this site is maintained as an allocation, it is considered that the quantum of any development should be reduced in recognition of the site's constraints.
Infrastructure - Dentists	11155	What about local services and facilities such as dentists
	10841	Object to the Manor Farm proposal as dentists are lacking in the area
Infrastructure - education	11155	What about local services and facilities such as schools
	11155	What about local services and facilities such as nurseries
	10663	The secondary schools local to Manor Farm are already over subscribed
Infrastructure - GPs	11155	What about local services and facilities such as doctors
	10841	Object to the Manor Farm proposal as GP's are lacking in the area
Infrastructure - Hospitals	10841	Object to the Manor Farm proposal as our local hospital only caters for minor injuries, a bigger hospital will be needed to support the increase in our community. Andover War Memorial Hospital could be knocked down and redeveloped.
Infrastructure - Roads	10841	Development of Manor Farm and the site in the Charlton Neighbourhood Plan will create major traffic problems, the roads are not of a sufficient standard to cater for such volumes due poor maintenance and adverse weather conditions, the roads will be impossible to use
Infrastructure- water and sewage	11155	Are there plans to improve water supply and sewage facilities ?
	11155	What about local services and facilities such as sewage and water supply

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Land at Manor Farm - this site has a range of significant constraints	11161	Land at Manor Farm has a range of significant constraints, including access, the AONB, The Local Gap, heritage and listed buildings and proximity to ancient woodland. Moreover, the Strategic Sites Viability Testing (January 2024) suggests challenging viability when considered on a present value basis.
Landscape	11155	appropriate landscape barrier' - can this be clarified as 'appropriate landscape barrier' as this would fully protect the heritage area from unsuitable development
landscape impact	10803	the draft Policy and accompanying sustainability appraisal has failed to appreciate the sensitivity of the landscape and potential harm to the open and largely undefined countryside location and the setting of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape
	10803	the 'Test Valley Landscape Sensitivity Study' (January 2024) has recognised this as a 'landscape of high overall landscape sensitivity to change', with a slight reduction in sensitivity to the south, to the west of Saxon Way (paragraph 1.1.17).
	10803	it is considered that the Council has failed to appropriately justify that this site is a suitable location for strategic growth and that it can appropriately accommodate the level of development proposed without significant landscape harm
Larger allocation than proposed in plan - benefits	10119	Support as a matter of principle the proposed strategic allocation of Land at Manor Farm, Andover (Policy NA5).
larger allocation would contribute to flexibility of housing supply	10119	Site can help meet housing need, relative to justifiable alternatives, and is fully compliant with national policy and the Local Plans sustainable strategy for housing distribution. Allocating a larger site than that proposed can provide flexibility to help meet unmet needs identified in the south of the Borough.
Local Gap	10762	Understand there is a Council Policy to ensure there is a green-space gap between the villages and residential areas surrounding Andover. Understand the Council have already rejected plans to

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		develop on land between Knights Enham and Enham Alamein, the creation of a significant buffer to protect the integrity and character of Knights Enham would also be consistent with that policy.
	10803	the site is in close proximity to the North Wessex Downs National Landscape and puts potential pressure on the gap between Andover and Enham Alamein (recognised in the scoring at Objective 8(c) of the Sustainability Appraisal).
location development	10803	this location for a large strategic allocation is inappropriate, as it represents a significant and largely uncontrolled incursion into the open countryside that is beyond the defensible northern boundary of Andover, marked by Saxon Way
Ludgershall access - deliverability	10119	Para 4.103 states that both the Wiltshire site (south east Empress Way) and the TVBC NA8 allocation require a road bridge over a railway used by the MoD, which is a significant piece of infrastructure requiring further discussions between Hampshire County Council, Network Rail, Wiltshire Council and the MoD.
Manor Farm	10235	EAPC acknowledges the TVBC Local Plan 2040 and the contents therein especially in relation to the earmarked development of 800 dwellings at Manor Farm, Knights Enham
	10803	object to policy
Manor Farm - allocation impacts on the North Wessex Downs AONB landscape	11161	allocation will impact the AONB which is a landscape highly susceptible to change and there are no obvious parameters to accommodate development within the existing landscape pattern. Identified in SA/site assessment.
Manor Farm - allocation potential access constraints	11161	Manor Farm - the allocation has potential access constraints, as identified in the SA/site assessment

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Manor Farm - allocation potential impacts on heritage assets.	11161	There is ancient woodland and SINC to the north of the site and there is potential for adverse impact on potential sites. Identified in SA/site assessment.
Manor Farm - potential impact on local gap	11161	Eastern area of site is within a critical local gap. The indicative 'developer' masterplan would significantly reduce the local gap. Identified in SA/site assessment.
Manor Farm - viability risks and evidence.	11161	Manor Farm - viability of the site is a risk, based on present day values. Evidenced in Strategic Sites Viability Testing (January 2024) Report.
National Landscape	Natural England 10140	Reference the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, the Council needs to demonstrate the site allocation is deliverable in its current location. Understood that where sites assessed as high landscape sensitivity in the Landscape Sensitivity Study, there are specific recommendations to lessen the potential impacts on nationally designated landscapes. Greater emphasis of the considerations to nationally protected landscapes should be made for the allocated site policy
North Wessex Downs National Landscape	10841	Object to the Manor Farm proposal as North Wessex Downs National Landscape should never be impacted by development, it should be protected
Other suitable areas	10663	Are there not more suitable areas for the Manor Farm proposal rather than in the middle of two quiet villages?
Proposed Green Space	10841	Object to the Manor Farm proposal as if there was any consideration for green space there wouldn't be development on the land, providing a 'defensible boundary' is irrelevant
	10841	Object to the Manor Farm proposal as no consideration has been given to green space along Saxon Way to provide a noise and privacy boundary for properties in Saxon Fields

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Public Right of Way	10762	Reference to 'the enhancement of the existing public rights of way'. We request the residents of Knights Enham be given the opportunity to consult on any amendments to public rights of way.
	10841	The public rights of way on the Manor Farm site should remain in place, serious consideration would need to be given to links with Andover Diamond Wood and Harmony Wood
Public transport	10243	The site is acknowledged to closely conform to the spatial strategy but achieving the aspirations for a high quality public transport choice may be challenging given the scale and location. Service 11 operates daytimes broadly every hour, should the County withdraw the budget for less frequent buses it would be at high risk of withdrawal. Significant development contributions would be required to establish a service operating at least every 30 minutes between 0700-1900, Monday-Saturday with evening and Sunday services worthy of detailed discussion. Optimising the relevance of this service should be discussed with local operators, if mode shift and longer-term commercial viability is to be achieved.
Public transport and site capacity	10243	Demands between existing development, this proposal and the proposal in the Charlton NDP may start to make a more frequent and effective service possible. If a significantly higher development capacity can be achieved this should be pursued as the viability of public transport here will be sensitive to overall scale of development as well as achieving a policy-compliant level of affordable housing however, the site does potentially impinge on protected heritage assets that present constraints to the achievable capacity of the site.
Service 11 logistics	10243	The potential for a reinforced bus service 11 would demand a slightly enlarged terminal loop with the western terminal taking advantage of the western arm of Kiel Drive roundabout. There is no way a stand-alone cul-de-sac access strategy can provide an effective and rational bus service pattern that would allow the combination of a modestly sized allocation with existing demands to the south. A second eastern access would be necessary with a reasonably direct and efficient primary street between these two points, connecting to a second all-movements junction on Saxon Way with Kiel Drive – probably a new roundabout replacing the current priority T-junction.
site constraints	10803	Policy NA5 references the need for a provision of a significant area of high quality and accessible green space in the north, a heritage impact assessment, a buffer to the east adjacent to Knights Enham, a buffer to the west to the crematorium and a sequential approach to direct development to areas of lowest flood risk. Therefore there are significant constraints to development on this site which

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		significantly reduces the extent of the developable area and question the suitability of the site for development.
infrastructure - water	10022 Southern Water	SW have undertaken preliminary assessment of capacity of existing SW infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for proposal which indicated that existing local water supply infrastructure to site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development
	10022 Southern Water	Proposal for 800 dwellings on site will generate a need for reinforcement of the water supply network to provide additional capacity to serve the development. This reinforcement would be provided through New Infrastructure charge to developers
	10022 Southern Water	connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation
	10022 Southern Water	Add criteria h) stating 'occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of water network reinforcement, in consultation with the service provider'
Strategic allocation - Manor Farm	10119	Strongly support the allocation of the land to deliver housing-led mixed use development in one of the most suitable and sustainable locations and which is available.
Strategic allocation - Manor Farm	10119	The allocation will support the overarching priorities for Northern Test Valley, including the regeneration of Andover town centre, by focussing sustainable growth at Andover and supporting the economy.
	10119	There are no technical constraints to delivering the development allocated.
	10119	There is additional land within the control of the site promoter that could be added to the allocation to deliver a greater number of homes than is currently proposed (at least 900). Additional land to the north, north west and north east could be included in the allocation, which would offer benefits in helping to meet housing need and enable more comprehensive masterplanning.
	10119	A larger allocation than is proposed would offer significant social benefits, including; community facilities, sports, open space (a larger country park) and recreational opportunities; extended rights of

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		way and connections to the public rights of way network and enhanced links to better connect with the countryside, including to Andover Diamond Wood and Harmony Wood, in accordance with draft policy HE3 (access to the countryside). This would in turn encourage healthy and active lifestyles
	10119	A larger allocation than is proposed would offer significant environmental benefits, including; opportunities for renewable energy provision/microgeneration (and climate change benefits); more green infrastructure, greater biodiversity and habitat opportunities and enhanced ecological networks; nature based solutions to mitigating climate change and BNG; a larger country park (to the north east, and north of Knights Enham), a greater buffer and defensible boundary with enhanced transition to the countryside. The additional land may also help the development to achieve nutrient neutrality (meeting draft policies BIO1, BIO2, BIO4. HE1 and HE3).
	10119	Suggest a larger allocation than that proposed would provide greater flexibility to deliver more homes (at least 900) which would provide more flexibility in housing delivery over the plan period, to meet housing needs (including potentially more specialist housing), whilst also enabling more flexibility in layout, masterplanning, residential parcels, density transition, connection and placemaking.
	10119	The allocation (figure 4.5) includes an arbitrary line that sub-divides two of the fields on the northern edge of the site boundary. Site promoter does not propose to build on the northern edge of the site, but it would be beneficial to incorporate countryside compatible uses that will help to achieve wider placemaking and biodiversity objectives. Some flexibility in the site boundaries will be needed to accommodate an appropriate and deliverable allocation.
	10119	Wording change.
Strategic allocation - Manor Farm - heritage considerations	10119	Revised wording proposed to increase flexibility to support development in the northern part of site at a lower density.
	10119	Policy criteria c) and map (figure 4.5) show an indicative heritage buffer west of Knights Enham. The site has been subject to a detailed heritage assessment including a Built Heritage Assessment (RPS, April 2022) which demonstrated that, subject to a suitable landscape scheme and mitigation, the site is deliverable in heritage terms and that any potential adverse heritage impacts can be either minimised or avoided.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10119	The Heritage Assessment and vision document previously submitted assessed a wider landholding to the north and northeast of the allocation, and this showed that while the land immediately north and west of Knights Enham and within the setting of the Manor House is of higher sensitivity (which should be retained as open space), the land to the east of this (beyond Hungerford Lane, and outside the current allocation) is of limited sensitivity in heritage terms and would be appropriate for development.
	10119	Accepting that the proposed heritage buffer is indicative at this stage, and that the requirement is for an 'appropriate buffer', it should be noted that the submitted Vision document showed a smaller buffer and it has been demonstrated that heritage impacts can be mitigated and minimised through the design and assessment process, as part of a future planning application, which will include a Heritage Impact Assessment and site specific design and landscape measures, in accordance with criteria b) of the policy.
Strategic allocation - Manor Farm - housing number	10119	The policy states that the allocation can provide 800 homes. However, design work to date on the allocation has shown the site can accommodate at least 900 dwellings. This capacity is also included in the growth scenarios in the Housing Topic Paper (2024) and Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2024) (para 5.128 suggests a potential of 800-900 homes). It seems unlikely that the 900 (rather than 800) would result in a significantly different conclusion to the sustainability of the growth scenario.
	10119	Design work for the Manor Farm site has shown that over 900 dwellings can be accommodated at an appropriate density for the site, with residential parcels carefully integrated, with a gradual and harmonious transition from the more urban to more rural setting further north. Given the SA support for 900 homes and uncertainty about capacity and deliverability on other allocated sites, there is no reason to delay delivery, and the policy text should be amended to make best use of the land available to deliver at least 900 homes.
Strategic allocation - Manor Farm - local centre and employment land	10119	Site promoter put forward a 1.1ha local centre within the proposed strategic allocation with combined employment floorspace, but it is noted a separate requirement for 1.5ha employment land is included in the policy text. Given that there is no specific justification for 1.5ha of employment land within the evidence base, the policy requirement should be reduced to state at least 1ha at this stage. It should also set out an indicative figure, to ensure flexibility in case of changes in market demand for small scale employment land, so that the allocation is justified and deliverable.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Strategic allocation - Manor Farm - proposed buffers	10119	Accepting that the heritage, crematorium and green space buffers (fig 4.5) are needed to minimise impacts, the buffers should not be rigid at this stage and should be shown as light shaded/hatched areas without a fixed boundary line to ensure sufficient flexibility, so that they can be adjusted as required, subject to further evidence and justification.
sustainable site	10119	Representation supports in principle the proposed allocation of Land at Manor Farm, Andover, and confirms the suitability of the site for development at a sustainable location north of Andover, for a development of at least 900 homes.
Traffic	10663	Saxon Way is extremely busy, how will it cope with another 800 houses from the Manor Farm proposal?
	10841	Object to the Manor Farm proposal as Saxon Way is already a rat run, what traffic calming measures will be put in place to reduce the speed? An extra 1200 cars along Saxon Way will make it more difficult to get out of Saxon Fields Estate

Policy NA6 Bere Hill
Paragraphs 4.70-4.79

Key Issue	Officer Response
Vehicular Access and Highways	Vehicular access from the A3090 is considered acceptable in highway safety terms and the additional traffic generated can be acceptably accommodated on the highway network.
Sustainable Transport Modes/Active Travel	Development would include provision and enhancement of pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre and to facilities and services in adjoining neighbourhoods to the east at Picket Twenty. Active travel links and routes will also need to facilitate safe access to the school to encourage walking and cycling to school. Walking, wheeling and cycling would require improvements to provide safe connections to Picket Twenty. Supporting text has been updated to reflect this. Further engagement with Hampshire County Council and local bus companies will be required to assess how access to bus services could be facilitated.
Landscape	The layout and strategic landscaping should be informed by a landscape assessment given the site's visual prominence and take into account the protection and enhancement of significant features such as the historic Ladies Walk through the provision of an appropriate buffer.
Noise	The indicative noise buffer shown in the inset map will require further technical work in the form of a noise survey to inform the buffer extent and layout of the development including any mitigation required to address unacceptable noise levels arising from the A303.
Infrastructure – education	A primary school will be required to be delivered on site funded through developer contributions. Financial contributions will also be required towards provision, enhancement and/or expansion of secondary schools and Special Educational Needs facilities to accommodate the arising pupil population. A day nursery and/or pre-school will also be required on site.
Heritage and archaeology	Development will require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) to demonstrate how the layout and design of the development will respond sensitively to the significance of Ladies Walk, the Iron Bridge and the listed buildings adjacent to the site.
Green Space	Access to natural and semi-natural green spaces should be provided to maintain a healthy lifestyle as well as a place for communities to connect, providing spaces for informal play and recreation. The green spaces should be significant in scale and link with existing areas of green space. It may be multifunctional in nature, incorporating enhancements to existing vegetation and responding positively to constraints such as buffer zones or structural landscaping, creating areas of opportunity to enhance opportunities for wildlife and their habitats.

Key Issue	Officer Response
Public Rights of Way	A strategy for enhancing the rights of way network should be considered alongside the layout of the area of significant green space, ensuring the linkages between paths is maintained and enhanced. While priority should be given to the function of the public rights of way in providing access to the countryside particularly to the south of the A303, additional use may require their upgrade and improvement. The Public Rights of Way Network may also provide a way for active travel and this should be considered when developing a framework for movement.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	10137	Para. 4.78 says that site access proposed from A3093 Picket Twenty roundabout but that further technical work will be required to assess the feasibility of any possible further access points. It is not clear whether the Council intends to undertake additional work or require further detail from land promoters
	10137	The indicative nature of this plan should be emphasised and will be subject to refinement. It is suggested that additional indicated routes are added to the plan including those proposed by the promoters of Bere Hill Farm and Land at Bere Hill, including the proposed access further north on the A3093.
	10230	Technical work to demonstrate the deliverable access can be provided to the site has been undertaken the site will need to be served by several access points. Criteria f) should be modified to read “access via the A3093” and illustrated in figure 4.6 with an access arrow from the A3093 further north on the L&Q Estates site if this diagram remains in the plan. Such an access can also support the word allocation and enable a first phase of development to be brought forward at an early stage.
	10673 10243	A single point of access for the Bere Hill development would seem to be inadequate The far western end of the site may exceed a 400m walk from stops on a rational bus service alignment. Dene Path leads into the existing built-up area however, caution should be taken assuming the limited services there will be sustainable long term. Securing a western vehicular access from Old Winton Road from the site is something that has yet to be demonstrated and needs “further technical work”.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Active Travel	10842	Network Rail note that this site falls within 20 minutes of the centre of Andover as a reasonable walking and cycling distance as identified within the Andover masterplan.
	10842	Given its relative proximity to the centre of Andover, this proposed site allocation could reasonably accommodate improved cycling and walking links to facilitate access to Andover town centre. Network Rail would encourage inclusion of this within the draft Policy to allow for improved access.
Andover rail station	10842	The potential for increased use of Andover station as a result of the development would also justify this development contributing towards improvements at the station to ensure it can accommodate the increased usage.
Arable land	11009	Why take arable land out of production? We should not be importing and increasing our carbon footprint
Bere Hill	10803	object to policy
BNG	10137	10% biodiversity net gain should be achievable on the Peel Holdings site.
Brownfield Sites	11009	I cannot understand why brownfield sites are not being used rather than green sites
Buffer	10803	whilst it is noted and appreciated the reasoning behind a suggested landscaped buffer to the north of the allocation, adjacent to Ladies Walk, this is unfortunate and may constrain the ability for the site to successfully assimilate with the wider Andover area and will require careful and sensitive design to create an effective integration of existing and new communities
	10137	The indicative buffer for noise to the south and east boundaries of the site is based on high level DEFRA mapping. It generates an average stand-off between 60 - 80 metres, equating to a total area circa 15 Ha across the allocation. This does not tie in with the buffer proposed within the Peel land which we consider to be sufficient, potentially in conjunction with other mitigation options which are currently being considered.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10803	buffers have been indicatively shown on Figure 4.6, however it does not appear that appropriate and relevant robust assessment work has been undertaken to confirm whether these are sufficient to address potential impacts and consequently whether the site can deliver the anticipated level of development
	11009	The Ladies Walk corridor need a very large buffer zone including mature trees, correct hedgerow species and wildflower open areas away from Ladies Walk for pollinators
Capacity	10137	Considered that the strategic allocation can deliver more than 1,400 dwellings, including a minimum of 700 dwellings on the promoter's land.
Community Services and Facilities	10762	Picket Twenty's key facilities and commercially led facilities have been regarded by some as inadequate. We will be keen to learn more about plans for Bere Hill at the Regulation 19 stage.
Connectivity to existing development	10243	The site is close to the southern edge of the town but the existing built form, heritage assets, topography, habitat and biological constraints bind on the site in a way the built footprint will stand off from the edge of the town which already "turns its back on the site". It is unclear if the direct link along Old Micheldever Road to the town centre could be used to form access restricted to buses and sustainable modes only, this would be essential if the aspirations to improve connectivity between Picket Twenty and the town centre could be achieved where bus services are concerned.
Constraints	10230	Suggest that figure 4.6 only shows the boundary of the allocation and removes reference to "indicative location for significant green space" and "indicative buffer for noise". If figure 4.6 remains the indicative location for significant green space on the indicative buffer for noise should reflect the information previously submitted by the promoter via the Vision Document and other promotion materials.
Contextual evidence	10137	the pattern of housing growth to the east of Andover was largely established by the previous local plan 2006 which ran until 2011 allocated 3,700 homes across the following two sites: east of Icknield Way/East Anton and Picket Twenty. Housing growth during the current adopted plan which runs up to 2029 focused to the east of Andover with two allocations at Picket Piece and Picket Twenty. This level of housing growth suggest that Andover is the key settlement within Test Valley and has been the

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		major focus of growth in the successive and current local plans. Andover has seen substantial and consistent housing delivery since the start of the current plan in 2011. Growth has focused on the east of the settlement delivering 4,120 dwellings since 2011. These delivery rates suggest a buoyant housing market. The council has a relatively strong five-year supply position for northern Test Valley as per the 2023 Housing Implementation Statement.
	10137	East Anton and Picket Piece are some distance from the shops and services of the town centre. Picket Twenty is slightly disconnected from the settlement separated by the proposed site allocation. This site is far better connected to the town centre than these historic allocations. The site represents an obvious infill opportunity and the next logical location for growth in Andover.
Education provision	10137	Land within the strategic allocation and funding from the three landowners could be made available for a primary school, if required. However, the wording needs updating to reflect this to clarify that the developer will not be delivering the school themselves, this will be delivered separately by the local education authority.
	10230	It is unclear at this regulation 18 stage whether a school is required on the site over the improvements and extensions to existing schools could be more efficiently and effectively provided through funding. It would be appropriate to note in the policy or supporting text that the school requirement is subject to confirmation from the education authority.
Environmental constraints	10068 Environment Agency	No environmental constraints identified.
Flexibility in policy	10230	In summary the site promoters supports the allocation. It is considered that an element of flexibility must be retained at this early stage to recognise; there are three land owners it will work collaboratively in the preparation of a master plan, that further evidence will need to be provided through the application process, that the allocation will need to be served by more than one access. The policy would benefit from minor rewording.
Flood risk	10137	Sequential test is required to locate development in the areas of lowest risk of flooding. However, a developer need not undertake a sequential test at the time of submitting an application for allocated sites, and it is requested that this paragraph be reworded accordingly.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Green Space	10137	Reference in the policy wording to "a significant area" could be variably interpreted and these words should be replaced with 'suitable' or equivalent.
	10137	It is not clear what has informed the 'indicative location for significant green infrastructure' shown on the figure, as there is no obvious supporting evidence for this and it does not seem to follow the topography or landform of the site. We suggest that this detail is amended in line with the evidence provided by the promoters of Bere Hill Farm and Land at Bere Hill unless the Council provides updated evidence that contradicts this.
	10137	Para. 4.76 says that additional work will be required to refine the precise area and nature of the green space for Regulation 19. It is not clear whether the Council intends to undertake additional work themselves in this regard or require further detail from land promoters.
Active Travel	10099 Hampshire County Council	Micheldever Road is not suitable for car traffic from the development but will provide a good opportunity for a direct active travel route to Andover. The town centre and railway station are within a 10 minute cycle journey which could match or better car travel times to these destinations. Suggest the additional criterion of: "i. The enhancement of Micheldever Road to provide a safe and convenient walking, wheel and cycling link to Andover town centre"
Infrastructure - education	10099 Hampshire County Council	The catchment primary and secondary schools are Anton Infant and Junior School & Winton Secondary School
	10099 Hampshire County Council	To mitigate the planned growth, applicants will be expected to contribute towards enhancing education capacity in accordance with Policy COM1- contributions towards Winton Secondary School and providing a new 2FE school
	10099 Hampshire County Council	To meet the demand of pre-school children from the site, a 110 place Day nursery and 40 place preschool option could be provided on the school site
	10099 Hampshire County Council	In accordance with policy COM1 one to two additional classrooms for SEND (special educational needs and disability) provision would be required at primary and secondary phase, at an appropriate nearby maintained or special school.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Any new school should be centrally located within its catchment area, within an 800m walking distance of all homes. Safe routes to school on foot or for cycling and wheeling should be provided. The school site would need to be permeable with an optimum number of pedestrian entrances. Parking provision for park and stride should be at least a five-minute walk away, not immediately outside the school gate.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	A contribution for both a framework and a follow up full travel plan should be secured from the developer.
Infrastructure - Transport	10099 Hampshire County Council	Policy DM2(h) of LTP4 states that the Local Highway Authority will only support new accesses onto A roads where the strategic flow of traffic is prioritised, and all other reasonable options have been considered. The roundabout also currently provides a poor environment for those walking, wheeling and cycling and would require improvements to provide safe connections to Picket Twenty.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Suggest amending criterion f: “f. Access to the development via A3093 roundabout, where it can be demonstrated the strategic flow of traffic is prioritised and high-quality active travel connectivity can be delivered”.
Public Right of Way	10099 Hampshire County Council	A network of Footpaths cross the site (Andover Footpaths 2,3,4,5 and 502) and a Restricted Byway/Byway runs north/south along the western edge of the site (Andover RB 52, which south of the A303 becomes Upper Clatford RB 752 and BOAT 16).
	10099 Hampshire County Council	A Country Park is welcomed as a concept; there is relatively little publicly accessible countryside in the area and its proposed location would also benefit the wider population of Andover. It is noted that a steep field adjoining the northern edge of the development area is currently used as open access, demonstrating a demand which will grow significantly with additional population, although the legal permission is not known.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	It will be important to enhance routes linking to the landscape south of the A303, particularly the Clatfords and Harewood Forest. Two rights of way provide this connection and should be enhanced and paths provided to them within the development. The western route is the Restricted Byway /Byway open to all traffic (Upper Clatford

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		BOAT 16, footpath 752 and Goodworth Clatford footpath 17); the surface here should be physically upgraded to cope with the additional use. The eastern path (Andover Footpath 2, 3 Goodworth Clatford 702 and 9) should be considered for upgrade to Bridleway to allow access by cycle and ridden horse. A Footpath is shown between these two proposed routes (Upper Clatford footpath 705 and 13, going through the Solar Farm); it does not have facility to cross the A303, so efforts should concentrate on the two proposed routes mentioned previously.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Andover Footpath 4 which runs east-west across the site is known locally as 'Ladies Walk' and should be protected and enhanced to ensure accessibility.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	A comprehensive approach to maintaining and enhancing public rights of way across the site should be included in any outline planning applications.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Financial contributions may be sought to enhance access from this site to the wider network, including the two Rights of Way with established crossings of the A303 which lead south into the countryside including Harewood Forest (Andover Restricted Byway 52 and Footpath 2) in accordance with the IDP NA6 and paths extending towards Pickets Piece. Inclusion of a Bridleway along the southern edge of the site, parallel to the A303 and connecting to the existing network at either end would be welcomed; if this were achieved extinguishment of part of Footpaths 2 and 3 would be considered.
Hedgerows	11009	The hedgerows in the area should be preserved to protect the wildlife that depends on it
archaeology	Historic England 10049	object -Noting the site includes / has the potential to include assets of archaeological interest, we advise referring in policy to archaeological remains, and add a reference to the HER in the supporting text
	Historic England 10049	object - advise liaising with the Council's archaeological adviser to ensure they support the approach taken
	Historic England 10049	We consider HIA is particularly needed for the site, informed by liaison with the Council's conservation team and its archaeological advisers

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
heritage impact assessment		
	Historic England 10049	object - amended wording proposed
Housing delivery	10137	Housing delivery is predicted to fall significantly in northern test valley to the extent that the housing requirement was not met in 2022 and 23. The Council could find themselves in a vulnerable position on five year housing supply in the coming years unless additional housing land is identified.
Infrastructure - Education	10762	Note that the site would generate a requirement for a new 2 form entry new primary school. Has there been any discussion about the need for a new secondary school?
Masterplanning	10230	It is suggested that this needs to be informed by a comprehensive master plan and supporting technical assessments. The site promoter acknowledges the desire and need to protect and enhance Ladies Walk add the surrounding landscape and have undertaken a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment. The policy and figure 4.6 should therefore be revised to require a minimum area of green infrastructure based upon the promoter's master plan and supporting technical assessments.
Masterplanning	10243	Due to separate land control, comprehensive master planning allowing for the rational development and phasing will be essential which is not reflected in the draft policy. Given how sensitive the access constraints on this site are and the land control across three landowners, it is important the key principles are agreed across the whole site in advance of planning application/s being submitted.
Highway access	National Highways 10291	1,400 homes lies adjacent to A303 junction with A3093
Noise pollution	10137	Requirements that the masterplan, layout and design of the development will need to take into account potential noise buffers along the southern boundary. The site promoter is currently considering what a suitable noise buffer may be, and other potential mitigation options.
Other uses	10841	The Bere Hill proposal would be a great location to build a new hospital, hospice, health centres and ambulance station due to its location

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Promoter evidence	10137	the Illustrative Master Plan focuses development on the southern and eastern sections of the site to avoid the higher ground providing a buffer to Ladies Walk and Iron Bridge. The master plan also ties in with the adjacent development parcels which includes land being promoted by L&Q Estates (land at Bere Hill hill) add Test Valley Borough Council (land at Bailiffs Bottom). an illustrative masterplan shows substantial public open space including an extensive area of public open space from the northern and western part alongside Ladies Walk and Iron Bridge delivering well integrated open space which is connected to the existing settlement and the public rights of way network.
	10137	SCP transport have undertaken an initial access assessment which has fed into the illustrative master plan. It considers suitable primary vehicular access into the site including: via the existing picket 20 roundabout on the A3093 and a new roundabout to the north also off the a 3093. Both of these access points are considered suitable and achievable
	10137	the Preliminary Ecological Assessment confirms that ecological value is concentrated within the woodlands and hedgerows at the perimeter so these have been largely retained within the proposed master plan. This ecological work will be refreshed and updated to inform the Regulation 19 consultation.
	10137	the Nutrient Neutrality Report confirms that the proposed peel development would convert arable and grazing land into urban development and open space. It should be possible to achieve nutrient neutrality on site. This can be supplemented with a range of offsite mitigation strategies if required.
	10137	the Noise Impact Assessment demonstrates that with commensurate mitigation options comprising a 3 metre noise barrier combined with strong frontage development to the A303 boundary, suitable internal and external amenity standards can be achieved including within the currently designated indicative noise buffer zone.
Public transport and site capacity	10243	If a public transport link is not achievable on Micheldever Road then a stand-alone “bespoke” service would be required however, with little or no other demand than that arising from the development, the costs to establish this will be high and long-term sustainability even as a single-bus operation every 30 minutes, is not entirely credible. This concern would increase if capacity reduces below 1400 dwellings and/or if a policy-compliant level of affordable housing is not delivered.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Public transport offer	10243	The site is acknowledged to closely conform to the spatial strategy but we have material concerns that a viable public transport strategy remains to be demonstrated, access to relatively infrequent services to the north on foot or cycle is challenged by topography furthermore, the existing services closest to the site are at risk of withdrawal under the County's proposals which assumes reliance on the P20 service as it would be inappropriate to divert service 76.
Quantum of development	10230	The policy may benefit from minor amendments to ensure the policy is unambiguous as required by paragraph 16 of the NPPF. A comprehensive master plan will be prepared to identify how the allocation is best developed as well as the likely number of dwellings. Some flexibility within the identified number of dwellings within the policy is therefore suggested. Suggest that the policy is re-worded to state "approximately 1400 dwellings".
site constraints	10803	the site has several key constraints – including noise impacts from traffic, access constraints and potential ecological and heritage impacts on Ladies Walk
Site details	10137	Peel has legal control of 52.5 hectares of agricultural land at Bere Hill and is promoted for a minimum of 700 dwellings
	10137	The Summary Development Framework demonstrates that the site is entirely suitable, available, and achievable for residential development. Other evidence undertaken by the site promoter seeks to demonstrate that the site can be delivered while enhancing the visual, ecological and historic asset of the site and its surroundings in addition to providing appropriate infrastructure and achieving additional vehicular access on the A3093.
	10137	the site is not in a flood risk zone and is not subject to any statutory or local environmental designation. There are some sites of local nature importance (SINCs) and tree preservation orders adjacent to the site. This can be incorporated into the development without any impact.
		the site is highly sustainable and is within 900 metres of the town centre which includes a range of facilities and services. The site is within a 20 minute walking catchment of the town centre and within walking distance of a range of services and facilities such as schools, bus stops, shops and community facilities in adjacent neighbourhoods.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
infrastructure - water	10022 Southern Water	SW have undertaken preliminary assessment of capacity of existing SW infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for proposal which indicated that existing local water supply infrastructure and local sewerage infrastructure to site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development
	10022 Southern Water	Proposal for 1,400 dwellings on site will generate a need for reinforcement of the water supply and wastewater networks to provide additional capacity to serve the development. This reinforcement would be provided through New Infrastructure charge to developers
	10022 Southern Water	connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of sewer flooding and low water pressure issues unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation
	10022 Southern Water	SW infrastructure crosses the site which needs to be taken into account for the layout of the proposed development as an easement of 6 metres or more, depending on the pipe size and depth would be required which may affect site layout or require diversion. Easements should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting
	10022 Southern Water	Add criteria i) stating 'occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of water network reinforcement, in consultation with the service provider'
	10022 Southern Water	Add criteria h) stating 'layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes
Support	10137	Fully welcome and support the allocation demonstrating that it is a sustainable location for development. Peel is committed to working together with the other land owners within allocation NA6. Joint working has already begun and will continue
	10230	Support the sites allocation and considers this strategic allocation wholly aligns with the overarching vision and objectives proposed for the local plan.
sustainable location	10803	this site represents a generally logical and appropriate location for the sustainable growth of Andover, which is appropriately defined by the A303 and A3093 to contain development and avoid uncontrolled sprawl

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Technical assessments	10230	Suggest that supporting text stating that the master plan and planning applications should be supported by technical assessments.
Test Valley Borough Council: Principle	11107	The Council supports the proposed strategic policy/ allocation at land at Bere Hill . Professional advisors will supplement the existing evidence to further demonstrate the technical unsustainable merits of the site appointment of advisors will be through cabinet. Commitment to collaborate with adjoining land owners to ensure a comprehensive and successful development can be brought forward
Test Valley Borough Council: Support	11107	Support integral environmental and infrastructure improvements proposed. The site is available for development and is anticipated to deliver the rate of build over the time frame indicated in the housing trajectory.
Vehicular access	10137	Given the scale of the proposed allocation, it will need to include provision for more than one vehicular access, and this needs to be enshrined within the policy.
Viability	10230	Paragraph 6.2 of the Strategic Sites Viability Assessment recognises that viability is a key consideration on strategic allocation site NA6. It is recommended that the policy or supporting text include a statement that the policy requirements will need to be subject to viability testing and in the event of viability concerns being demonstrated any future applications will be assessed fairly and pragmatically.
Wildlife	11009	How will you protect the bats, skylarks nesting sites and all other wildlife

Policy NA7 & NA8 Ludgershall
Paragraphs 4.83- 4.107

Key Issue	Officer Response
Cross boundary working	<p>The proposed allocations of NA7 and NA8 at Ludgershall are on the boundary with Wiltshire Council. Through the Duty to Co-operate, both Test Valley Borough Council and Wiltshire Council co-operate on a number of matters relating to the proposed allocations at Ludgershall set out in our emerging local plans to ensure new development is well integrated into Ludgershall and is delivered with the appropriate types and levels of infrastructure that is co-ordinated with the phasing of development. This engagement is ongoing.</p>
Infrastructure	<p>Both proposed allocations would be required to contribute towards the provision of infrastructure such as schools, highways and transport, community facilities, healthcare, recreation, ecology and biodiversity.</p> <p>TVBC works with infrastructure providers, Wiltshire Council and other organisations to assess the impact of development and identify appropriate mitigation, including the timing of its delivery. Provision of utilities such as reinforcement to grid connections or upgrading waste water infrastructure are co-ordinated with a phased approach to development. This work is ongoing and will inform the Regulation 19 stage.</p> <p>Proposed allocation East of Ludgershall (NA7) – this site will be required to provide a new vehicular access, enhance active travel connections from the site to facilities in adjacent neighbourhoods and Ludgershall town centre and provide new or enhanced public transport infrastructure. Appropriate recreation facilities will be required on site for a development of this scale. This development will need to contribute towards local education, healthcare and community facilities.</p> <p>Proposed allocation South East of Ludgershall (NA8) – This site will be required to deliver a primary school on site, a new vehicular access via a bridge over the railway line, enhance active travel connections from the site to facilities in adjacent neighbourhoods and Ludgershall town centre and provide new or enhanced public transport infrastructure. Other infrastructure such as community facilities and shops will be co-ordinated with the Wiltshire allocation to the west (Policy 40 of Wiltshire emerging local plan). An area of significant green space will be required on site and will be co-</p>

	ordinated with the delivery of the proposed Wiltshire allocation to the west. A financial contribution towards local healthcare facilities will be required.
Masterplanning	The site will be required to be masterplanned and informed by technical evidence such as landscape impact, sustainable movement patterns and opportunities to conserve and enhance ecology and biodiversity. Masterplanning should be co-ordinated between different landowners and take into account adjacent allocations and development proposals to ensure new neighbourhoods are quality places.
Highways and access	<p>Transport modelling evidence demonstrates there is sufficient capacity along the A342 to accommodate the additional growth proposed at Ludgershall, but that further detailed modelling will be required for the Regulation 19 stage. A link road via a bridge over the railway line will enable access to both into the TVBC proposed South East of Ludgershall allocation (NA8) and the allocation proposed in Wiltshire Council Regulation 19 Local Plan Policy 40. The link road and bridge will require alterations via a new junction to enable access from both proposed allocations of East of Ludgershall (NA7) and South East of Ludgershall (NA8). Both developers of NA7 and NA8 will need to make provisions for access to their respective sites so as not to prejudice the other in the event that one site comes forward earlier.</p> <p>It is expected that the link road between the Wiltshire and TVBC NA8 allocations will be designed to accommodate local traffic for the purposes of accessing these allocations. Transport modelling evidence will also be used to inform specific improvements at key locations where impacts are identified.</p> <p>Work with Wiltshire Council and Hampshire County Council, as highway authority, and Network Rail continues to determine the timescales for delivery of the bridge over the railway line taking into account transport modelling evidence and timescales for phasing of the allocation in Wiltshire Regulation 19 Local Plan Policy 40.</p> <p>Costs associated with delivering a bridge over the railway line to access the allocation have been taken account of at Regulation 18 Stage 2 in the strategic sites viability assessment, which will be updated for the Regulation 19 stage.</p>
Active travel and accessibility	Both proposed allocations will be required to provide high quality infrastructure that prioritises movement within and beyond the sites via walking and wheeling. This will be required to be factored into the design of the junction enabling vehicular access to both allocations and for the site South

	<p>East of Ludgershall (NA8), active travel will be factored into the design of the bridge to enable safe and convenient movement between the allocations, particularly where NA8 will contain facilities and services such as a school, new community facilities and potentially a shop.</p> <p>Masterplanning of both the TVBC (NA8) and Wiltshire Council (Policy 40) allocations will require prioritisation of active travel infrastructure to ensure good connectivity so that journeys on foot or non-motorised means are able to permeate the sites and adjacent neighbourhoods easily and make it attractive to access existing facilities in the west of Ludgershall via active travel modes. A framework for movement via active modes will be a central pillar of the masterplanning process.</p>
Transport	Ludgershall is served by the Activ8 bus service which runs 3 times an hour between Salisbury – Tidworth – Andover, via Andover railway station. Development will be expected to provide enhancements to existing and provide new public transport infrastructure and enable good connectivity to bus stops.
Biodiversity and nature conservation (including ancient woodland)	<p>Development will be subject to ecological studies including habitats and protected species. Mitigation will be provided to satisfy the Habitats Regulations. While the allocations are not within a statutory nature conservation designation, the allocations are within 6.4km of Salisbury Plain Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Area (SPA) where recreational impacts will need to be taken into account as part of an approach to mitigation. The Council is working with Wiltshire Council and Natural England on an appropriate strategy for mitigation taking into account the existing approach adopted by Wiltshire Council.</p> <p>Further ecological studies will inform the layout and design of the site including buffers around ancient woodland and other ecologically sensitive areas as identified in surveys.</p>
Landscape impact	The layout and strategic landscaping of both proposed allocations should be informed by a landscape assessment given their close proximity to the North Wessex Downs National Landscape and take into account the protection and enhancement of significant features through the provision of appropriate enhancements and/or buffers.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
A342 - Impact	11001	The A342 is already very busy and at peak hours can be dangerous to access and/or cross, there is no mention of traffic calming/management anywhere in the plan

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	10817	The delivery of any access to the allocation for Policy NA7 must not preclude the emerging proposals for the roundabout and overbridge to facilitate Policy NA8. Appropriate safeguards are required within Policy NA7 as it would be envisioned that the NA7 site would be accessed via a fourth arm to the proposed roundabout.
Adverse impact on nearby operational farming practices/activity and use of Biddesden Lane.	10826	The increased population and vehicles from the development would have a direct operational impact on the neighbouring farm, particularly at the end of the day, including increased traffic and recreational activities. Significant traffic is already using Biddesden Lane as a cut through, and this combined with increased recreational activity will make moving stock and large farm equipment even more difficult.
Adverse impacts on SINC designations in area, adjacent woodland belt, field margin and wildlife	10826	There are a number of areas designated as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation in this area, some of which are on the adjoining land or local to this site, and which directly benefit the work of the Wessex Farm Conservation Cluster Group. The Groups work has encouraged significant numbers of birds and small mammals, including dormice, owls, badgers, bats and deer. The parcel adjoins a well established belt of trees and field margin which a large development will undoubtedly have an adverse effect upon.
Allocation facilities working together	10243	Working with the Council and promoters of NA8, we would urge the opportunity to provide facilities to act as a substantial local travel interchange are provided if that site is to be brought forward. This might be better located south of Andover Road within that allocation, immediately east of any junction and bridge connection. If this does take place, the pedestrian and cycle access strategy for NA7 should take due account of this facility. However, we would stress that we do not consider the soundness of NA7 having any bearing on the allocation and delivery of draft allocation NA8.
Aspirations	10243	These aspirations should be relatively straightforward to achieve, at modest costs.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Biodiversity	10633	The local area provides sanctuary and habitat to birds and surrounding wildlife, which will be lost due to the proposed development.
Disruption to farming caused by people/poor behaviour/not sticking to public rights of way will increase.	10826	Disruption to farming caused by people, poor or antisocial behaviour, uncontrolled dogs and people not sticking to public rights of way will increase. This is already a problem for the farm.
Ecology - Mitigation	11001	Our expectation is that any mitigation to ecological concerns is not just the bare minimum of measures
Environmental constraints	10068 Environment Agency	No environmental constraints identified.
Flooding	11001	Concerned about any potential flood risk on developments and any additional knock on risk to other areas
Active Travel	10099 Hampshire County Council	With a small area of surface water flooding, what measures will be implemented to locate development in areas of lowest flood risk?
	10099 Hampshire County Council	There is currently no footway or cycleway provision on the A342 so the policy should consider how residents access facilities in Ludgershall without the need for a car. Suggest the additional criterion of: "g. The provision of high-quality active travel infrastructure to provide links through the site and safe walking, wheeling and cycling connections to existing facilities in Ludgershall."
Infrastructure - Schools	10099 Hampshire County Council	The catchment secondary school to this site is Harrow Way Community School

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10099 Hampshire County Council	To mitigate the planned growth, applicants will be expected to contribute towards enhancing education capacity in accordance with Policy COM1- contributions towards the expansion of Harrow Way Community School.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Contributions would also be sought for the creation of a new primary school or the expansion of Appleshaw St Peter's CE Primary & Kimpton, Thruxton & Fyfield CE Primary schools to meet the demand brought by this site. For the primary phase this would need to be considered alongside the other site of land South East of Ludgershall.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	A new pre-school would also be required as part of this site
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Contribution would need to be secured for Home to School transport as more than 3 miles to Harrow Way Community School.
Infrastructure - Transport	10099 Hampshire County Council	Policy DM2(h) of LTP4 states that the Local Highway Authority will only support new accesses onto A roads where the strategic flow of traffic is prioritised and all other reasonable options have been considered. Suggest amending criterion d: "d. Access to the development via A342 to the south, where it can be demonstrated the strategic flow of traffic is prioritised".
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Notwithstanding policy contained within LTP4, the County Council is unable to provide comments on whether a new access onto the A342 would be achievable or acceptable due to the lack of technical evidence available at this stage. The County Council would welcome further engagement with the site promoters and the Borough Council to discuss how safe access to the site could be achieved.
Public Right of Way	10099 Hampshire County Council	The County Council request that additional supporting paragraphs are added to both NA7 and NA8 to include the requirement for protecting and enhancing access to the countryside as well as to towns. And 4.97, including consideration of the upgrading of existing Footpaths to Bridleways, such as Kimpton Footpaths 6, 7 and 501.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	A contribution may be sought towards maintenance and enhancement of the wider rights of way network in accordance with IDP NA7 and NA8, including onsite and offsite upgrades of existing Footpaths to Bridleways.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Harm to landscape character	10826	A large scale development will adversely impact the beautiful landscape in the area, particularly from Biddesden and the Chutes, including through light pollution and increased traffic.
Harm to wildlife and biodiversity and to ongoing nature conservation schemes in the area.	10826	The adjoining land includes considerable acreage put to environmental schemes, and as members of the Wessex Farm Conservation Cluster Group, they work together to create wildlife corridors and complimentary schemes to enhance biodiversity and landscape, for people to enjoy. A significant housing development will be disruptive to this process.
Increase pressure on already stretched resources	10826	A large scale development will add further pressure to already stretched local resources.
Infrastructure	11025	Concerned that there is a lack of infrastructure to support new development.
Infrastructure - Community Facilities	10633	There are no provisions in the plan for the proposed development for children's play areas.
	10633	There are no provisions in the plan for the proposed development for a community hall.
Infrastructure - Dentists	10633	There are no provisions in the plan for the proposed development for an increase in local Dentist practices.
Infrastructure - GPs	10633	There are no provisions in the plan for the proposed development for an increase in local Doctors surgeries.
Infrastructure - health	10761	Castle Practice is closest GP practice to development and is likely to be most affected by increase in demand caused by increase in housing

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - Public Transport	10779	The bus service mentioned is neither frequent nor reliable and there are safety issues reported by young people. It is hoped the demand from the proposed development should lead to an improved bus service.
Infrastructure - Roads	11025	Increase in population would lead to more road use - the road is already damaged and susceptible to flooding.
Infrastructure - Schools	11025	The new development would increase pressure on schools that are already oversubscribed.
	10633	There are no provisions in the plan for the proposed development for primary or secondary schools.
infrastructure - sewer	11001	There are major works required to support waste and water treatment for the sites, which although noted in the Plan are unplanned and uncosted
	11001	Southern Water are undertaking a 5 year plan, however this is not sufficiently progressed to know if it encompasses adequate measures to address the needs for the existing community as well as the proposed development
Infrastructure - Shops	10633	There are no provisions in the plan for the proposed development for an increase in shops/retailers in the local area.
Infrastructure - Water	11001	We would want assurance that new developments have adequate drainage facilities and water treatment solutions in place so as not to compound existing issues
Light Pollution	11001	Concerned about any potential light pollution caused by development, in particular for residents of Great Shoddesden and Little Shoddesden but also including those on higher ground in the Parish
Local resources / site selection	11025	The development would greatly increase the population, putting a strain on local resources, especially with proposed Wiltshire County Council West of Ludgershall.
Loss of agricultural land	10826	The proposal will result in the loss of good agricultural land, which will be taken out of food production forever, at a time when sustainability is very much in the limelight.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Loss of environmental benefits associated with responsible farming of the land	10826	The environmental benefits naturally associated with responsible farming practices on the land will be lost.
Ludgershall	10803	object to policy
	10803	objections to identifying Ludgershall for major housing development and the lack of reference in the settlement hierarchy to confirm this as a suitable location to accommodate the level of growth proposed remains
	10803	it is considered that there are serious uncertainties about the suitability of Ludgershall to accommodate future housing growth due to it being a lower order and less sustainable settlement
Ludgershall sites access to services and facilities	10803	Site selection process raises concerns over appropriateness of allocations east of Ludgershall which do not benefit from access to significant level of services and facilities available at Andover
NA7 - Ecology and Biodiversity	10112	NA7 can integrate with ecological networks and improve biodiversity. Design will include ecological mitigation and protection of habitats, including woodland boundaries with adequate buffers, sensitive lighting and compensatory measures in design, where necessary. Allocation will incorporate at least 10% BNG in line with national planning policy.
NA7 - Flood risk	10112	Note some surface water flooding identified on the site. Surface water run off can be managed effectively through the implementation of a SUDs-based drainage scheme, in line with the LLFA and national requirements.
	10112	Note some surface water flooding identified on the site. Surface water run off can be managed effectively through the implementation of a SUDs-based drainage scheme, in line with the LLFA and national requirements.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
NA7 - meets a range of local plan objectives	10112	The allocation meets a range of local plan objectives, as follows; reducing impact on our changing climate; improving biodiversity and ecological networks; creating green, safe, well designed places; supporting infrastructure; promoting access to the countryside; conserving and enhancing landscape character; supporting active travel infrastructure and reducing impact from travel; working with communities.
Ancient woodland	Natural England 10140	Proposed allocation proposed directly adjacent to areas classified as ancient, replaced woodland and / or ancient & semi natural woodland. Impacts should be considered in line with the NPPF paragraph 186 and standing advice.
National Landscape	Natural England 10140	Reference the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, the Council needs to demonstrate the site allocation is deliverable in its current location. Understood that where sites assessed as high landscape sensitivity in the Landscape Sensitivity Study, there are specific recommendations to lessen the potential impacts on nationally designated landscapes. Greater emphasis of the considerations to nationally protected landscapes should be made for the allocated site policy
Salisbury Plain SAC & SPA	Natural England 10140	Site falls within 6.4km of Salisbury Plain SPA, therefore necessary to address impacts from increased recreational impact in accordance with policy BIO2. Recognise the Council is working with Wiltshire Council to establish whether mitigation can be secured towards existing mitigation strategy.
North Wessex Downs	11001	Concerned about any potential damage to the environment caused by development, a specific ecology consideration that causes us concern. The need to consider the impact of the development on the setting of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape
landscape impact	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	concerns given the site abuts the National Landscape (AONB) and will have an impact
landscape sensitivity assessment	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	needs to be landscape led, a landscape sensitivity assessment should have been carried out and form part of the evidence base for the allocation

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
LVIA	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	LVIA and lighting assessment required as part of any application and should be included in the policy
Pollution	10633	The proposed development will lead to an increase in pollution due to the increase in traffic.
Power Supply	11001	Concerned there is no reference to the demand on utilities and capacity for power to these sites, we would want assurance that current supplies would not be jeopardised before, during or after housing is established
	11001	Concerned there is no reference to the demand on utilities and capacity for power to these sites, we would want assurance that current supplies would not be jeopardised before, during or after housing is established
Public transport links and facilities	10243	The allocation relates directly to the Activ8 corridor and by virtue of location and scale, it is highly appropriate and sustainable and is strongly supported. Residents will be able to take advantage of the service from first occupation subject to upgraded bus stop facilities being provided on London Road. Care should be taken to locate at least one pair of high-quality bus stops, associated with a new pedestrian crossing facility, on Andover Road. This should be accessible by direct pedestrian links northwards into the body of the development.
Roads	11001	Expect that increased traffic flows will cause traffic delays at peak times and a degradation of road surfaces
Salisbury Plain SPA	11001	Concerned about any potential damage to the environment caused by development, a specific ecology consideration that causes us concern. The need for appropriate mitigation to any impact on the Salisbury Plain SPA and its significance for the conservation of bird species
Scale	10133	Do not support approach in spatial strategy to direct significant quantum of planned housing growth to east of Wiltshire market town of Ludgershall. This approach is inconsistent with objectives of spatial strategy and moreover, site selection process does not support sites at Ludgershall in favour

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		of development options at Andover, especially in respect of land at Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165)
Scale and impact of proposal on neighbouring land	10826	Concerned about proposed development north of A342, which is contiguous with the land owned by representer and the scale of the proposal will impact and effect the neighbouring farm in various ways.
Site Access	11001	Major works required to support access to the site which although noted in the LP are unplanned and uncostered
	11001	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
	11001	Figure does not identify the access of the other site, in reality the two will be opposite each other resulting in the need for a major junction at this point, either roundabout or traffic lights requiring extensive signage and lighting increasing the impact of light pollution. This should be highlighted as a consequence of the proposal
site constraints	10803	have serious concerns regarding the suitability of this site to accommodate housing development due to the significant development constraints that are identified – the ‘close proximity’ of the National Landscape and the need to create a ‘positive contribution to its setting’ (paragraph 4.89), the proximity to the Salisbury Plain SPA and the need for appropriate mitigation (paragraph 4.91), the lack of a confirmed suitable access (paragraph 4.92), potential for traffic noise (paragraph 4.93) and the need for an odour assessment (paragraph 4.94) in addition to the need for a sequential approach to flood risk (paragraph 4.95)
	10803	significant development constraints in their own right and when combined significantly constrain development potential and the area of developable land available. It does not appear that relevant and robust assessments have been undertaken to consider development potential and furthermore no attempt has been made on Figure 4.8 to identify any buffer zones or mitigation areas to address potential impacts, as shown in Figures accompanying other draft allocations. Consequently, there is no certainty that the site could deliver the level of development proposed.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10803	there are significant issues associated with the soundness of this site in terms of suitability to deliver the level of development proposed due to the combination of significant constraints, in particular the potential for landscape harm to the National Landscape and provides a lack of justification for this site allocation
infrastructure - sewer	Southern Water 10022	SW have undertaken preliminary assessment of capacity of existing SW infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for proposal which indicated that existing local sewerage infrastructure to site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development
infrastructure - wastewater	Southern Water 10022	Proposal for 350 dwellings on site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network to provide additional capacity to serve the development. This reinforcement would be provided through New Infrastructure charge to developers
infrastructure - water	Southern Water 10022	limited capacity in water supply infrastructure is not a constraint to development provided planning policy and subsequent conditions ensure that development aligns with the delivery of new wastewater infrastructure
	Southern Water 10022	connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation
	Southern Water 10022	Add criteria g) stating 'occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of water network reinforcement, in consultation with the service provider'
Speed	11001	Ongoing concern that the speed of traffic through the village is excessive, additional traffic is likely to compound the problem as people seek to get to work/school
Strategic allocation NA7 - active travel and highway improvements	10112	The site allocation can deliver/support active travel enhancements and connections to Ludgershall and neighbouring proposed allocations, and with traffic calming to A342, without need for a joint masterplan with NA8 (including enhancements such as speed limit reductions to A342, signalised crossing points and a cycle/footway)
Strategic allocation NA7 -	10112	Site allocation will deliver 40% affordable dwellings, to comply with HOU1 in full.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
to deliver affordable homes (40%)		
Strategic allocation NA7 can and should come forward on its own. Access is unfettered.	10112	The site can and should come forward on its own. While it should give consideration to adjoining allocated site(s) to south, and their access, it will have its own access proposed off A342, which may take the form of a roundabout. The site access is unfettered by any ownership constraints or any constraints due to network rail control and can be delivered through engagement with Hampshire County Council.
Strong support for strategic allocation NA7	10112	Site promoter strongly support the proposed strategic allocation of Land east of Ludgershall (Policy NA7) to deliver new homes to help meet identified local housing need and confirm it can be delivered within the first 5 years of the Plan.
Traffic	11001	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. Traffic already uses Kimpton as a route to get to the A303, this issue is exacerbated during road closures
Traffic modelling	11001	KPC believe that detailed modelling of traffic flows using the A342 from the site eastbound and westbound is essential to ensure that infrastructure to support potential traffic flows is identified and delivered
Utilities	10633	There are no provisions to improve local utilities such as power, water supply, drainage and road improvements for the area.
Will add strain to water resources, sewerage and drainage, which is already a concern.	10826	Development will put additional strain on water supplies, sewerage and drainage in the area and this is a concern. Resources are already under pressure and existing facilities need constant pumping and tankers transport effluent away.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Activ8 bus	Wiltshire Council 10202	Bus provision cites the Activ8 service as accommodating needs of the development. Important to address need or bus routing to penetrate into the developed urban fabric to maximise opportunities for residents to utilise sustainable transport options
Ecology Salisbury Plain SPA	Wiltshire Council 10202	Working on cross boundary matters concerning Salisbury Plain SPA and proposed allocations to consider appropriate mitigation. Ludgershall lies within with SPA 6.4km Zone of Influence (Zol) where recreational pressures from residential development must be addressed with adequate and appropriate mitigation to ensure compliance with Habitats Regulations
Education - Secondary	Wiltshire Council 10202	Note there is insufficient capacity at Wellington Academy to accommodate scale of growth envisaged by Test Valley on top of growth already planned through draft Wiltshire local plan
Education	Wiltshire Council 10202	Further discussions will be required regarding school provision in context of existing facilities and cumulative growth in the area
Highway access	Wiltshire Council 10202	Primary access is proposed from layby or generated junction provision to south from A342 and alternative access arrangements appear restricted due to lack of connectivity with existing highway infrastructure
Wiltshire Council: Infrastructure Delivery	Wiltshire Council 10202	Concerns over timely provision of infrastructure to support such high levels of housing at Ludgershall, which has implications for delivery of allocation in Wiltshire
Masterplan	Wiltshire Council 10202	Both Wiltshire and Test Valley draft local plans recognise need for masterplans for strategic allocations and important to plan comprehensively for sites at Ludgershall
Masterplan - ecology	Wiltshire Council 10202	Comprehensive (cross-boundary) masterplan for both Wiltshire and Test Valley allocation sites to ensure potential for in-combination and cumulative effects on ecological receptors can be appropriately managed
Masterplan - Housing Trajectory	Wiltshire Council 10202	Masterplans for sites at Ludgershall need to consider anticipated housing trajectories across both Wiltshire and Test Valley allocation sites with view to setting a single overall comprehensive (cross-boundary) masterplan

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Masterplan - infrastructure and sustainable transport	Wiltshire Council 10202	Comprehensive (cross-boundary) masterplan for both Wiltshire and Test Valley allocation sites to address shared infrastructure and sustainable transport to ensure improvements to local service provision commensurate to scale of growth
Masterplan - phasing and delivery	Wiltshire Council 10202	Comprehensive (cross-boundary) masterplan for both Wiltshire and Test Valley allocation sites to address phasing and delivery
Protected species - farmland birds	Wiltshire Council 10202	Draft Wiltshire local plan allocation at Ludgershall requires survey to inform suitable mitigation for ground nesting bird species and may be appropriate for Test Valley allocations to also consider potential for farmland birds
Scale of development at Ludgershall	Wiltshire Council 10202	Concerns about ability of market to accommodate such high levels of housing at Ludgershall
Scale of development at Ludgershall	Wiltshire Council 10202	Scale of growth would have implications for timely delivery of Wiltshire draft local plan allocation at Ludgershall
Solent SPA/SAC	Wiltshire Council 10202	Omits reference to location of site within River Test catchment and need for mitigation in relation to Solent internationally designated sites
Solent SPA/SAC	Wiltshire Council 10202	Cross reference to Policy BIO2 setting out requirements relating to international nature conservation designations are included in other proposed allocation policies. For consistency same cross referencing should be included in Ludgershall allocations
Sustainable travel modes	Wiltshire Council 10202	Mapping indicates a former track existing to the north west of the site, however this appears to be significantly overgrown with vegetation, is not included in the site allocation, nor is it highway/PROW and would not only lead to Biddesden Lane which does not provide infrastructure to accommodate segregated access for pedestrians and cyclists

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Wiltshire Council 10202	To west of site it may be possible to connect to Pretoria Road for walking and cycling, however this would result in significant remodelling or removal of a Town Council maintained and owned play area
	Wiltshire Council 10202	Lack of alternative access for any mode of transport would place reliance upon A342 Andover Road to convey residents from site to town centre
	Wiltshire Council 10202	With consideration of available infrastructure Andover Road is supported by narrow footways that do not extend to the site and no cycling infrastructure is present. Andover Road is therefore not considered sufficient to accommodate the sustainable transport needs of the development site
	Wiltshire Council 10202	Due to constraints accessing the development site, recommend para.4.90 amended to illustrate that site would need to provide new and enhanced walking and cycling infrastructure to connect to the town centre and further afield, and reliance upon 'existing pedestrian [and] cycleways' should not be stated as a means to achieve sustainably accessed development
A342 - Impact	11001	The A342 is already very busy and at peak hours can be dangerous to access and/or cross, there is no mention of traffic calming/management anywhere in the plan
Access		Para. 4.98 should be modified as follows "...to ensure multiple access points <u>sufficient connectivity</u> towards Ludgershall." The precise number of access points is not yet determined and the word 'connectivity' gives flexibility. Further evidence has been commissioned to evaluate the transport and accessibility for the development as a whole and will be shared with both TVBC and Wiltshire Councils.
	10817	The main vehicular access is shown indicatively on Figure 4.9. Empress Way was constructed to a distributor road standard as it was envisaged to have a second point of access onto the A342 to the east, however, this has never been delivered. Both emerging Wiltshire Policy 40 and the NA8 schemes would facilitate this future connection. The parameters for the overbridge have been discussed with Network Rail through ongoing engagement.
		Modelling and junction arrangement preliminary design is ongoing through engagement with relevant stakeholders to inform a Transport Delivery Note that will be made available to both TVBC and Wiltshire Council to support joint working to demonstrate access and infrastructure deliverability strategy and includes further work on bridge feasibility to assist with certainty.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10243	A sustainable access strategy needs to be focused on Andover Road, maximising pedestrian and cycle connectivity to stops on it. It is prudent at least one pair of stops at the main entrance in Hampshire features enhanced cycle access, secure cycle parking facilities, a good standard of lighting, and some kind of dedicated facility for short stay waiting for pick up and set down as part of a comprehensive master plan to support these sites coming forward.
	10779	This point of access would not be safe for use for pedestrians and cyclists by the volume of vehicular traffic generated by the two developments on either side of Shoddesden Lane and it would be prejudicial to the existing users to stop their vehicular access to limit the use of this road.
	10133	Site specific analysis fails to give sufficient weight to challenges associated with delivery Land east of Ludgershall from reality of site served from A342 Andover Road and public transport connections
	10133	Conclusions that road network may have capacity to accommodate development at Ludgershall, means promoting less sustainable development sites, where opportunities for reducing car dependency are significantly lower than site options at Andover
Ancient Woodland	11001	Concerned about any potential damage to the environment caused by development, a specific ecology consideration that causes us concern. Identifies that Willis Wood as an ancient woodland will require an ecological buffer
	10223	support the requirement for an ecological buffer to the Willis Wood ancient woodland
Biodiversity	10751	The South East of Ludgershall proposal will have a big impact on conservation areas, flora and fauna
Construction Access	11001	Shoddesden Lane would be entirely unsuitable as an access point to either site for any construction traffic, TVBC must ensure that Shoddesden Lane is protected from the impact of construction works
Cross boundary	11001	Suggest that this site would be used to provide an access route for the proposed site at Empress Way in Wiltshire, if the 2 sites are joined what mitigation will be put in place to stop roads on both sides becoming short cuts to avoid congestion on the A342

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10803	Barrier between this site and Empress Way site is Shoddessen Lane, this is a single track road which is unsuitable to be widened to accommodate any access to either development
Cumulative impacts	10126	there is a need to integrate with existing and proposed development in Wiltshire (paragraph 4.98) and consequently a need to coordinate with forthcoming development within the neighbouring local authority area that could affect overall deliverability
Delivery	10126	Cumulative impacts with other proposals in Wiltshire and Test Valley, collectively disproportionate to the settlement. There is a significant level of growth, change and disruption in a relatively short timeframe. Not the most appropriate strategy versus the reasonable alternatives.
Ecological buffer	10817	May not be completed in trajectory, given scale, complexities, infrastructure and masterplanning coordination, and infrastructure requirements.
Ecology - Mitigation	11001	The need for any buffer and the precise mitigation will be informed by ecological surveys. No buffer should be identified on Figure 4.9 as this is not informed by evidence and is potentially misleading in determining the spatial extent of the buffer.
Education provision	10817	Our expectation is that any mitigation to ecological concerns is not just the bare minimum of measures
Education	10751	Requirement for 1.5 FE primary school on site. Further evidence is required from HCC to justify the need and the size of the school, including the phasing of this facility as part of the allocation. An updated version of the illustrative masterplan indicated a potential location for the school.
Enhanced bus stops	10243	There is no work in the area around South East of Ludgershall, working from home and commuting will put pressure on the locality
Land contamination	Environment Agency 10068	Land immediately between the railway and the A432 could offer scope for enhanced bus stops and we urge the potential for this is looked at in much greater depth. Contains a recycling centre. Contamination may be associated with this area. Any development would need to carry out a suitably detailed phased investigation and some remediation may be required.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Flooding	11001	Concerned about any potential flood risk on developments and any additional knock on risk to other areas
	10779	With a small area of surface water flooding, what measures will be implemented to locate development in areas of lowest flood risk?
Future Management	11001	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 Councils in the future
Infrastructure - Schools	Hampshire County Council 10099	The catchment secondary school to this site is Harrow Way Community School
	Hampshire County Council 10099	To mitigate the planned growth, applicants will be expected to contribute towards enhancing education capacity in accordance with Policy COM1- contributions towards the expansion of Harrow Way Community School.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Contributions would also be sought for the creation of a new primary school or the expansion of Appleshaw St Peter's CE Primary & Kimpton, Thruxton & Fyfield CE Primary schools to meet the demand brought by this site. For the primary phase this would need to be considered alongside the other site of land East of Ludgershall.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	In accordance with policy COM1 one additional classroom for SEND (special educational needs and disability) provision at primary and secondary phase is required at an appropriate nearby maintained or special school.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	A new pre-school would also be required as part of this site.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Contribution would need to be secured for Home to School transport as it is more than three miles to Harrow Way Community School.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Hampshire County Council: Infrastructure - Transport	Hampshire County Council 10099	Similar issues to Policy NA7 with the addition of the need to demonstrate that a crossing of the railway line is achievable and deliverable.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	The potential for this route to accommodate traffic from the development site proposed within the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan should also be considered within the assessment of the site and the impact of development.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Suggest the following change to criterion e: “e. Access to the development via bridge over the railway line to the A342 to the north, where it can be demonstrated strategic flow of traffic is prioritised”.
Hampshire County Council: Public Right of Way	Hampshire County Council 10099	Kimpton Footpath 7 crosses the site and Footpaths 501 and 6 are just south of the site. Kimpton Bridleway 12 runs eastward from the site.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	There is a lack of Bridleways at present and a significant demand from horse-riders.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	An extension to Kimpton Bridleway 12 into the development site, which would provide a through route from Ludgershall into the countryside to the east, would be welcomed.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Given that this site abuts the county boundary a collaborative approach with Wiltshire Council to providing a connected rights of way network and countryside/ green infrastructure is needed.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Consideration should be had for area tier green recreation space, such as a new country park to mitigate against private vehicle use and impacts on the nearby National Landscape.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council request that additional supporting paragraphs are added to both NA7 and NA8 to include the requirement for protecting and enhancing access to the countryside as well as to towns. And 4.97, including consideration of the upgrading of existing Footpaths to Bridleways, such as Kimpton Footpaths 6, 7 and 501.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	A contribution may be sought towards maintenance and enhancement of the wider rights of way network in accordance with IDP NA7 and NA8, including onsite and offsite upgrades of existing Footpaths to Bridleways.
housing delivery	10803	there is no certainty that the site could deliver the level of development proposed.
Infrastructure	10751	The infrastructure around South East of Ludgershall seems poor to support so many families
Infrastructure - Broadband	10751	There are broadband issues in the area, these services may be unprepared to cope
Infrastructure - electricity	10751	Local services to South East of Ludgershall are already over stretched such as, electricity
Infrastructure - health	10761	Castle Practice is closest GP practice to development and is likely to be most affected by increase in demand caused by increase in housing
Infrastructure - NHS services	10751	There are many retirees in the area, will they be 'pushed to the side' with the influx of new people on NHS services
Infrastructure - Public Transport	10779	Mentions the frequent bus service - the service is neither frequent nor reliable and there are safety issues reported by young people. The demand from the proposed development should lead to an improved bus service.
Infrastructure - Sewer	10779	There are major works required to support waste and water treatment for thr sites, which although noted in the Plan are unplanned and uncosted

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11001	Southern Water are undertaking a 5 year plan, however this is not sufficiently progressed to know if it encompasses adequate measures to address the needs for the existing community as well as the proposed development
	11001	Local services to South East of Ludgershall are already over stretched such as, sewage
Infrastructure - Shops	10751	Local shops to South East of Ludgershall cannot cope with additional demand
Infrastructure - Water	11001	We would want assurance that new developments have adequate drainage facilities and water treatment solutions in place so as not to compound existing issues
Infrastructure - Water	10751	Local services to South East of Ludgershall are already over stretched such as, water supply
Infrastructure - Wiltshire	11001	What infrastructure are TVBC proposing to allow an access route to be created between the site and the Empress Way site?
Integration of access	10779	The proposal of integration of the routes through the site to the south of the A342 with those through the adjoining Wiltshire development will be challenging.
Land extent	10243	The land under control is of a peculiar extent, only a short frontage is presented to Andover Road but the bulk stretches south to Shoddesden, a distance of about 1.2km from Activ8 on Andover Road/Main Street. A substantial area extends to the east but this sits south of land in third party control and its development would represent an irrational urban form in the landscape. The ability to secure direct pedestrian access farther east onto Andover Road is equally precluded.
Landscape Character	10633	The cost of building the bridge over the railway from the A342 (Andover Road) would be too expensive and would be a massive blot on the landscape character.
Light Pollution	11001	Concerned about any potential light pollution caused by development, in particular for residents of Great Shoddesden and Little Shoddesden but also including those on higher ground in the Parish

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Ludgerhsall bridge	10803	a bridge over the railway used by Ministry of Defence is required for access, which is described as a 'significant piece of infrastructure' requiring further discussions between Hampshire County Council, Wiltshire Council and Network Rail (paragraph 4.103) – consequently until appropriate agreements are reached in principle with the relevant parties for this bridge then it cannot be confirmed that suitable access can be achieved to allow the site to come forward for development
Ludgershall	10803	object to policy
	10803	objections to the identification of Ludgershall for major housing development and the lack of reference in the settlement hierarchy to confirm this as a suitable location to accommodate the level of growth proposed remain
Ludgershall - deliverability	10119	Question whether the preferred growth scenario 1 (as described in the Spatial Strategy Topic Paper) with significant development at Ludgershall (1500 homes across two sites) across a boundary with Wiltshire is the most reasonable and sustainable option, given uncertainty around infrastructure delivery. The allocations cannot be relied upon unless there is clear evidence that such a project is deliverable and viable. Growth scenarios 3 and 4 appear to perform better in terms of accessibility to community infrastructure and health, with a greater focus on Andover as a focus for growth.
Ludgershall - site is inaccessible and needs a bridge crossing	11161	South East of Ludgershall - site is inaccessible without substantial investment in a bridge crossing over railway line which may take many years in its own right and which requires agreement with Wiltshire and Hampshire authorities. Deliverability is questioned.
Ludgershall access - deliverability	10119	Para 4.103 states that both the Wiltshire site (south east Empress Way) and the TVBC NA8 allocation require a road bridge over a railway used by the MoD, which is a significant piece of infrastructure requiring further discussions between Hampshire County Council, Network Rail, Wiltshire Council and the MoD.
Ludgershall railway	10842	Network Rail notes the proposal for access to the site to be via a bridge over the railway line. Network Rail would encourage the site promoter to engage with relevant teams within NR over any railway land required for the bridge
	10842	there are level crossings on the section of the line adjacent to the proposed allocation

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10842	Re-development of the site and the provision of an alternative access via the railway bridge, could give rise to opportunities to pursue closure of these crossings. Network Rail would support the inclusion of potential for closing the crossings within the text of the draft allocation. This would help to improve safety and potentially allow for greater use of the railway line at some point.
Ludgershall sites access to services and facilities	10133	Site selection process raises concerns over appropriateness of allocations east of Ludgershall which do not benefit from access to significant level of services and facilities available at Andover
MOD	10121	access to the site would be required over MOD railway line and it's important that DIO is consulted over proposals and if bridge could be facilitated over land
NA8 Accessibility	10133	Proposed allocation at Ludgershall specifically Policy NA8 allocation, have significant constraints that impact on ability to provide suitable access and connectivity to local services and public transport network on A342 Andover Road.
	10133	MOD railway line represents a barrier to connectivity (Wiltshire LP Planning for Tidworth and Ludgershall background paper) and concerned that significance of this constraint is not given sufficient prevalence in the site selection process and reliance on Ludgershall sites as key component of Spatial Strategy.
NA8 Rail bridge	10133	Agree delivery of rail bridge is significant piece of infrastructure, but its absence is major constraint which impacts upon suitability of site to support sustainable patterns of development
	10133	Silent on risks on need to cross railway line. Viability, ransom and significant cost issues of delivery. Risk of deliverability overall, but also affordable housing and other community infrastructure, due to high uncoded infrastructure requirements
	10133	Feasibility of providing rail crossing not been assessed. Concerns over engineering requirements and physical space available, raises feasibility concerns that site is capable of being served by appropriate access

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
National Landscape (AONB)	10817	Noted that both NA7 and NA8 have been considered combined into one parcel with the Test Valley Landscape Sensitivity Study (1.1.327 - 1.1.343). Each site has very separate and distinct landscape character qualities and should not be combined for the purposes of underpinning the LP.
Ancient woodland	Natural England 10140	Proposed allocation proposed directly adjacent to areas classified as ancient replaced woodland and / or ancient & semi natural woodland. Impacts should be considered in line with the NPPF paragraph 186 and standing advice.
National Landscape (AONB)	Natural England 10140	Reference the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, the Council needs to demonstrate the site allocation is deliverable in its current location. Understood that where sites assessed as high landscape sensitivity in the Landscape Sensitivity Study, there are specific recommendations to lessen the potential impacts on nationally designated landscapes. Greater emphasis of the considerations to nationally protected landscapes should be made for the allocated site policy
Natural England: Salisbury Plain SAC & SPA	Natural England 10140	Site falls within 6.4km of Salisbury Plain SPA, therefore necessary to address impacts from increased recreational impact in accordance with policy BIO2. Recognise the Council is working with Wiltshire Council to establish whether mitigation can be secured towards existing mitigation strategy.
Noise	10817	The adjacent railway line does not carry passengers and is only occasionally used by the MOD. Referencing this factor alone within criteria g) is not justified, however it is accepted that noise considerations may be relevant for masterplanning purposes owing the highways infrastructure.
North Wessex Downs	11001	Concerned about any potential damage to the environment caused by development, a specific ecology consideration that causes us concern. The need to consider the impact of the development on the setting of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape
North Wessex Downs National Landscape: Building height and materials	10405	major development has potential to impact the setting of the AONB, building heights and materials will be key
North Wessex Downs National	10405	joint masterplan with Wiltshire would be advised to set the scene

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Landscape: Masterplanning		
Not sustainable pattern of development	10126	Will not contribute to fostering more sustainable patterns of development versus reasonable alternatives in Andover, including due to the absence of a rail link between Andover and Ludgershall.
Odour assessment	10779	If farmers are prohibited from producing odours they may lose their livelihood, and we the benefit from their produce.
Poorly located from facilities	10243	A significant portion of the site extending to the south is poorly located to the public transport spine on Andover Road and is a relative distance from the service core at Ludgershall. It would be inappropriate to divert Activ8 off its current route as this would in effect leave the existing settlement north of the rail line unserved.
Preferred Pool of sites	10133	Level of services and facilities at Ludgershall is clearly limited, in stark contrast to those within catchment of Finkley Down Farm. Ludgershall town centre is modest, as recognised in Wiltshire Regulation 19 LP consultation
	10133	For Ludgershall, significant development can only reduce car movements if supported by range of services and facilities (Wiltshire SA), brings into question appropriateness of directing significant levels of growth to lower tier settlement with substantially lower level of services and facilities. Finkley Down Farm will benefit from existing and significantly higher level of services and facilities.
Public Right of Way	11001	Public rights of way cross the site and there is a need to enhance these routes should housing be developed on the site, expect that any enhancement is not just the bare minimum, not just a pathway between properties and through car parking spaces
	10817	Reference to several public rights of way crossing the site. There is only one public footpath, reference 130/7/1.
Public Transport	11001	Assigns a positive or strongly positive rating to 2B, 2D & 3H based on the site being within 400m of a frequent bus route. While the entrance may be within 400m the furthest part of the site is much

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		further away. The rating must be assessed against the furthest someone will have to walk, we therefore believe that these items should be reassessed and regarded accordingly
Rail bridge	10779	The new bridge proposed will be challenging as it will need to encompass the construction of the bridge and the junction(s) of the roads leading to the proposed developments both to the north and south of the A342.
	10779	How will the cost for such an expensive and time consuming project be covered?
Railway line	10779	Will the MOD be consulted as the army uses the railway line to transport tanks and heavy equipment.
Road bridge	10126	Policy NA8 site relies on a significant road bridge over the railway line for vehicular access. It is unclear from paragraph 4.103 of the Local Plan whether the necessary legal agreements are in place already to assure the delivery of this bridge, and the technical feasibility and viability implications are known for the site delivery trajectories.
Salisbury Plain SPA	11001	Concerned about any potential damage to the environment caused by development, a specific ecology consideration that causes us concern. The need for appropriate mitigation to any impact on the Salisbury Plain SPA and its significance for the conservation of bird species
Scale	10133	Do not support approach in spatial strategy to direct significant quantum of planned housing growth to east of Wiltshire market town of Ludgershall. This approach is inconsistent with objectives of spatial strategy and moreover, site selection process does not support sites at Ludgershall in favour of development options at Anodver, especially in respect of land at Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165)
Scale	10243	We do not consider the scale proposed appropriate and have serious concerns to its sustainability the further south it extends. A more compact allocation of up to 700 dwellings related to the public transport spine and the committed development to the west within Wiltshire would be sufficient to justify a local centre and primary school necessary to ensure reasonable self-containment which is currently lacking south of the railway further, of a scale to justify the deliverability of the rail bridge which we recognise presents a significant abnormal cost.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Site Access	11001	Major works required to support access to the site which although noted in the LP are unplanned and uncoded
	11001	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 permission to build such a bridge
	11001	Is this really a feasible solution to provide access to the site? What alternative access solutions have TVBC considered?
	11001	Figure does not identify the access of the other site, in reality the two will be opposite each other resulting in the need for a major junction at this point, either roundabout or traffic lights requiring extensive signage and lighting increasing the impact of light pollution. This should be highlighted as a consequence of the proposal
Site Allocation	11108	Object to allocation and Recommend deleting the proposed allocation and draft policy
site assessment	10803	It also does not appear that relevant and robust assessments have been undertaken to consider development potential and furthermore no attempt has been made on Figure 4.9 to identify any buffer zones or mitigation areas to address potential impacts, as shown in Figures accompanying other draft allocations.
site constraints	10803	serious concerns regarding the suitability of this site to accommodate housing development as Policy NA8 sets out significant constraints to development that could potentially affect the principle of development on this site and consequently question its achievability as a site
	10803	In addition to 'in principle' constraints, there are also references to proximity to the North Wessex Downs National Landscape (paragraph 4.99), adjacent ancient woodland (paragraph 4.100), proximity to the Salisbury Plain SPA (paragraph 4.101), the need for an odour assessment (paragraph 4.102), possible railway noise/vibration (paragraph 4.105), potential for contamination (paragraph 4.106) and the need for a sequential approach to flood risk (paragraph 4.107)
	10803	there are significant development constraints and when combined significantly constrain development potential and the area of developable land available

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10803	there are significant issues associated with the soundness of this site in terms of suitability to deliver the level of development proposed due to the combination of significant constraints, in particular the potential for landscape harm to the National Landscape and potential for uncontrolled sprawl into the countryside.
site deliverability	10803	there are serious uncertainties about the deliverability of this site based on a need for a coordinated approach for development in the neighbouring local authority area and requirement for bridge access over the railway.
Southern Water: Amenity	10022	Site is within 100m of Ludgershall wastewater treatment works (WTW) which potentially could have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the site's future occupants arising from the WTW essential operational activities. Impacts could include odour from wastewater processing and noise and vibration from wastewater pumping
	10022	support inclusion of h) requiring odour assessment
	10022	suggest amended wording to h) 'an odour assessment to be carried out in consultation with Southern Water, and appropriate mitigation in relation to nearby Ludgershall WTW.'
Southern Water: infrastructure - wastewater	10022	Proposal for 1150 dwellings on site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network to provide additional capacity to serve the development. This reinforcement would be provided through New Infrastructure charge to developers
	10022	connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation
	10022	Add criteria i) stating 'occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of wastewater network reinforcement, in consultation with the service provider'
	10022	SW have undertaken preliminary assessment of capacity of existing SW infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for proposal which indicated that existing local sewerage infrastructure to site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Speed	11001	Ongoing concern that the speed of traffic through the village is excessive, additional traffic is likely to compound the problem as people seek to get to work/school
Support	10817	Agree that Policy NA8 is a sound component of the plan, subject to modifications outlined below.
Sustainability	10243	It is arguable that a dedicated service running south of the railway would be appropriate as the distances involved to key destinations are relatively great and the amount of staff and vehicle resource required directly reflects this. Reinforcing the current corridor to offer a higher frequency service is more likely to stimulate revenue on the corridor as a whole and would justify residents travelling further to stops due a reduction in the generalised journey time. We therefore have considerable concerns around the sustainability of the allocation as currently proposed.
Sustainable modes interchange	10243	Vehicular access points on Andover Road for this allocation and NA7 are essentially aligned which is rational and supported as it creates the best scope for some kind of focused sustainable modes interchange.
Traffic	11001	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. Traffic already uses Kimpton as a route to get to the A303, this issue is exacerbated during road closures
	10751	One access to the site will put pressure on an already busy road, at peak times there are long queues and congestion
	10779	The bridge construction and junctions would have to be managed and ensure minimum disruption to traffic as this could impact local villages of Tidworth, Kimpton, Thruxton, Fyfield and surrounding network.
Traffic modelling	11001	KPC believe that detailed modelling of traffic flows using the A342 from the site eastbound and westbound is essential to ensure that infrastructure to support potential traffic flows is identified and delivered
Activ8 bus	Wiltshire Council 10202	Bus provision cites the Activ8 service as accommodating needs of the development. Important to address need or bus routing to penetrate into the developed urban fabric to maximise opportunities for residents to utilise sustainable transport options

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Ecology Salisbury Plain SPA	Wiltshire Council 10202	Working on cross boundary matters concerning Salisbury Plain SPA and proposed allocations to consider appropriate mitigation. Ludgershall lies within with SPA 6.4km zone of influence where recreational pressures from residential development must be addressed with adequate and appropriate mitigation to ensure compliance with Habitats Regulations
Education	Wiltshire Council 10202	Further discussions will be required regarding school provision in context of existing facilities and cumulative growth in the area
Education primary	Wiltshire Council 10202	Query whether 1.5FE primary school is large enough to accommodate 1,500 homes within Test Valley area. Our multipliers indicate at least 2FE school would be required
Education Secondary	Wiltshire Council 10202	Note there is insufficient capacity at Wellington Academy to accommodate scale of growth envisaged by Test Valley on top of growth already planned through draft Wiltshire local plan
Highway access	Wiltshire Council 10202	Delivery of Wiltshire draft local plan allocation expected to be dependent upon delivery of southern link road between Empress Way to A342 Andover Road within Test Valley. Trigger point for need for this connection yet to be determined through transport modelling currently being undertaken. Consequent implications for phasing yet to be determined.
Highway access and bridge	Wiltshire Council 10202	Access would utilise same railway bridge as Wiltshire proposed allocation (subject to confirmation of trigger point).
Infrastructure	Wiltshire Council 10202	Site adjoins Wiltshire local plan proposed allocation and will therefore generate similar but additional demands for amenities and infrastructure
Infrastructure Delivery	Wiltshire Council 10202	Concerns over timely provision of infrastructure to support such high levels of housing at Ludgershall, which has implications for delivery of allocation in Wiltshire
	Wiltshire Council 10202	Cross boundary growth is being promoted by same landowner. It is important to ensure consistent approach to delivery requirements
Masterplan	Wiltshire Council 10202	Both Wiltshire and Test Valley draft local plans recognise need for masterplans for strategic allocations and important to plan comprehensively for sites at Ludgershall

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Masterplan - ecology	Wiltshire Council 10202	Comprehensive (cross boundary) masterplan for both Wiltshire and Test Valley allocation sites to ensure potential for in-combination and cumulative effects on ecological receptors can be appropriately managed
Masterplan - Housing Trajectory	Wiltshire Council 10202	Masterplans for sites at Ludgershall need to consider anticipated housing trajectories across both Wiltshire and Test Valley allocation sites with view to setting a single overall comprehensive (cross-boundary) masterplan
Masterplan - infrastructure and sustainable transport	Wiltshire Council 10202	To ensure demands for amenities and infrastructure are met combination of allocation site plus Wiltshire allocation would welcome collaboration on a single consolidated masterplan to include access and movement framework plans.
	Wiltshire Council 10202	Key consideration for consolidated masterplan will be education and retail related trips associated with the development
	Wiltshire Council 10202	Comprehensive (cross-boundary) masterplan for both Wiltshire and Test Valley allocation sites to address shared infrastructure and sustainable transport to ensure improvements to local service provision commensurate to scale of growth
Masterplan - phasing and delivery	Wiltshire Council 10202	Comprehensive (cross-boundary) masterplan for both Wiltshire and Test Valley allocation sites to address phasing and delivery
Masterplan - phasing and highway access and bridge	Wiltshire Council 10202	Consider masterplan approach will be needed to consider phasing and impact plans to determine earliest viable delivery of bridge and avoid over-loading Wiltshire highway assets which could detrimentally affect amenity of existing properties
Phasing of development	Wiltshire Council 10202	Development of Ludgershall needs to be phased in a coordinated way, logically extending from Empress Way in a west-east fashion and of a scale that benefits the town with coordinated delivery of infrastructure
	Wiltshire Council 10202	Anticipate growth within Wiltshire would be logical starting point for any expansion of Ludgershall with further growth within Test Valley to follow

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Protected species - dormouse	Wiltshire Council 10202	Dormouse population recorded in Willis Wood on northern and eastern periphery of Ludgershall. Given Willis Wood located adjacent to proposed allocation NA8 suggest this is considered with potential to specify a survey in policy or supporting text
Protected species - farmland birds	Wiltshire Council 10202	Draft Wiltshire local plan allocation at Ludgershall requires survey to inform suitable mitigation for ground nesting bird species and may be appropriate for Test Valley allocations to also consider potential for farmland birds
Scale of development at Ludgershall	Wiltshire Council 10202	Concerns about ability of market to accommodate such high levels of housing at Ludgershall
	Wiltshire Council 10202	Scale of growth would have implications for timely delivery of Wiltshire draft local plan allocation at Ludgershall
Solent SPA/SAC	Wiltshire Council 10202	Omits reference to location of site within River Test catchment and need for mitigation in relation to Solent internationally designated sites
Solent SPA/SAC	Wiltshire Council 10202	Cross reference to Policy BIO2 setting out requirements relating to international nature conservation designations are included in other proposed allocation policies. For consistency same cross referencing should be included in Ludgershall allocations
Sustainable travel modes	Wiltshire Council 10202	Due to position of railway line site has limited opportunities to access town centre by walking and cycling.
	Wiltshire Council 10202	Given scale of growth existing infrastructure is not considered sufficient and new and enhanced infrastructure should be provided which recommend forms part of a required Access and Movement Framework plan. Recommend para.4.97 amended to secure improvements to the walking and cycling network
Willis Wood Ancient woodland	Wiltshire Council 10202	Willis Wood area of ancient and semi-natural woodland adjoins proposed allocation. Recommend need for ecological buffer to ancient woodland with specified distance of at least 15m to align with buffer zone recommendations section of Government guidance on ancient woodland

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	11108	W1 consider the reliance upon development at Ludgershall unwise due to the requirement of a road bridge over a railway used by the MOD and that will require substantial negotiation with stakeholders.
	11108	W1 suggest that the Ludgershall allocations are discounted unless clear evidence of the road bridge infrastructure being delivered
	10789	Access to the A303 from these sites will use Amesbury Road and the Thruxton junction-both slip roads are unsafe.
	10856	The proposed development would increase the need for additional long distance footpaths and cycle ways so that access is made easier for existing and future residents of the area.
	10856	There will need to be provisions to create alternative access points to any proposed employment site/expansion at Thruxton Airfield/Track so that HGVs and other traffic do not pass through Thruxton Village.
	10856	Footpaths and access for residents to the countryside on the west side of Thruxton village should be retained amidst any development.
	10792	There should be better provisions for pedestrian and cyclist access to the A342 and the surrounding area.
	10792	A cycleway should be installed along the Andover railway line that connects into the Sustrans cycle system onto the National route 45 to the North West of Ludgershall at Shaw Hill.
	10779	There are no clear proposals in relation to the road bridge access to the site to the south of the railway line, or the new main road passing through the Wiltshire/TVBC towns and the A342 junctions
	10779	There will need to be new access roads at either end of the new arterial road through the TVBC and Wiltshire developments.
Accessibility	10940	A cycle lane is needed linking Ludgershall and Weyhill

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Additional amenities	10779	Neither the TVBC nor the Wiltshire plan includes enough space or provision for Section 106 agreements to provide the additional amenities which 8-11,000 people will need such as schools, hospital and A&E facilities
Amenity	11118	Homes should be seen as part of communities and not built without any reference to how the occupants will live. Tidworth does offer more than Ludgershall in terms of shopping but Tidworth is an army community with its own facilities for the army employees that are not available to the civilian population. The recognition of the need for sensitivity, consultation and further proposals in relation to the North Wessex Downs and the Salisbury Plains Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will need to be addressed in the construction phase
AONB	10779	Development to the north of the A342 will have an effect on the adjacent area of outstanding natural beauty, TVBC will need to ensure there is sympathetic construction and landscaping.
	10779	Will developers have to work with the Council of Partners (who manage the North Wessex Downs), MOD (Salisbury Plain) and Natural England in preparation of a strategic approach for the proposed developments?
	10779	The developments will have an impact on the areas of outstanding natural beauty.
Archaeology	10779	There are significant archaeological sites in the area affected by the proposed developments and measures should be put in place for archaeologists to assess the proposed sites prior to construction.
Biodiversity	10792	There should be improvements to green spaces to protect wildlife and so that nature is preserved locally despite the proposed developments.
	10779	There are a significant number of species that will be destroyed by the proposals and the land lost by the adjacent proposals for solar parks.
	10779	What proposals are there for the protection of creatures in the area and their habitats.
	11021	The Ludgershall proposals are concerning due to the loss of wildlife corridors

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10779	Any change to the area through development needs to be carefully managed due to the mix of calcareous grassland and heath, woodland and chalk streams, including some ancient heritage sites.
Boundary review	11001	Perceived reliance on Wiltshire, is there an argument for the developments to be formalised as part of Ludgershall by redrawing the town council boundary and therefore also the Wiltshire boundary. Alternatively, could the development be its own parish within TVBC leaving the remainder of Kimpton as a true Tier 4 settlement
Character	10759	The serious risk is that this proposal will undermine and destroy the character of this village The development of the new town(s) will significantly change the character of Ludgershall and potentially of Kimpton
	10779	The development of the new town(s) will significantly change the character of Ludgershall and potentially of Kimpton
Community Developments	10856	Local Communities should have more authority in decisions on developments being built in their community.
Community Engagement	10759	If TVBC wish to progress along these lines it must a minimum provide much more information and engage fully with local communities including Kimpton Parish, neighbouring parishes and Wiltshire. Must also discuss fully whether alternative proposals can be proposed
Community Services and Facilities	10975	What provision is there for additional amenities which 8-11,000 people will need, including schools, hospital and A & E facilities, community and leisure facilities?
Connected Strategy	10792	The proposed plans for development need a connected strategy between TVBC, Wiltshire CC, Ludgershall Town Council and the involved stakeholders.
Consultation- Wiltshire Council	10705	There is need for Consultation with Wiltshire Council regarding the 2 large developments because they are abutting the boundary

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Crime	10975	What is being done about rural crime that will be needed with so many new homes. We have one rural policeman currently for 245 sq miles – not enough
Cross boundary	10036	Strongly recommend TVBC include information from Wiltshire regarding their housing developments under consideration in the vicinity. The combined size of proposed developments will impact all ancillary decisions including infrastructure, noise, dark skies and protected landscapes
	11001	Can TVBC confirm that Wiltshire CC does indeed plan to provide such supporting facilities and services for housing within TVBC as no reference to this in the Wiltshire Local Plan
	11153	assume that the areas of development around Ludgershall in Hampshire and Wiltshire would be developed in a coordinated cross-border fashion, given that the increase in population of Ludgershall/Faberstown would be very significant
	11153	would expect high environmental and design standards, taking into account climate change and the same sustainable development approach to be taken at the sites, if approved, on either side of the county boundary
	10779	The TVBC proposals for development at Ludgershall must be considered together with the proposal by Wiltshire for development South East of Empress Way
	10779	The development proposed in the Wiltshire Local Plan and the developments proposed in the TVBC Local Plan will have to be developed in conjunction with each other.
	10779	The proposed Wiltshire and TVBC developments should have a 'joined-up' approach to give consideration for the rural surroundings and the needs of the local population.
Cumulative impacts	10126	A strategic scale extension to Ludgershall will have cumulative impact implications to account for over and above that proposed in Policy 40 of the Wiltshire Local Plan at present. Ludgershall is a relatively modest settlement with limited facilities, and relies heavily on adjacent settlements, particularly Andover, for key service and facilities.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Density	11001	Concerned about housing density of the development, although acknowledge they are better than the proposed densities of allocations by Wiltshire CC at Ludgershall
Developer Contributions	10036	Suggest the plan includes the stated intention to issue S106 agreements and/or CIL to mandate contributions to new facilities
Development at Ludgershall	10759	APC believes that this proposal is not adequately thought out and does not serve the interests of this rural area, nor indeed the interests of the wider TVBC area
	10777	Do not support proposed approach to direct housing growth east of Wiltshire at Ludgershall. Consider this approach is inconsistent with objectives of the spatial strategy and site selection process does not support sites at Ludgershall in favour of development at Andover
	10777	Almost 40% of the total planned strategic development for the NTV sub area is being directed to the edge of Ludgershall and away from the Tier 1 settlement of Andover. This approach is not supported
	10777	Ludgershall falls outside of the boundary of Test Valley and therefore does not feature within the settlement hierarchy for Test Valley. Directing a significant amount of development to Ludgershall, represents a significant shift in the spatial strategy for the NTV sub area
	10777	Compared to Andover, Ludgershall provides significantly less local facilities and services to meet day to day needs and as such the majority of development should be located at Andover being the principle settlement in the Borough
	10777	Both NA7 and NA8 are preferred options to land south of Forest Lane despite them having much lower potential to encourage the uptake of sustainable and active travel modes and their location in close proximity to the AONB. This brings in to question the ranking of these sites within the SA
	10777	It is considered that the Council has not robustly demonstrated why the proposed allocations are the most suitable and it is considered the Council has not properly assessed the relative performance of the alternative site options
	10777	SA Appendix IV Housing Site Appraisals, we do not consider the summary properly assesses the site

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10777	Site selection process raises concerns as to the appropriateness of the proposed allocations east of Ludgershall which do not benefit from the access to the significant level of services and facilities available at Andover. Yet these development locations are identified as sequentially preferable to land south of Forest Lane
	10777	Wiltshire Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation it describes Ludgershall centre as modest with a focus on day-to-day top up food shopping and services. Even Tidworth does not provide a significantly greater range of facilities and services, specifically shopping and leisure, particularly compared to Andover
	10777	Services and facilities at Ludgershall are limited, and the modest nature of Ludgershall town centre is referenced within the Wiltshire Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal, housing without the mitigation of additional employment and retail opportunities would be likely to result in significant car dominated mode share
	10777	Understood there are constraints regarding the existing railway line and requirement for public transport connections between the site and the town centre to providing a sustainable development. This would likely require the delivery of a bridge which could both be costly and take a long time to agree and deliver
	10777	There would therefore be no added benefit to the local communities of Test Valley by locating a significant proportion of NTV's housing requirement on the edge of Ludgershall. The closest settlement to these sites within Test Valley is Redenham, which is identified as Countryside in the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy and is circa 2km from the proposed allocation sites
	10777	The NA7 site is in close proximity to the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, there is potential for significant effects on the setting of the National Landscape
	10777	With noise constraints relating to the A342 to the south, and area of surface water flooding on the site, it is questionable, given the landscape constraints, whether approximately 350 dwellings can be realistically achieved on proposed site allocation NA7

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10777	Access is proposed from the A342, and a bridge would be required over the railway, which is used by the Ministry of Defence. This is a significant piece of infrastructure, which may take time to resolve. It is questionable therefore whether proposed site allocation NA8 is deliverable based on the access constraints, and even if the access solution is resolved, whether the approximately 1,150 homes can be delivered in the LP plan period to 2040
	10777	Questionable whether the two site allocations NA7 and NA8 are in a sustainable location, isolated from the rest of the borough. At examination there is risk that the sites may not be able to show they are deliverable or able to deliver the quantum of housing proposed for the LP plan period. Careful consideration is needed to ensure that significant development in this location would not result in significant, adverse effects on a National Landscape and the wider rural landscape character
	10777	Question whether the potential cumulative impacts of site allocations NA7 and NA8 combined with the site allocations put forward by Wiltshire Council in the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan have been properly considered. An additional circa 2,300 units will have a significant impact on local schools, heath provision, roads, and utilities
	10777	Unclear whether a Statement of Common Ground has been progressed between Wiltshire Council and Test Valley Borough Council to understand how growth of Ludgershall will be delivered in a sustainable way. If both Wiltshire and TVBC are serious about the extensions to Ludgershall, this ought to be promoted through a combined framework, with a proper vision, and a supporting Development Plan Document (DPD), a Design Code
	10777	Question whether there is the market demand for such significant growth at Ludgershall to be delivered in the plan period. How will the sites in Wiltshire and Test Valley be phased and what assumptions have been made in regard to delivery rates? Again, at examination there is risk that the sites may not be able to show they are deliverable or able to deliver the quantum of housing proposed for the LP plan period
Disproportionate growth	10126	Significant quantum of growth directed to Ludgershall through the adopted Wiltshire Local Plan to date, which is still bedding in, and now a further allocation is proposed under draft policy 40 of the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan. This is a significant level of growth, change and disruption in a relatively short time frame, at a relatively modest scale settlement. Contend that adding a further

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		1,500 units is disproportionate to the settlement, and it is not the most appropriate strategy versus the reasonable alternatives.
Employment	10856	Development that increases employment at Thruxton Airfield/Track is supported if it is in accordance with the Thruxton Neighbourhood Plan (NDP) and complies with NDP EC1,a,b,c,d,e.
	10779	There should be jobs available prior to the completion of the proposed developments so there are not residents without work, the burden of which could be significant.
Environmental assessments	10779	Environmental Impact Assessments and Statements will be necessary for these developments.
Environmental Damage	10759	What planning considerations, including environmental considerations, have been taken into account, and what will be the cost to the community and TVBC? What consideration has been given to matters such as flood risk and the lives of protected species in the area
EV charging	10779	Will there be adequate charging points for hybrid/electric vehicles in the new developments?
Flooding	11021	Concerned at the risk of flooding at the Ludgershall proposals
	10779	Both sites have some standing water and most local villages suffer from flooding and sewage contamination as an example Great Shoddesden and Little Shoddesden rely on private water supplies which are particularly vulnerable.
Focus on Ludgershall	10126	While the goal appears to be making Ludgershall more self-contained, it will take many years for sites to be built out and provide the infrastructure, services and facilities needed to enhance the sustainability credentials of this settlement. Even then, Andover is likely to remain a key draw for commuters, and the absence of a rail link between the two is likely to result in increased reliance on an increased level of car borne journeys, contrary to guidance in the NPPF and working against draft policy CL1.
General	10705	Opposed to the developments proposed in these areas as they are unsustainable and to the detriment of Ludgershall & Faberstown residents

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
General - Objection	10759	APC believes there is a fundamental objection to the concept of development of 1500 homes in Kimpton a tier 4 parish
	10759	There is not adequate evidence that this plan can be implemented in a meaningful way. Too many of the important issues in the enhancement of Ludgershall are not adequately developed and there must be a much more involved analysis and consultation before any such plan is advanced
	10759	The issue of traffic along A342 must be considered in a far greater detail if any significant building in Ludgershall is to be advanced
Green Space	10940	Hope that the new development proposed will not impact the display of wild flowers situated on the eastern side of the road through Shoddesden.
	10856	Test Valley continues to be allocated development when the local communities are against the continued development on greenfield sites that are important to the agriculture industry.
	10856	TVBC are intent on building over the countryside that Test Valley is famous for, reducing tourism and therefore the local economy.
	10792	Provisions should be created to replace the trees that will be removed to create the access points to the proposed development, and there should be an increase in the number of trees planted as result.
Greenfield	10779	The proposals are on greenfield sites and the insufficient availability of farmland and grazing should be considered, the value of the countryside should be recognised.
House building rate	11118	The AMR (2022-23) indicates a slowing down in housebuilding in Test Valley-inferring that there is an over estimated need for housing in North Test Valley given that a) jobs are primarily found in South test Valley and b) there is insufficient infrastructure in place to support the RLP
Housing Mix	10779	There is no information as to the mix of housing to be provided of the 2,720 housing proposed in Ludgershall

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10779	To assess the future workforce, is it not important to set out the housing mix and based on that the number of people of working age who will live in the developments?
Housing need and un-met needs	10243	It is relatively unclear whether these sites meet endogenous needs in the borough, or in practice could or should meet un-met needs arising in Wiltshire.
Impact of development	11118	The draft plan has not provided an assessment of the impact of the more than double increase in the population of Ludgershall-the Wiltshire plan has touched on a "Tidworth and Ludgershall" market town but with no detail.
Impact of existing population	11001	Possible that new residents may not consider they have an interest in the southern area of the parish and risks over time a change in the structure of the PC with conflicting priorities between different areas of the Parish and a lack of appreciation of broader parish needs and decline of the southern area of the parish
Impact of jobs on housing	10779	If there are not enough jobs for the new influx of people this could result in an excess of housing with developments becoming 'dormitory towns' where the residents are neither fully engaged with, nor making any meaningful economic contribution to the local community.
Improved community	10779	The new communities could (if the implementation of planning requirements is properly managed) result in a much-improved local community with significant local assets and amenities.
Infrastructure	10036	Local services such as schools, dentists, doctors and hospitals will be needed in or close to Ludgershall will necessitate cross county collaboration. Suggest this needs to be explicitly stated in the plan and agreed with Wiltshire
	10036	Adequate services are fundamental to the success of new developments and quality of life of residents. Incumbent upon the Council to ensure services are in place prior to and developments
	10705	These two sites total 1500 dwellings which cannot be supported by the infrastructure of Ludgershall which is surrounded on 3 sides by the Ministry of Defence land, private land and is close to an AONB-the development is actually in Wiltshire but will have effects on the Ludgershall community

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10705	Land South East of Ludgershall for 1150 dwellings will require a bridge to cross the railway line onto the A342 and will also require safe pedestrian access
	10792	There have been no improvements as a result of other developments in the area to infrastructure and there are no provisions for infrastructure in the plans for the new developments to cope with the additional pressure.
	11021	Concerned at the lack of infrastructure proposed, improvements should come at the start of the development not the end
	11118	What lessons have been learnt from the review of the Current adopted plan (2011-2029)-there is no assessment of how local infrastructure has coped with the additional house building that has taken place how the previous plan actually worked, what has/hasn't gone to plan and how these failures will be addressed in the next plan.
	10792	The 2020 Army rebasing project from Germany has put additional pressures on local infrastructure, and the proposed developed will increase this pressure on struggling sections of local capacity.
	10779	There must be sufficient local infrastructure to ensure that new residents do not need to commute by car to southern Test Valley.
Infrastructure - A&E	10779	What are the proposals for the provision of A&E services
	10779	The air ambulance will have moved to Eastleigh to serve the greater demand in southern Test Valley which will increase the risks to Test Valley residents
Infrastructure - A342	10759	Access from Andover to the east is along a busy A342 which runs through the community of Weyhill and past other rural parishes. The traffic assessment document supporting the Local Plan focuses on Andover and not on the impact of Ludgershall and Tidworth

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - Access	10759	Fundamental that the quality of life in rural areas is not damaged by over development. The local community is understood to have major concerns about access to the sites which would require significant work including across the old railway line that runs near the A342
Infrastructure - Active Travel	10764	request for cycle lane on A342 towards Andover
	10764	Activ8 will need to run more frequently
	10764	should look at opening railway Andover to Ludgershall
Infrastructure - broadband	10764	will there be broadband improvements to the sites
	10779	Telecoms and broadband services are very poor in the area, will there be FTTP for the new area?
Infrastructure - Care	10779	Will more care and nursing homes be built? How will they be staffed and funded?
Infrastructure - community facilities	10764	need more youth facilities, sports facilities and community centre
	10764	Ludgershall needs more shop facilities
	10779	The provision of adequate community facilities such as playgrounds, sports and leisure facilities and/or community centres is vital in reducing violent crime levels but they are not included in the plan
	10779	No community facilities have been allocated by TVBC or Wiltshire, a lack of will make the developments less desirable and likely to increase crime for teenagers and young adults. Section 106 agreements should be in place to ensure these are provided.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - Dentists	11133	Dental surgeries will require investment to support the proposed developments.
	10705	There is currently no dentist services in Ludgershall
	10856	Local Dental services have not received sufficient provisions or expansion to cope with the increase in housing and therefore population.
	10779	What are the proposals for the general shortage of dentists
Infrastructure - electricity	10764	electricity power already at capacity
	10705	Wiltshire Local Plan has noted that there is insufficient electric power to supply developments that are not in the pipeline already
	10779	There are already electricity supply shortages, the proposals will add burden which may be unable to cope without the appropriate infrastructure.
Infrastructure - Facilities	10779	The existing facilities in Ludgershall & Tidworth are not within walking distance of the proposed developments and they are not sufficient for the new residents, there is acknowledgement for the need for community facilities and amenities but there are no proposals for new facilities
	10779	It is unclear whether either TVBC or Wiltshire intend to provide for playgrounds and open spaces as the sports facilities in Tidworth are not within walking distance of the proposed developments
	10779	Access to shops is likely to be difficult as there isn't enough parking in Ludgershall and Tidworth, provision needs to be made with a S106 agreement, so these facilities are included in the developments
Infrastructure - Further Education	10779	There needs to be sufficient provisions in place for the proposed development to provide adequate access to college or apprenticeship/training opportunities for young adults within walking distance or a good bus service.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - gas	10764	will sites have access to gas
	10779	What will be the provisions for gas supply for the proposed developments and will bottled gas be permitted?
Infrastructure - GPs	11133	GP surgeries will require investment to support the proposed developments.
	11021	Concerned at the insufficient GP services around the Ludgershall proposals
	10705	The doctors surgery is already over capacity and is situated in the town centre of the town with little room for expansion
	10856	Local GP services have not received sufficient provisions or expansion to cope with the increase in housing and therefore population.
	10792	The GP surgery is in need of additional provisions to support any expansion as a proposed development.
	10779	The new residents will need additional GP services
Infrastructure - health	10730	level of growth proposed will have a significant impact on the provision of healthcare services within Ludgershall (services commissioned by NHS BSW ICB)
	10730	to support proposed level of growth there will be requirement to deliver significant increase in healthcare infrastructure capacity
	10730	welcome reference for the need for a co-ordinated approach to masterplanning the three sites across council boundaries
	10730	request further detail added to site allocations to clarify how additional healthcare capacity required to meet the needs arising from the proposed housing growth would be delivered

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10730	both policies should include specific requirement to deliver funding contributions towards healthcare to provide sound basis for securing necessary contributions
	10730	allocation policies should align with the planning obligations identified in Strategic Sites Viability Testing and draft IDP
	10730	need to work with BSW ICB to determine most appropriate form of healthcare mitigation whilst developing site masterplans
	10730	BSW ICB keen to meet to refine primary healthcare infrastructure requirements and associated indicative capital costs of delivery
	10761	Previous development in Ludgershall has not resulted in improvements to healthcare facilities and Castle Practice had to self fund expansion
	10761	Funding constraints - Castle Practice cannot self fund expansion to address new development
	10764	Caste Practice at capacity and chemist always busy - need for improvements
	10764	no dentist currently in Ludgershall but need for new one
Infrastructure - Leisure	11021	Concerned at the lack of leisure facilities around the Ludgershall proposals, Tidworth Leisure Centre has limited opportunities for civilians
	10779	According to Wiltshire, the MoD and Ludgershall Council should be responsible for sports and leisure facilities but without an enforceable agreement, how likely is it that this will happen and where will the required funding come from
Infrastructure - Local Amenities	10792	Improvement to local sports facilities is necessary for the area, especially with the additional demands of the proposed development.
Infrastructure - Local Facilities	10633	There are no benefits to the proposed developments as they negatively impact existing residents.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10779	There are no clear proposals as to how TVBC will ensure that all essential services and amenities are available to the new residents as soon as they move in
Infrastructure - Local Services	11133	The proposed developments will depend on the local services of Ludgershall.
	11133	Chemists will require investment to support the proposed developments.
	11133	Shops will require investment to support the proposed developments.
	11133	Youth services will require investment to support the proposed developments.
	11133	Leisure facilities will require investment to support the proposed developments.
Infrastructure - Ludgershall	10764	Two sites border Ludgershall and Faberstown and will be using all facilities, infrastructure, roads and resources
	10764	If sites were Wiltshire development the town council would get CIL/ S106 funds and precept once dwellings are occupied. Concern at lack of monetary contributions
	10764	town council would like guarantee that they will be consulted and part decision makers
	10764	A342 heavily used road will need improvements including more crossings, reduced speed (Ludgershall TC have speed survey can provide)
Infrastructure - need	10759	Any large scale development plan must properly consider the local area in detail and especially its infrastructure both as it currently exists and also as it is likely to evolve over the next 10 to 20 years. This reflects the entire local plan's thinking in terms of of the tiering formulation
	10759	Means that consideration must be given to issues such as local educational needs, medical needs (including hospitals and dentists), road access across the local area and community transport, employment locally, local shops, cultural and sport facilities and the local environment

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10759	Any plan advanced must fit in with any other plans nationally for development of these particular items, although one of the proposed sites recognises that a new primary school should be built, what are the plans for GP surgeries, hospitals and dentists in the area that gives the residents confidence this development is desirable
Infrastructure - Nurseries	11021	Concerned at the lack of nurseries around the Ludgershall proposals
Infrastructure - Pharmacies	11021	Concerned at the insufficient pharmacies around the Ludgershall proposals
Infrastructure - Playgrounds	10779	Will TVBC and Wiltshire ensure there are S106 agreements to incorporate children's play areas and open spaces in all the proposed developments?
Infrastructure - police	10764	how will Hampshire Police deal with site and will this result in increased crime
	10792	There are no provisions for there to be a new police station in Ludgershall, as the proposed development would increase the population and the need for increased policing.
Infrastructure - Public Transport	10856	Local Public Transport has not received sufficient provisions or expansion to cope with the increase in housing and therefore population.
	10856	There are limited public transport links from Thruxton village into Andover, which increases car use and therefore pollution. The proposed plans should include more sustainable travel links in villages.
	10792	An integrated transport system is necessary to support the proposed development, including the use of the branch railway line that connects the main line in Andover onto the wider rail system.
	10779	Public transport is poor and the bus service is infrequent and unreliable thus, new residents will need their cars which will lead to more traffic congestion, what are the proposals for improvement & management?

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - Recycling facilities	10779	Will the new development have domestic waste and recycling facilities as if not, fly-tipping will increase.
Infrastructure - Roads	10759	Weyhill community in Amport Parish does not consider the A342 is adequate, nor can it fairly be expected to cope with the increased volume of traffic that would result from a development of this scale on the outskirts of Ludgershall. Narrow lanes through local villages could provide alternative routes but are not suitable for such use
	10759	Road surfaces are of a poor quality, with very limited funding from HCC at present. APC is of the view that the junctions where the lanes meet the A342 are not adequate to support increased use for access and egress
	11082	Are any mitigations or improvements under consideration?
	11133	Highway infrastructure will require investment to support the proposed developments.
	11021	Concerned at the poor road access around the Ludgershall proposals, there would be an increase of traffic on already unsuitable and poorly maintained roads
	10789	TVBC needs to ensure that the road infrastructure is adequate and safe to service these developments
	10856	The road network surrounding the proposed developments requires a significant upgrade in order to stop the local villages becoming congested and unsafe for existing residents. The proposals for development on Ludgershall Rd and the expansion at Thruxton Airfield will require an updated road layout with an A303 junction and the closure of the access road at the western point of Thruxton village, as increased traffic will make the village even more dangerous for pedestrians.
	10856	The proposals for development on Ludgershall Rd and the expansion at Thruxton Airfield will require an updated road layout with an A303 junction and the closure of the access road at the western point of Thruxton village, as increased traffic will make the village even more dangerous for pedestrians.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10792	Road improvements should be made to A342 prior to the proposed development, as it cannot currently cope with HGVs and the increase in traffic.
	10779	The access roads to the site south of the railway line are inadequate for construction traffic and the proposed railway bridge will be a difficult, costly and lengthy project but should be in place before construction begins
	10779	Significant challenges to be addressed in relation to the new arterial road from Tidworth/Ludgershall to the A342 through the new developments to the south of the railway line
	10779	The road network should be reviewed and a plan prepared to deal with the extra traffic from the proposed development.
	10779	The roads in the area are dangerous with potholes, additional traffic will worsen this problem.
Infrastructure - Schools	10764	Schools in Ludgershall are at capacity and there will be need for a secondary school and one or two new primary schools
	10759	Kimpton currently supports a primary school with Thruxton and Fyfield. What are the plans for education locally is the proposal goes ahead? In the analysis, one would expect to see far more thorough discussion. Similar points arise in other areas such as health and employment
	11133	Schools will require investment to support the proposed developments.
	11021	Concerned at the lack of schools around the Ludgershall proposals
	10705	It is noted that there is a possibility of having a primary school on the development but currently Wellington academy is the only secondary school catering for Ludgershall and Tidworth and is up to capacity
	10792	Provisions must be put in place prior to the proposed development in order to ensure that there is an expansion of local schools and a coherent education policy for the area.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10779	Local pre-schools, primary and secondary schools are at full capacity and there is insufficient provision for them in the TVBC and Wiltshire plan
	10779	Will TVBC and Wiltshire revisit provisions for primary schools in the area, there are limited places at Kimpton and Appleshaw Skylark Federation schools. The current provision of one school cannot support the proposals.
infrastructure - sewer	10759	Kimpton is a rural parish in tier 4. The sewer system runs from Kimpton village to Fullerton WWTC south of Andover, these facilities are not properly considered in the plan, not can they accommodate much additional demand, there are major works required to support waste and water treatment for the proposed developments which are not planned or costed
Infrastructure - Shops	10705	There are only 2 convenience stores serving Ludgershall so anyone needing to access larger supermarkets will increase vehicle journeys will not help towards reducing the carbon footprint
	10856	Shops have declined significantly in the local area and would be insufficient for any further developments.
	10779	There is a 'convenience store' indicated in the Wiltshire proposal but nothing in the TVBC proposals, will this be revisited as part of the preparation of detailed proposals? An enforceable S106 for each new development could address these issues.
Infrastructure - transport	10764	100 acre roundabout and Weyhill roundabout will need improvements
	10764	Tidworth bridge over MOD railway is already congested and would be made worse
	10764	New bridge would need to be completed before development starts for works traffic
	10975	The development of the new town(s) will significantly change the character of Ludgershall and potentially of Kimpton without significant infrastructure investment. There are no trains and a very unreliable bus service. Therefore, there will have to up to approx. 11,000 cars that will swamp the current road network. There is very poor transport to the nearest local amenities in Tidworth

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10975	There are no clear proposals in relation to the road bridge access to the site to the South of the railway line, or the new main road passing through the Wiltshire/TVBC town(s) and the A342 junctions
	10779	Transport to colleges in Andover, Sparsholt or Swindon is currently problematic, are there any proposals for the new residents in this regard?
Infrastructure - Utilities	10856	Capacity for broadband would need to be significantly increased in order to provide for any additional development.
	10856	Capacity for electricity would need to be significantly increased in order to provide for any additional development.
	10792	There is insufficient provision for gas/hydrogen to the northern side of the A342, as currently properties on this side of the main road do not have access to gas central heating.
Infrastructure - waste	10764	query over how refuse collection would be collected
	10779	What are the provisions for waste collection, will this be in conjunction with Wiltshire?
	10764	sewage works at capacity and new pumping station will be required
	10856	The current wastewater infrastructure needs significant upgrading as there has been waste water system problems in the villages of Thruxton, Fyfield and Monxton. The proposed developments will put additional strain on this, and cause damage to the underlying aquifer which is the main source of drinking water for the region, as well as damage to wildlife and chalk streams.
	10792	There must be appropriate provisions for a water and sewerage system to support the proposed development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11021	Concerned over wastewater disposal, Fullerton plant is over capacity and Southern Water have no plans for improvements before 2030 meaning untreated water continues to be pumped into the River Test which is causing pollution and health worries for people and wildlife
	10779	Where will the sewage from the new sites go? Fullerton is already at full capacity
	10779	There are serious issues with Southern Water, what has been proposed to deal with the proposed development?
Infrastructure - Wiltshire	10759	Ludgershall and Tidworth provide limited local infrastructure, it is not clear there these communities would welcome or could manage large development in TVBC
	10759	Acknowledge by TVBC of the need to co-ordinate with Wiltshire's plan, but not acceptable that a significant local plan should be agreed without a great deal more information. Information is required as to Ludgershall's view of the plans with regard to all infrastructure, facilities and services issues
	10759	Does Wiltshire support and encourage such a development across the boundary? Access to Ludgershall and Tidworth is fairly limited from the east.
	11001	These developments are alongside proposed sites of 1220 dwellings at Empress Way and implies a greater reliance on Wiltshire CC, Ludgershall and Tidworth to provide facilities and services to support these developments
Infrastructure-broadband	10705	The Broadband Services in Ludgershall are very poor with constant breakdowns
Infrastruture - Requirement	11001	Need an understanding of the demographics of expected residents of these developments, assessed on a site by site basis to help understand the mix of housing and required facilities and services to support these developments and the rest of the Parish
Kimpton Parish	10759	The proposal is for Kimpton Parish designated as Tier 4 with a local population of around 350, should accommodate 2 sites for development of 1500

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Local investment	10940	The parish for the development SE of Ludgershall is Kimpton, though Ludgershall will be used for services needed by the new residents. Ludgershall will need investment to cope with the strain on local services.
Ludgershall	10764	natural beauty in Ludgershall and wildlife, ask for environmental impact statement
Ludgershall - adverse impact on setting of AONB	11161	Development of the two Ludgershall allocations has the potential to cause significant adverse effects on the setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB which is adjacent to the site.
Ludgershall - allocation likely to be isolated and car dependent in the absence of infrastructure.	11161	Ludgershall - allocation is likely to be isolated and car dependent in the absence of the full range of the infrastructure improvements required. This would undermine overall spatial strategy of the plan.
Ludgershall - assessment of sustainability	11161	Sustainability of sites is entirely dependent on significant future infrastructure improvements - in projects that are not located within Test Valley or Hampshire, and the sites lie at least 1.5km from the centre services/amenities.
Ludgershall - assessment of sustainability - based on limited bus access	11161	Sustainability of Ludgershall sites relies heavily on single bus services from Andover to Salisbury, via Ludgershall and Tidworth. This is a frequent service but is very limited on Sundays and bank holidays, which will lead to car dependency on these days.
Ludgershall - delivery within trajectory is not realistic	11161	Ludgershall - delivery of the allocations within trajectory is not realistic due to uncertainties around infrastructure and accessibility. It is likely to slip by several years.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Ludgershall - large scale allocations not sustainable - limited public transport.	11094	Ludgershall is over 11km from Andover and accessed by the relatively minor A342. It had a population of 5,400 in 2021 and the proposed allocations would swell this by 3,900, or a 72% increase. Wiltshire Council has already allocated more than enough sites for consideration nearer the centre of Tidworth and Ludgershall. This area of Wiltshire is not served by rail and the local bus services take a long time to get anywhere other than Andover. Meeting Test Valleys need in Ludgershall does not seem a sustainable option
Ludgershall - sites will not be sustainable - walking and cycling routes poor	11161	Ludgershall - sites will not be sustainable - walking and cycling routes to town centre along Andover Road (A342) are unattractive and unsafe and heavily trafficked, with intermittent walking/cycling provision.
Ludgershall - sites will not be sustainable without significant infrastructure improvements prior to delivery	11161	Healthcare and educational infrastructure will need to be addressed before any significant development on the Ludgershall edge can be built out, or the Test Valley allocations will be isolated and unsustainable
Ludgershall sites not sustainable and are uncertain in suitability and deliverability	11161	Ludgershall sites not sustainable and are uncertain in suitability and deliverability. This makes them premature, and the local plan should not rely upon their delivery. Wiltshire have referred to 'Tidworth and Ludgershall Market Town' - is this a vision shared by TVBC?
Masterplanning	10817	With reference to paragraph 4.86 it is important to note that Policy NA8 allocation and emerging Wiltshire LP Policy 40 allocation are both under the control of the one site promoter. A comprehensive masterplan for both sites is being developed.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10817	The emerging indicative masterplan locates the community facilities into a position more central to the proposed population and reflects market testing requiring a prominent location, including proximity to the highway's infrastructure. Additional context including the identification of Tidworth and Ludgershall as sustainable market towns, suitable for significant development, would assist.
NA7 - Ludgershall is a sustainable location and settlement	10112	Ludgershall performs favourably when compared to other 'Tier 2' settlements within the Draft Plan settlement hierarchy. It has a strong range of services and facilities and good connections to Andover, Salisbury, Winchester, Amesbury, Tidworth and Marlborough. The A342 adjoining site has regular bus services to Andover, Salisbury and Winchester City Centre.
Natural environment and access to the countryside	10779	There needs to be a careful balance between nature and access to the countryside, what mitigation measures will be implemented and enforced to ensure there is food security as well as the ability to enjoy the natural environment
Objection	10133	Do not support inclusion of sites at Ludgershall as these neither support the objectives of the spatial strategy or represent that most appropriate development locations
Overdevelopment	10856	There is no necessity in the area for further development as there is current housing that remains unoccupied.
Parking	10856	Car parking is already a present issue in the area, and the proposed development would lead to a significant increase in vehicles on the road putting further pressure on this.
Pedestrian and cycle access	10779	Access for pedestrians and cyclists from Ludgershall under the Shoddesden Lane bridge should be revisited in the light of the essential vehicular access for the new residents
	10779	Access for pedestrians and cyclists at the Ludgershall end of Shoddesden Lane presents some challenge and might be reconsidered; there should be consultation with the operators of the affected Farms and residents
Police	10779	There isn't enough cover by Hampshire Rural Police to cater for crime and policing in the area currently and this will be exacerbated with the new developments

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Pollution	10779	During and after the construction phase, there will be an increase for noise, air, light and water pollution and TVBC and Wiltshire Environmental Health Officers should be prepared for the issues that will arise from this.
Population increase	11001	As this area has seen significant development in recent years and has further large development underway this area will double its population to 2040
	11001	The proposed land allocation would result in an increase of over 1000% in dwellings and nearly 1300% increase in population
Process	10759	Any plan that does not properly address identified issues in detail in TVBC and Wiltshire in terms of actual plans and the risks to the community, is not properly brought forward
Public Consultation	10856	There is a need for the community to be more involved in appraisals ahead of proposed developments, as the plan is not democratic if not consulted on with the public in the communities they affect. This includes the local community being involved in pre application advice to developers.
Public Right of Way	10779	Footpaths run across the area marked for the proposed development which are used by local residents to access open land and almost directly onto Salisbury Plain. How will enhancement of these rights of way be achieved?
Public Transport	10779	There will be serious issues for new residents regarding public transport unless the issues are resolved in regards to access to essential services, including bus and rail.
	11021	Concerned over the lack of public transport around the Ludgershall proposals, outlying villages have limited access to get to the A342 for the bus
	10940	Invest in the rail line at Ludgershall for passengers to use as an alternative to car use and to support the local population increase due to the new development.
	10243	The settlement is on the jointly operated Activ8 service which operates 7 days a week with regular frequencies. Restoration of additional frequencies operated between Andover and Tidworth only that

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		were dropped during COVID would be vital for public transport to play a significant role in meeting mobility demands. However, it makes little sense to run additional buses if the frequency would be split between two routes – as it would need to be if development south of the railway were to be meaningfully served. Whilst land directly on the Activ8 route to the north of the A4342 can be considered highly appropriate for development, serious questions exist for us about the appropriateness of a joint allocation that is by far the largest in the plan south of the military railway where relevant public transport choices are unlikely to be easily deliverable nor effective.
Railway barriers	10779	Effective barriers should be implemented in order to prevent access to the railway line.
Range of facilities	10243	Ludgershall's range of facilities is limited with low self-containment. Employment has been dominated by the presence of the military, but the sale of Castledown Business Park would diversify employment and secondary education is offered. We agree that land adjacent to Ludgershall does offer potential for meeting housing need on an appropriate scale, subject to it also having good access to the principal public transport offsetting its limited service and employment offer.
Regeneration	10940	Ludgershall is in desperate need of regeneration, especially to the shop area.
Renewable energy	10779	The National Grid is at full capacity and there are no proposals for renewables. TVBC/Wiltshire should assess the requirement for the new developments to include air heat pumps, solar panels and small turbines.
Scale	10243	The Wiltshire and Test Valley proposals in combination could be described as an entirely new village however, a new village or settlement was ruled out on the basis the quantum did not require it. We would suggest that from examination of the plan strategy and the evidence behind the larger allocation at Ludgershall, the plan circumstantially proves the opposite.
	10133	Sites at Ludgershall do not represent appropriate locations for development at scale proposed
Secondary education	10243	The scale of development jointly proposed could tax local facilities. If secondary education needs cannot be fully met then the viability of providing additional provision either in Hampshire or Wiltshire without creating difficulties with the scale and effectiveness of new and existing provision will need full and robust assessment.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
SEND resources	10779	As the resources for SEND pupils is overstretched, what proposals exist to provide support for current residents and the future residents of these proposals?
Settlement Hierarchy	10759	The point of the tier system appears clear, that development should be concentrated on tier 1 and 2 settlements. Tier 4 parishes are not appropriate for significant development, how is the current proposal in the plan envisaged within the Tier 4 criteria?
Spatial Strategy	10975	Plan acknowledges that there is a greater need for housing in South Test Valley (where there are more jobs) than in North Test Valley, any new builds should be concentrated on brown field sites not green field
	10975	By not building in existing towns on brown field sites (i.e. Andover) the centres become a ghost town as there is not the demand from shoppers. It is no secret that it costs much less to build on green field sites, but we must think of the long term effect on our town centres and countryside
Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy	10243	These sites are physically remote from the borough's main centres of services and activity and do not clearly align with the spatial strategy. Ludgershall does not feature in the settlement hierarchy but if it did, it would be a tier 2 settlement which does justify significant development
Spatial strategy conformity	10243	We find it perplexing these sites advanced as allocations when they scored less well in the Sustainability Appraisal than other sites in the north which are also far better in conformity with the spatial strategy as they are adjacent to Andover. Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA 165) stands out as performing substantially better.
Support for strategic allocation NA8 alongside NA7	10112	Strongly support the proposed strategic allocation (Policy NA8) alongside neighbouring allocation (Policy NA7) and collectively the sites will make a significant contribution to delivering the housing requirement for Test Valley Borough, alongside the Wiltshire County Council neighbouring site allocation (Land at Empress Way). The three allocations together will deliver approximately 2,720 homes.
Sustainable Development	11001	If implemented without addressing these comments KPC does not believe that these policies will deliver the high quality sustainable developments envisioned by TVBC

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Traffic	10036	Majority of traffic from the new housing will be in the direction of Andover and Basingstoke, where the majority of employment likely exist. The importance of road planning to avoid bottlenecks and rat runs will be the key to the success of these developments. A joined up approach is needed across the Ludgershall and Manor Farm developments
	11082	Would like to know what if any assessment has been made of the increase in road traffic there will be in the A342 following the development of 1500 houses adjacent to Ludgershall
	11082	This development will have a significant impact upon traffic levels on the A342 and the villages it passes through
	10789	Proposed new developments around Ludgershall will generate significant increase in traffic along the A342 into and out of Andover, and along the lanes to the south of the development
	10940	A bypass is required to counteract the issue of traffic which will be increased by the new development - the issue already exists turning right from Biddesden Lane.
	10856	The combination of the developments along Ludgershall Rd and the development by Wiltshire County Council will significantly increase traffic on the Ludgershall-Weyhill Rd and through Thruxton village which has narrow roads and limited pedestrian safety.
	10779	There will be considerable traffic problems generated at peak times by workers and school children causing increased volume of cars on the A342.
	10779	Traffic management during construction should be carefully planned to mitigate the impact on Kimpton, Great Shoddesden and Little Shoddesden.
Water use and management	10975	We have had significant flooding, sewerage & run off water off issues in Kimpton, Thruxton & Fyfield this year and previous years. Is there any provision for this additional sewerage that will be created with so many new homes being created? Where will it go as Fullerton is already at max capacity?
Housing assessment	11118	The draft plan is also missing any assessment of the numbers of people who may take up the new proposed Ludgershall housing who are economically and socially dependent and how the Council will support them

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Community facilities	11118	Neither TVBC nor Wiltshire have allocated any space for community facilities- the draft plan suggests that this need will be assessed later which is procrastination and could potentially be ignored later, proposals need to be put in place, now, for community provision through s106 agreements as once the developer has planning permission agreements will be hard to enforce
Car Use	11118	The Plan reads well as to the integration of the proposed developments with the road, cycling and pedestrian routes but it seems most if not all the occupiers of the proposed homes will need cars
Traffic	11118	There needs to be a proper study of the ability of the A342 to cope with the additional traffic which will come from both the TVBC development and the Wiltshire one as congestion, particularly at peak times will be an issue. H
Traffic	11118	How will the junctions where the proposed developments join the A342 be managed?
Railway line safety	11118	Is there any concern that the railway line might become a magnet for young children as a play area? will the army be giving it up? If not, shouldn't safety barriers be incorporated into the development?
Employment allocations	11118	TVBC acknowledge that some areas designated for employment in the adopted plan have not yet been developed-but have not provided an assessment as to why -will there be a better provision of jobs in the new plan?
Spatial Strategy	11118	The draft plan acknowledges that there is more work in the south of the borough than in the north, yet the draft plan proposes more new housing in the north -why is this?
Employment Opportunities	11118	What will TVBC do to ensure that there is work for the wage-earners who want to take up new homes and where are the proposals to ensure that jobs will be ready for the influx of additional wage earners?
Employment	11118	The draft plan development at Thruxton seems to provide a limited number of jobs -have prospective employers been identified and when will these jobs be available?

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Agricultural Land	11118	It is concerning that there is limited (and some negative) reference in the draft plan to agriculture- hopefully some agriculture land in Test Valley will survive the drive to create solar farms, housing and industrial development.
Climate Emergency	11118	The draft plan recognises that there is a climate emergency but does little to comfort the reader that agricultural use of land will be encouraged
Infrastructure	11118	The draft plan does not reassure the reader that the need for health and social care facilities is considered as important and needs addressing- presently the local community is largely dependent on Castle GP practice in Wiltshire and very limited dental services which will be stretched even further with the new proposals
Health care	11118	Does TVBC have any proposals to meet the needs of the additional population as local care and nursing homes all have waiting lists for patients, they struggle to fill staff vacancies and are affected by national shortages of nurses, health care assistants, carers, physiotherapists, occupational therapists and other ancillary staff?
Health and Social care	11118	There should be a well-thought and explained plan in place to cover health and social care before any permission is given to build homes for 11,000-12,000
Policing	11118	There is no recognition in the Draft plan of the lack of policing in rural North-West Hampshire-at present only 2 active police officers cover an area of 200 square miles- it would be encouraging to read in the draft Plan that this situation is recognised, that the impact of substantial development around Ludgershall has been assessed and that TVBC have plans to improve policing in the north of the Borough
Infrastructure-Water	11118	There has been significant failure by Southern water to maintain and repair the water infrastructure- It would be encouraging if the local plan addressed these issues and stated what steps TVBC plans to take to ensure that Southern Water can satisfactorily handle the increase in population.
Infrastructure-technology	11118	Has TVBC considered liaising with BT/Openreach to ensure that a reasonable service is provided in future as currently they have not been prepared to invest in improving the infrastructure because the numbers of consumers was considered insignificant-but this will change with the new developments

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure-education	11118	There is a great shortage of places for children in Ludgershall, Kimpton, Appleshaw, Fyfield, Thruxton in all education categories i.e. Primary, Secondary and College/Further Education and there is a severe shortage of SEND provision and one s106 primary school will not be sufficient
	11118	What proposals exist to provide SEND support both for the current and for the expanded population if these developments go ahead
Scale of development	11118	The scale of the new homes proposed by TVBC and Wiltshire around Ludgershall could have an adverse impact on the existing towns and settlements unless they are holistically managed with sufficient and improved infrastructure and amenities
Support	10779	What provisions do TVBC have in place to support the residents of the new homes that are economically and socially dependent?

Chapter 4 Proposed Employment Sites Northern Test Valley

Paragraphs 4.108- 4.112

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Suggested amendments to the supporting text relating to proposed employment sites, in particular Thruxton Aerodrome	The wording of the supporting text will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Employment Provision	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The principle of the plan providing significant additional employment land in northern Test Valley is welcomed and supported as its clear demand exists in the area.
Existing development	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Delete second sentence of paragraph 4.112 Delete second sentence of paragraph to read "...Thruxton Aerodrome. The criteria-based policy supports the re-development of existing employment uses and will enable the site to redeveloped existing units on site. National policy..."
Thruxton Aerodrome	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Delete and replace paragraph 4.111 with alternative wording regarding reference to Thruxton Aerodrome and NPPF Delete and replace paragraph with alternative wording to read " The site combined with the level of committed employment supply, does exceed the Northern Test Valley employment requirement. The "

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		<p>benefits and unique opportunity presented by allocating at Land South of Thuxton Aerodrome justify exceeding the employment requirement. <u>The NPPF encourages planning policies to set out a clear economic vision and strategy which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth; to identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy; and be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the Plan. A unique opportunity has been identified at Thuxton which has potential to delivery significant economic benefits (including through the provision of choice and competition) which justifies the allocation of Land South of Thuxton Aerodrome."</u></p>

Policy NA9 South of Thruxton Aerodrome
Paragraphs 4.113-4.120

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Multiple suggested amendments to the supporting text and policy	The wording of the policy and supporting text will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan.
Flood Risk	The wording of the supporting text will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan, including on flood risk.
Contaminated Land	The wording of the supporting text will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan, including on contaminated land.
Site within buffer zone of the safeguarded Thruxton Airfield waste site	The existing waste site will be considered in the context of any development proposals.
Historic Impact Assessment	The wording of the supporting text will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan, including on any impact on heritage and potential need for a HIA.
Flexibility beyond aviation and motor sport needed	The wording of the supporting text will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan, including on the type of development and whether this should allow for greater flexibility.
Traffic	Development would provide upgrades and financial contributions towards highways provision and sustainable transport modes to accommodate the impact of additional travel movements.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	11081	Amend paragraph regarding access provision

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend paragraph to read "The existing site access off Aerodrome Road is proposed to provide the site access and <u>may</u> will require improvements. There is potential need for offsite junction improvements which may include the slip road to the A303. "
Advanced manufacturing	10779	How has the need for employment in advanced manufacturing been identified?
Amend criterion a)	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend criterion a) with minor changes for clarity Amend criterion a) to read "a) The use comprises <u>comprising</u> a business activity which is related to either aviation, or to motor sport or the motor industry, and/or has a connection to <u>the</u> use or operation of the airfield, or motor racing circuit; <u>or</u> "
Ancillary non-employment uses	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend final sentence to add reference to non-employment uses for visitors to the Aerodrome Amend final sentence to read "...The site also has potential to support some ancillary uses to support the main employment function including non-employment facilities to support on-site businesses, and employees, <u>and visitors to the Aerodrome.</u> "
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council: Employment Sectors	10757 Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	Strategic allocation South of Thruxton Aerodrome in Northern Test Valley is welcomed, as it provides for employment floorspace to support employment sectors identified by the local enterprise partnerships.
Clarity	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend paragraph for clarity on site context and access Amend second sentence to read "...Thruxton Village. The site is adjacent to this and the A303 which provides good connectivity to Andover and the wider strategic road network."
Comprehensive redevelopment	11081	Important to acknowledge any redevelopment proposal is brought forward in comprehensive manner in order to fully understand the implications, impacts and benefits

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	
Criterion b)	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend criterion b) for clarity and to add additional reference to non-employment uses for visitors Amend criterion b) to read "Where ancillary <u>complementary</u> non-employment uses are proposed, these will primarily support onsite businesses and their employees <u>or visitors to the aerodrome and motor racing circuit.</u> "
Criterion c)	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend criterion c) to revise reference to sequential approach to flood risk Amend criterion c) to read " A sequential approach will be taken within the site to direct d Development <u>should be directed</u> to areas..."
Criterion d)	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend criterion d) regarding access Amend criterion s) to read " Access via <u>All development should be accessed/serviced using the existing access from business park at Aerodrome Road.</u> "
Cumulative impacts	10779	A strategic study of the impact of traffic, activities proposed in relation to noise disturbance which might affect Kimpton and industrial pollution, both air and water should be mitigated.
Dark skies	10036 Thruxton Parish Council	We suggest an additional item to the policy along the following lines f) The site is close to Salisbury Plain SPA and is within the buffer zone. Appropriate mitigation will be required to protect dark skies
Engagement	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Would welcome further positive dialogue

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Flood risk	10068 Environment Agency	Not demonstrated that this site provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk.
	10068 Environment Agency	A site-specific flood risk assessment should demonstrate that the site will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and where possible will reduce flood risk overall.
	10068 Environment Agency	Development should avoid flood risk zone 3 unless it can be demonstrated that it is not flood risk zone 3b, and compensatory flood storage can be provided on site.
Land contamination	10068 Environment Agency	There is part of a historical landfill in this allocation area. Contamination may be associated with this. Any development would need to carry out a suitably detailed phased investigation and some remediation may be required.
	10068 Environment Agency	Parts of the site are in a source protection zone 2, this may provide some constraint for development. Drainage in this area may potentially need additional safeguards to ensure the source is protected.
	10068 Environment Agency	If this site was historically part of the aerodrome, comments provided on policy NA10 regarding PFAS contamination will be relevant.
Existing development	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Approximately half (c.7ha) of allocated site currently developed for low density employment generating uses. Most building are dated and pressing need for redevelopment to provide modern fit for purpose accommodation

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	None of the existing buildings are restricted (via planning condition) to aviation or motor linked industries. They operate under general employment uses and important this flexibility is retained in any redevelopment and therefore policy Maintain flexibility for redevelopment of existing buildings
	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend paragraph to add reference to area of existing development Amend first sentence to read "The site comprises some existing employment development (<u>circa 7 hectares</u>) and ..."
First paragraph	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend first paragraph to add reference to Proposals Map and deleted reference to positive relationship with site Amend first paragraph to read "...Aerodrome (<u>as defined on the Proposals Map</u>). Development will need to achieve a positive relationship with the Thruxton Aerodrome Site. "
	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Insert new additional paragraph after first paragraph regarding redevelopment of existing buildings Insert new additional paragraph after first paragraph to read " <u>Redevelopment of the existing business park (circa 7 hectares) for Employment uses comprising offices (E(g)(i), Research and Development (E(g)(ii), Industrial Processes (E(g)(iii), General Industrial (B2), Storage and Distribution and Open Storage (B8), and support facilities will be permitted.</u> "
	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend first paragraph to clarify criteria apply to site outside of redevelopment of existing buildings Amend first paragraph to read "... <u>On the remainder of the Site (circa 8 hectares) Development for employment uses</u> will be permitted subject to..."
Flexibility employment needs	11119 St Modwen Strategic Land Ltd	The Plan relies on one new employment site allocation at Thruxton. There is a possibility that this site may not deliver as expected and therefore the Plan should not rely on a sole site. This does not provide flexibility to respond to changing market conditions.
Flood risk	11081	Amend paragraph on approach to flood risk

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend paragraph to read "There are small areas within the site affected by flood zones 2, 3 and surface water flooding. A sequential approach will be taken within the site to direct d Development <u>should be directed</u> to areas at lowest risk of flooding within the Site."
Infrastructure - Transport	10099 Hampshire County Council	There needs to be a more robust approach to ensuring accessibility to the site by sustainable means is improved to ensure the development can be accessed without needing a car. Suggest the following amendment to criterion d: "d. Access via existing business park at Aerodrome Road and high-quality connections to existing walking, wheeling and cycling links to be provided"
Minerals and Waste	10099 Hampshire County Council	sites fall within the buffer zone of the safeguarded Thruxton Airfield waste site. This site is operated by SITA and Earthline Ltd. and is currently safeguarded under Policy 26 (safeguarding – waste infrastructure) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	There is no mention of this safeguarded site in policy's supporting text, so it is requested that this be included. Wording to require engagement with the Waste Planning Authority and the safeguarded site's operators is needed.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	it is requested that the requirement to not constrain existing or allocated minerals or waste infrastructure is included in the supporting text
heritage impact assessment	10049 Historic England	We consider HIA is particularly needed for the site, informed by liaison with the Council's conservation team and its archaeological advisers
	10049 Historic England	object - advice proportionate HIA to inform allocation
impact on listed buildings and conservation area	10049 Historic England	In exchanges in early 2023, we welcomed the Test Valley officer comments that "due to the size and scale of the buildings, the views from the conservation area and listed buildings will need to be considered as well as views from Scheduled Ancient Monument; and the effect of lighting should also be considered." There is no indication that these issues have been considered further at this stage, nor that the

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		applicant will be required to consider much matters. We suggest adding a new criterion to the policy as shown opposite, accompanied by appropriate supporting text. e) The layout and form of development will avoid or minimise harm to the setting of Thruxton Conservation Area, its listed buildings and Scheduled Monument;"
Infrastructure - Roads	10036 Thruxton Parish Council	Suggest the policy add a condition that modification to the A303 junction adjacent to Aerodrome Rd is both mandatory and work completed prior to any planning application is approved
	10036 Thruxton Parish Council	During building and operation additional HGV traffic would adversely affect local residents, Thruxton Down Road is unsuitable. There is already HGV traffic using the road from Grateley and Tidworth as well as accessing the current industrial estate
	10036 Thruxton Parish Council	We suggest an additional item to the policy along the following lines e) A mandatory precursor to any development of the site must be modification to the A303 junction to allow entrance and exit in both directions. Priority consideration will be given to the following - minimising conflicts of local and site traffic - changing Thruxton Down Road to have "access only" status, speed limits and/or traffic calming measures - closing the road from the village to the industrial site to all vehicular traffic so it may be used solely by cyclists and walkers
Land south of Thruxton Aerodrome	11001 Kimpton Parish Council	KPC notes the inclusion of Land South of Thruxton aerodrome as a proposed employment site
Landfill	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Delete paragraph on former landfill site Delete paragraph to read "A limited area of land within the site on the northern boundary includes part of a former landfill site. Further investigation is required to determine appropriate mitigation measures."
Highway access	10291	Adjacent to A303 junction with Wiremead Lane

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	National Highways	
New criterion	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Add new additional criterion after criterion a) on advanced manufacturing, knowledge based, creative, or high technology industry uses Add new additional criterion after criterion a) to read <u>"The use comprises a business activity which is related to advanced manufacturing, knowledge based, creative or high technology industries."</u>
	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Add additional criterion on safe and efficient operation of the airfield or motor racing circuit Add additional criterion to read <u>"Development should not impact on the safe and efficient operation of the airfield or motor racing circuit."</u>
New requirement	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Add additional wording after criteria on requirement for masterplan Add additional wording after criteria to read <u>"Any planning application should be supported by an illustrative site-wide masterplan."</u>
Public transport	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The location only provides for employee access by car as there is no public transport provision, the Thruxton area lies far south of the Activ8 corridor. The scale of proposed and existing development is not sufficient to make a public transport offer viable. A single end user B8 distribution facility of the scale indicated might, dependent on employment density, justify a dedicated shift- change bus link to Andover, but this is highly speculative.
Redevelopment	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Important that existing site conditions are recognised, and policy framed to provide best opportunity for site to come forward for development and delivery anticipated benefits
Restriction on uses	11081	Beyond existing built form more restrictive policy approach can be justified based on evidence base

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	
	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Need for flexibility beyond solely aviation and motor based industries in order to complement redevelopment of wider site and provide positive framework for redevelopment Flexibility beyond aviation and motor sport
Site Allocation	11108 Woolsington One (W1) Ltd	Support the identification of land south of Thruxton aerodrome for business activities related to aviation, motor sport or the motor industry.
Sound approach	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	On basis that proposed allocation is supported by evidence base Council' s approach is considered to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy and therefore sound.
	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	On basis that proposed allocation accords the objectives of NPPF para.86 Council' s approach is considered to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy and therefore sound.
	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	On basis that proposed allocation is deliverable within plan period Council' s approach is considered to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy and therefore sound.
Speed	11001 Kimpton Parish Council	Ongoing concern that the speed of traffic through the village is excessive, additional traffic is likely to compound the problem as people seek to get to work

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Support	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Support subject to minor adjustments. Absence of policy provision to support to support role of sites and historically restrictive policy framework has contributed to lack of investment over time and consequent decline in overall quality of infrastructure and facilities within the site
Support in principle	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Support site specific policy which provides in principle support for development. Notwithstanding we duly request some adjustments to the detailed policy wording and of the supporting text
Traffic	11001 Kimpton Parish Council	Not enough information is available to enable KPC to support/oppose the proposed employment site, however there is an overarching concern about the increase in traffic that would be generated
	11001 Kimpton Parish Council	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. Traffic already uses Kimpton as a route to get to the A303, this issue is exacerbated during road closures
	10779	Development could lead to an impact on traffic and access roads to Thruxton Aerodrome and through the surrounding villages are narrow
Transport objectives and spatial strategy	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The allocation cannot be considered to support the transport and movement strategic objectives in the plan nor can it conform to the spatial strategy, it aggravates already high car-dependence for journeys to work.
Unsustainable	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	If Thruxton is not considered appropriate for strategic scale housing it is not possible to follow why it should be considered sustainable for employment development on this scale therefore, the allocation is not supported.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment

Policy NA10 Thruxton Aerodrome
Paragraphs 4.121-4.128

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Multiple suggested amendments to the supporting text and policy	The wording of the policy and supporting text will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan.
Contaminated Land	The wording of the supporting text will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan, including on contaminated land.
Site within buffer zone of the safeguarded Thruxton Airfield waste site	The existing waste site will be considered in the context of any development proposals.
Scheduled Monument	The wording of the supporting text will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan, including on any impact on the scheduled monument.
Historic Impact Assessment	The wording of the supporting text will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan, including on any impact on heritage and potential need for a HIA.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Aeronautical and motor sports	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend second sentence of paragraph for clarity Amend second sentence to read "...This policy seeks to support and facilitate the continued focus of the site as a centre for <u>the</u> aeronautical and motor sports industries."
Criterion a)	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend criterion to provide clarity on uses related to aviation, motor sport or the motor industry, or the airfield or motor racing circuit Amend criterion to read "The use comprises a business activity which is related to either aviation, or to motor sport or the motor industry, and or has a connection to <u>the</u> use or operation of the airfield, or motor racing circuit."

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Criterion b)	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend criterion regarding non-employment uses and add additional reference to the operation of the aerodrome or motor racing circuit. Amend criterion to read "Where <u>complimentary</u> non-employment uses are proposed, these will primarily support onsite businesses, and their employees or visitors to the aerodrome and motor racing circuit <u>or the operation of the aerodrome or motor racing circuit.</u> "
Criterion c)	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend criterion on the area for the focus for development and redevelopment and provide greater flexibility regarding this Amend criterion to read " New Development is primarily related to the redevelopment and extension of existing buildings <u>shall primarily be located within the eastern western part of the site withiin or in proximity to the existing building cluster and accessed off Aerodrome Road.</u> "
Criterion d)	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend criterion to change would to should Amend criterion to read "Development would <u>should</u> not impact on the safe and efficient operation of the airfield or motor racing circuit."
Criterion e)	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend criterion to amend will to shall and provide clarity on the location of the designated heritage assets in proximity to the site Amend criterion to read "The layout and form of development will <u>shall</u> avoid significant adverse impacts on the areas of higher landscape sensitivity to the north of the site and the setting of the Thruxton Conservation Area, listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monument <u>to the east; and</u> "
Criterion f)	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Delete criterion Delete criterion to read " Main vehicular access via existing aerodrome access to Aerodrome Road; and "
Criterion g)	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend criterion with regard to transport improvements Amend criterion to read " Any appropriate improvements shall be <u>are</u> made to the transport network to manage impact, including junction improvements and/or financial contributions as required <u>appropriate and where they are justified.</u> "

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Critical to future of site	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Proposed policy is critical to facilitating enhancement of existing facilities serving the airfield and racing circuit which are increasingly outdated, as well as supporting additional development aimed at supporting and safeguarding the existing role and function of these uses
Development and Redevelopment	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend paragraph on the area for the focus for development and redevelopment and provide greater flexibility regarding this Amend paragraph to read "Development/ <u>redevelopment</u> should be primarily related to the redevelopment and extension of existing buildings <u>focussed</u> within the eastern <u>western</u> part of the site (<u>within or in proximity to the existing building cluster</u>) and should not impact upon the continued safe and efficient operation of the airfield or motor racing circuit."
Engagement	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Would welcome further positive dialogue
East / West	10068 Environment Agency	References existing buildings in the east of the site. There are no buildings shown in the east of the site, they appear to be in the west of the site. Should this read west?
Land contamination	100680 Environment Agency	There is historical landfill in this allocation area. Contamination may be associated with this. Any development would need to carry out a suitably detailed phased investigation and some remediation may be required.
	10068 Environment Agency	Increasing concerns in recent years about risks for PFAS contamination. PFAS is a group of chemicals that in general do not break down and have been linked to possible health implications. One significant source has been Aqueous firefighting foam, which is often used in association with firefighting/training facilities at airports. PFAS contamination can be challenging to address and can provide a very significant constraint to redevelopment. Principal concern areas would be those used for firefighting / training facilities at any airport / airfield, but other areas may also be of concern.
Infrastructure - Transport	10099 Hampshire County Council	There needs to be a more robust approach to ensuring accessibility to the site by sustainable means is improved to ensure the development can be accessed without needing a car. Suggest amending

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		criterion f as follows: "f. Access via existing business park at Aerodrome Road and high-quality connections to existing walking, wheeling and cycling links to be provided"
Minerals and Waste	10099 Hampshire County Council	sites fall within the buffer zone of the safeguarded Thruxton Airfield waste site. This site is operated by SITA and Earthline Ltd. and is currently safeguarded under Policy 26 (safeguarding – waste infrastructure) of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	There is no mention of this safeguarded site in policy's supporting text, so it is requested that this be included. Wording to require engagement with the Waste Planning Authority and the safeguarded site's operators is needed.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	it is requested that the requirement to not constrain existing or allocated minerals or waste infrastructure is included in the supporting text
heritage buffer	10049 Historic England	object - anticipate that a heritage buffer nearest the Scheduled Monument is likely to be appropriate review addition of a heritage buffer
heritage impact	10049 Historic England	object - One could interpret the proposed policy to mean that less than substantial harm is acceptable in this location. Nuanced wording is needed, informed by proportionate evidence. review wording
	10049 Historic England	object - The extent to which the airfield is of heritage interest does not seem to be acknowledged in the approach to this site's development. (link to HE guidance provided) review assessment of heritage asset
heritage impact assessment	10049 Historic England	We consider HIA is particularly needed for the site, informed by liaison with the Council's conservation team and its archaeological advisers
	10049 Historic England	object - advice proportionate HIA to inform allocation

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Scheduled Monument	10049 Historic England	object - amended wording suggested. To align with terminology in the NPPF, we recommend reference to Scheduled Monument, rather than Scheduled Ancient Monument. The layout and form of development will avoid significant adverse impacts on the areas of higher landscape sensitivity to the north of the site and avoid or minimise harm to the setting of Thruxton Conservation Area, its listed buildings and Scheduled Monument; where opportunities exist to enhance the setting of designated heritage assets, they should take."
Positive framework	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Policy introduces a positive planning framework to facilitate appropriate development within the existing aerodrome which has been absent from previous adopted local plans
Proposed uses	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Amend first paragraph to delete word primarily Amend first paragraph to read "Development for Employment uses comprising primarily offices (E(g)(i),..."
Scale of development	11118 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	It is very disappointing to note that the draft LP appears to have been prepared without communication with the Wiltshire Unitary Authority when between the two authorities 3750 homes are proposed. The 2021 census puts Ludgerhall's population at 8390 and Ludgershall has very few amenities and limited shopping for its existing population, and this will be exacerbated with the increase in population from the two proposals
Site Allocation	11108 Woolsington One (W1) Ltd	Support the identification of Thruxton aerodrome for business activities related to aviation, motor sport or the motor industry.
Support	11081 Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	Support subject to minor adjustments. Absence of policy provision to support to support role of sites and historically restrictive policy framework has contributed to lack of investment over time and consequent decline in overall quality of infrastructure
	11081	Support site specific policy which provides in principle support for appropriate development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Weston Air (Thruxton) Ltd / Thruxton Circuit	
Thruxton Aerodrome	11078 Cambium Developments Ltd	Council proposes to allocate c.15ha of Land at Thruxton Aerodrome for employment use. Clearly whilst some of the future workforce would choose to live in Andover, where a significant proportion of the housing requirement for Norther Test Valley is proposed, some would prefer to live within 2 miles of their place of work in a village location which provides a differing quality of life from urban living

Chapter 4 - Southern Test Valley

Paragraphs 4.129-4.140

Key Issue	Officer Response
Nature Reserve	Local nature reserves are protected by biodiversity policy (Policy BIO1) and have been taken into account as relevant, as part of the site assessment selection process.
Infrastructure - Roads	Development would provide upgrades and financial contributions towards highways provision and sustainable transport modes to accommodate the impact of additional travel movements.
Infrastructure - Schools	Developments would make a financial contribution towards the enhancement of local schools as required based existing capacity and need to accommodate additional pupils.
Infrastructure – Health	Development would make a financial contribution towards enhancement of local primary care provision based upon existing capacity and increase in population
Infrastructure - Wastewater	A Water Cycle Study has been undertaken as part of the evidence base, and the Council is working with water companies on the provision of wastewater infrastructure and water quality alongside the delivery of new development. This will be updated to inform the Regulation 19 stage.
Site Selection	The process undertaken to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal
Romsey Town Centre and Brownfield Sites	The scale of development requirements to meet local housing need and the limited potential of brownfield site requires greenfield allocations to be proposed. Opportunities for development within the town centre will be maximised and considered on their individual merits subject to heritage constraints.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Agriculture	11036	Hoe Lane is a good location for agriculture which should be used more during the current cost of living crisis.
Alternative Sites	10885	There are many other sites that could be chosen that would not impact the uniqueness of this part of Test Valley.
Biodiversity	10956	Maintaining the connection between Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and surrounding countryside is important to sustain wildlife welfare.
	10956	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows and West of Cupernham Lane would result in biodiversity loss.
	10958	Maintaining the connection between Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and surrounding countryside is important to sustain wildlife welfare.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10958	Permanently isolating Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve from surrounding countryside would restrict the access of wildlife to the nature reserve.
	11011	The protection of countryside and green space is pivotal to protecting local wildlife.
	11011	Maintaining connections between Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and surrounding countryside is critical to attracting diverse species and sustaining wildlife welfare.
	11011	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows will impede wildlife by isolating Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve from surrounding countryside.
	11013	It is essential to protect countryside status in order to maintain biodiversity.
	10885	Maintaining connections between Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and surrounding countryside is critical to attracting diverse species and sustaining wildlife welfare.
Countryside	10956	Development along Cupernham Lane and urban sprawl will physically and permanently harm the countryside around Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve.
	10958	The Local Plan should continue to protect open countryside.
	10958	Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows is not designated within the current development plan and lies beyond settlement boundaries. It is an open countryside location and the updated local plan should protect this status.
	11011	The local plan protects open countryside and should continue this policy.
	11011	Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows is not designated within the current development plan and lies beyond settlement boundaries. It is an open countryside location and the updated local plan should protect this status.
	11012	Any development beyond existing northern boundary of Oxlease Meadows should be prevented with land retained as protected countryside.
	11013	The local plan protects open countryside and should continue this policy.
	10885	Local Plan should protect the countryside status of the Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows which is not designated within the current development plan amend lies beyond settlement boundaries.
Development	10948	Concern at the heavy building taking place along Cupernham Lane and the growing impact of Fishlake Meadows nature reserve.
Green Space	10956	The Local Plan should continue to protect open countryside.
	10885	Any development on land North of Oxlease Meadows would permanently impact the natural and open appearance of Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve.
Housing in Romsey town centre	10052	No allocations are made in Romsey town centre. Note there is a proposal within the south of town centre masterplan for approximately 30 homes. The town centre is an ideal location for additional housing being within easy reach of all facilities including public transport.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure	10956	Believe the increased building around the Horse Field North of Oxlease Meadows is putting pressure on the surrounding area.
Infrastructure - Roads	10948	The road infrastructure within central Romsey is already struggling with the volume of traffic - further development would increase this issue.
Infrastructure - Schools	11036	The proposed development site at North Baddesley and Romsey will increase the strain on Mountbatten School.
Infrastructure - Wastewater	10052	There is no mention concerning wastewater from sites other than Velmore Farm and King Edward Park which will discharge to treatment works linked to the River Test.
Landscape Character	10948	The character of Fishlake Meadows nature reserve is being changed by damaged by building along its edges.
	10956	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows and West of Cupernham Lane would permanently alter the character of Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve.
	10958	Current local plan boundaries should be maintained to ensure that there is not overdevelopment along Cupernham Lane which would permanently harm the visual character of the countryside.
	10958	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows would permanently alter the character of Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve.
	10958	The canal and footpath form an important part of the visual character - development on land North of Oxlease Meadows will permanently impact the environment.
	11011	Over development along Cupernham Lane will physically and permanently harm the visual character of countryside surrounding Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve.
	11011	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows will permanently alter the tranquil character of Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve.
	11013	Over development along Cupernham Lane will physically and permanently harm the visual character of countryside surrounding Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve.
	10885	Development along Cupernham Lane and urban sprawl will physically and permanently harm the countryside around Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve.
	10885	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows and West of Cupernham Lane would permanently alter the character of Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve.
Local Amenities	10958	Further development to the North of Oxlease Meadows and West of Cupernham Lane would result in loss of amenity.
	11013	It is essential to protect countryside status in order to prevent a loss of amenity.
	10885	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows would cause a loss of amenity.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Local Services	10956	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows and West of Cupernham Lane would result in loss of amenity.
Noise pollution	10956	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows and West of Cupernham Lane would result in increased noise pollution.
Pollution	10956	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows and West of Cupernham Lane would result in increased pollution.
Proposed Development Sites	10956	Fully support of efforts to ensure that further developments in this area is kept out of the Local Plan.
Romsey	10114	Romsey is a highly sustainable settlement
Safety	10956	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows and West of Cupernham Lane would result in a loss of safety in the area.
Settlement Boundaries	10956	As set out in the Draft 2040 Plan, it is critical to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadow Nature Reserve and the scenic canal path.
	10956	Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows is not designated within the current development plan and lies beyond settlement boundaries. It is an open countryside location and the updated local plan should protect this status.
	10957	Critical to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and the scenic canal path as per the current local plan and proposed in draft 2040 plan.
	10958	Critical to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and the scenic canal path as per the current local plan and proposed in draft 2040 plan.
	11011	Critical to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and the scenic canal path as per the current local plan and proposed in draft 2040 plan.
	11011	Any development is unnecessary and should be prevented by maintained current local plan boundaries.
	11012	Important to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and the scenic canal path..
	11013	Critical to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and the scenic canal path as per the current local plan and proposed in draft 2040 plan.
	11013	Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows is not designated within the current development plan and lies beyond settlement boundaries. It is an open countryside location and the updated local plan should protect this status.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10885	Critical to maintain existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and the scenic canal path as per the current local plan and proposed in draft 2040 plan.
Site selection	10599	There is no explanation as to why particular sites were selected for housing development.
Traffic	10956	Further development on land to North of Oxlease Meadows and West of Cupernham Lane would result in an increase in traffic in the area.
Traffic/Pollution	11036	The proposed development site at North Baddesley and Romsey will see and increase in traffic, and therefore greenhouse gases and pollution.
Whitenap	10114	Site promotor says it is fully committed to delivering Hoe Lane and Whitenap
Access	10722	Segregated cycle paths are necessary in order to encourage the use of non-motor travel which will reduce the amount of traffic congestion on the roads.
Access to the Countryside	10737	Southern Test valley has been over developed and the quality of life has been diminished by the lack of access to the countryside for leisure
Brownfield Sites	10832	There is no mention of the derelict brewery site in Romsey which should be the number one priority for southern Test Valley rather than building freely on greenfield sites
Development across the borough	10845	The plan seeks to put majority of additional housing requirement in the south of the borough mainly in Valley Park, housing should be spread across a number of sites
	10739	Why have Chandlers Ford and Romsey had a disproportionate volume of housing allocated whereas central Test Valley has practically no additional allocations?
High Street	10972	Housing is growing ahead of any infrastructure and needs to be limited and ensure the high street is improved
Housing Mix	10832	The plan should allocate reasonably proportioned low level housing such as bungalows near/in Romsey town to allow older people to downsize and prevent underutilisation of housing
Infrastructure - GPs	10972	Housing is growing ahead of any infrastructure and needs to be limited and ensure the doctor surgeries are improved
	10722	The increase in population as a result of proposed development would require an increase in provisions to GP practices which are struggling with the current demand.
Infrastructure - Roads	10722	The current road layout should be reconsidered in order to minimize the impact of traffic congestion on local roads due to the proposed developments
	10972	Housing is growing ahead of any infrastructure and needs to be limited and ensure the roads are improved
Infrastructure - Schools	10972	Housing is growing ahead of any infrastructure and needs to be limited and ensure the schools are improved

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - Wastewater	10722	The increase in population as a result proposed development would exacerbate the issue of Test Valley chalk streams being polluted by untreated water discharge. Sewage treatment works should be installed prior to development as a result of liaising with Southern Water.
Infrastructure-roads	10737	Southern Test valley has been over developed and the road network is not maintained to cope with the extra traffic
local gap	10737	Southern Test valley has been over developed, the towns and villages are closer together and the feeling of being separate communities has been eroded
Noise pollution	10737	Southern Test valley has been over developed and the quality of life has been diminished by all the noise pollution
Pollution	10737	Southern Test valley has been over developed and the quality of life has been diminished by all the pollution
Support	10243	We note and broadly concur with the explanatory text.
	10243	We note and broadly concur with the explanatory text.
Traffic	10737	Southern Test valley has been over developed and the quality of life has been diminished by all the extra traffic
	10722	The increases in traffic in the area will make the roads busier, increasing congestion and pollution.
Upton Lane	10279	Why is a residential allocation for 80 dwellings on land at Upton not included in this paragraph? But its marked, albeit in a different colour from other allocations, on the map in fig 4.12?
Whitenap	10243	Regarding Whitenap, it is proving exceptionally difficult to identify how it can be served by public transport as it is now apparent that diversion of Bluestar services 4 and 5 are not achievable. Extension from the bus station to terminate within the site might be achievable but the scale of development now proposed makes it highly unlikely that the additional vehicle resource would be commercially sustainable and journey times to major destinations would be relatively unattractive.

Policy SA1: Romsey Town Centre
Paragraphs 4.141-4.148

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be covered in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Flood risk	Development would be subject to a FRA and provision of emergency access to the south of the site
Heritage	Development would be subject to a heritage study taking account of the conservation area appraisal, nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets as well as any potential archaeology
Infrastructure – Green space	The town centre masterplan includes enhancements to the waterways running through the town centre and encourages the creation and enhancement of green spaces in the centre of Romsey, this would provide benefits not only for wildlife and the natural environment but also for residents and visitors
Infrastructure – Transport	Development would include provision of pedestrian and cycle allowing for improved links to and from the town centre to the station and surrounding areas, including a new transport hub as part of the South of Romsey Town Centre Masterplan
Regeneration – Masterplan	This policy identifies the importance of development being in accordance with the objectives of the South of Romsey Town Centre Masterplan which identifies a range of public realm improvements, mixed-use development, and community and leisure uses alongside a new and improved transport hub
Residential development	The South of Romsey Town Centre Masterplan identifies the opportunity for approximately 30 new dwellings to come forward as part of the mixed use development, which would contribute to the viability, vibrancy and sustainability of the town centre

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Crosfield Hall - Romsey Masterplan	11135	People should be able to access community buildings by foot or cycle-the Crosfield Hall should be kept in the town centre

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Flooding	11037	Romsey is prone to flooding and there would need to be precautions taken for the additional flooding risks caused by the proposed development.
Green / blue infrastructure	10052 Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	There are also opportunities to make other areas along waterways in the town more accessible and attractive, and more trees in the town centre to reduce pollution and provide summer shade helping to ameliorate climate change.
Green Space	10052 Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	Welcome the vision for more green space in Romsey town centre as indicated in the plans for the area south of the town centre and on the Brewery site.
Heritage	10049 Historic England	“appropriately” should be “approximately
Infrastructure	11037	The local infrastructure is already struggling and will not be able to cope with an additional 5000 houses added by the proposed developments.
Infrastructure - Roads	11019	The road infrastructure is becoming too congested on Romsey Road with developments at Toot Hill, Redbridge, Hoe Lane, Nursling Industrial Units and Old Tyre Place with planning for 38 houses in Romsey.
Infrastructure - Wastewater	11037	Southern Water is not coping with the current sewage outflow, a problem which will be worsened by the proposed development.
Masterplan	11037	The Draft Local Plan seems to have adopted the Romsey masterplan which has not had the same level of scrutiny, and which has had major changes pushed through without proper public consultation.
Registered Park and Garden	10049 Historic England	Recommend adding a short paragraph at the end of this section on nearby Registered Parks and Gardens, in particular the contribution made by Broadlands Registered Park and Garden (Grade II*) to the town.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Residential opportunities	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Maximising the capacity of appropriate residential opportunities in Romsey town centre is supported as this is one of the most accessible locations in the borough by sustainable modes. However, we note only 30 dwellings are considered to be likely to identify which is not a strategically significant quantum.
Retail	11115	There is pent up demand and leakage of retail at Romsey. Retail provision as part of north of Sandy Lane would help retain spending in the town
Romsey Bus Station Masterplan	11135	Disagree with the bus station being taken further away from the town-public transport hubs must be placed in the most accessible locations
	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We note the master plan is adopted involving the redevelopment of the bus station, it is important to recognise the plans aim to ensure no loss in the capacity or functionality which is very important and welcomed.
Romsey Town Centre	10812 Romsey Town Council	Concur but query whether the 30 homes are included in the earlier calculations
	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	No detailed plans have been publicised to be able to state in the Local Plan that 30 dwellings will be provided. Retail evidence has not yet been available either – this is apparently yet to be done.
South of Romsey Town Centre	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	It is understood the Citizens' Assembly identified the need for more green space in the centre of town. There is no evidence that this has been recognised.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	There is inconsistency between the draft Local Plan and the SoRTC Masterplan. In the Masterplan it states that 'evaluation of the Crosfield Hall site is uncertain', whereas the Local Plan states that the Masterplan 'is being delivered proactively' with no mention of uncertainty.
	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	Surely a feasibility study is taking place on all of the South of Romsey Town Centre, not just the Bus Station site, in order to analyse the whole site?
Traffic	11037	The local development would add more vehicles to roads already struggling with traffic, e.g. The Sun Arch is a bottleneck at commuting times.

Policy SA2: Delivering High Quality Development in Romsey Town Centre
Paragraphs 4.149-4.160

Key Issue	Officer Response
Design	Design policies DES1-2 will apply to development proposals in the town centre and will for example consider architectural interest and a positive relationship between the ground and upper floors of buildings. Where possible, buildings in the town centre should aim to open onto the street, providing activity, interest and natural surveillance onto the public realm, which can in turn help places to feel safe
Green infrastructure	Green infrastructure such as the use of green roofs and walls will be encouraged in appropriate locations, where they are sustainable and where longer term maintenance and management is deliverable
Heritage	Development would be subject to a heritage study taking account of the conservation area appraisal, nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets as well as any potential archaeology

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Archaeology	10049 Historic England	The current wording could be interpreted to include views to, from and including listed buildings, without fully considering the significance of those buildings. Arguably it would be better to refer to archaeological remains within a grouping associated with other heritage assets as suggested.
Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan	10049 Historic England	We broadly support this policy, and suggest minor amendment to criterion a.
Delivering High Quality Development	10812 Romsey Town Council	Concur with the detail, it is noted that the policy is poorly phrased

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10812 Romsey Town Council	What exactly is meant by high quality development?
Green Roofs	10977	Strongly suggest more emphasis is made on implementation of green roof, these will be valuable in combating the effects of extreme weather from climate change
Green Space	10223 The Woodland Trust	support the requirement for the creation of appropriate, sustainable new green spaces or green infrastructure and biodiversity within the vicinity of the town centre
High Quality Development	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	Aspiring to high quality for town infrastructure is a very worthy cause. Assessment of quality will require a clear structure for expertise together with valid authority if this aim is to be achieved.

Policy SA3: Romsey Town Centre Uses
Paragraphs 4.161-4.164

Key Issue	Officer Response
Flood risk	Development would be subject to a FRA and provision of emergency access to the south of the site
Use classes	The policy seeks to promote a mix of uses within the town centre including allowing an element of residential use to allow for a vibrant, viable and sustainable town centre, which is well served by a range of facilities and services. It does not state which uses should be present in the town centre, but states where particular uses would be acceptable

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Culverts	10068 Environment Agency	There are sections of culverted main rivers - new buildings should not be built over culverted watercourses. The Environment Agency has a presumption against building new sections of culvert unless unavoidable.
Flood risk	10068 Environment Agency	Not demonstrated that this site provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk.
	10068 Environment Agency	A site-specific flood risk assessment should demonstrate that the site will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and where possible will reduce flood risk overall.
FRAP	10068 Environment Agency	For all sites, any activities in, over, under or within 8 metres of a main river designated watercourse will require the prior written permission of the Environment Agency in the form of a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP). This permission is separate and in addition to any planning requirements.
Town Centre Uses	10812 Romsey Town Council	Phrasing is poor, it does not direct what the developer must do. Not clear if the policy can be enforced given the ever-widening scope of use classes. The new class E encompasses a whole range of uses with potential of switching without planning permission

Strategic Housing Allocations Southern Test Valley
Paragraphs 4.165-4.169

Key Issue	Officer Response
Land Allocation	The process and justification for the choice of sites proposed for potential allocation for development is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Site Appraisals (Appendices IV and V) and the Site Selection Topic Paper. The scale of development requirements leads to a need for greenfield sites outside of existing settlement boundaries to be proposed for allocation.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Land Allocation	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	There is no explanation of changes in selected countryside to housing or employment land. There is no doubt change is a requirement but the Plan should justify the area choice.
	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	New housing south of the bypass will set a precedent such that the bypass road will no longer provide the “hard edge” between countryside and town so treasured by Romsey residents.
	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	The need to justify applies equally to the land expansion of Abbey Park industrial site.

Policy SA4 Ganger Farm
Paragraphs 4.170-4.177

Key Issue	Officer Response
Access, highway infrastructure, traffic.	The vehicular access to the site allocation is proposed to be via Storeys Crescent to the north, connecting to Ganger Farm Way and Jermyn's Lane. It is recognised that there is a substantial level of concern about traffic to and from this site and the impact this will have on the area, local roads and pedestrian/cycling safety, etc. There are concerns that the roads are inadequate for the proposed development. The access to the development would be via Scoreys Crescent, and this route and junctions would be suitable to serve the development of the eastern part of the site allocation, subject to suitable highway improvements and Hampshire County Council (HCC) agreement, based on traffic modelling evidence and liaison with HCC, who are the highway authority. The western parcel may be accessed from the west, with links towards Braishfield Road. It is recognised that construction traffic is going to be disruptive for a period of time, and that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) may be appropriate for this development to help to minimise and mitigate the impacts of construction traffic and disturbance.
Sustainable transport options	The site is considered to be at a sustainable location. The policy's supporting text and development management policies support enhancement of walking and cycling connections to the facilities and services available at Abbotswood and Ganger Farm, and in the wider town and town centre. Additional pedestrian and cycling links to the south and west will help the development to integrate within the area and will provide active travel connections to access nearby services, schools, facilities, and open spaces, including to bus routes and bus stops at Winchester Road and at Jermyn's Lane. There are rail connections in the town centre and there is potential to enhance the facilities and bus stop infrastructure for bus (and rail) users.
Biodiversity and wildlife	The site comprises agricultural fields with areas of ecologically sensitive woodland and hedgerows. In the immediate vicinity are multiple SINC areas. The woodland (including the ancient woodland) can be retained through masterplanning and layout and a buffer is proposed to the ecologically sensitive woodland areas within the policy. The policy criteria will seek to protect and enhance the existing habitat on and around the site. It is considered that there is considerable potential to enrich biodiversity in masterplanning this development, including within the required buffers and green spaces. SANG provision will help to mitigate recreational impact on the New Forest SPA designation.
Infrastructure, facilities, services	Financial contributions may be appropriate towards infrastructure provision off site, including to enhance capacity at existing local secondary and primary schools and also towards healthcare provision and to mitigate the impact of the development. The site will connect to Southern Water sewerage and water infrastructure, and other key infrastructure. Public open space, including play and recreational provision would be provided on site.

Key Issue	Officer Response
Minerals and Waste	It is noted that the site is over 3ha in area and almost wholly within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. A Mineral Resource Assessment would be appropriate to seek to maximise the prior extraction of mineral resources, in line with the policies of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan.
Trees and woodlands	The site contains areas of ecologically sensitive woodland some mature trees, including trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The woodland and trees (including the ancient woodland) can be retained through masterplanning and buffers are proposed to seek to protect these landscape and ecological features, supported by policy criteria.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	10096	A vehicular access to the site from Storeys Crescent has already been granted permission (22/01149/FULLS).
	10096	A current planning application for the development of the eastern part of the site allocation proposes an access road and footway to the eastern side of the allocation, providing vehicular, pedestrian and cycle route to the site.
	10096	A current planning application for the development of the eastern part of the site allocation proposes a shared foot and cycleway from the south of the allocation towards Winchester Road, providing a link to the existing bus stop and onwards to nearby schools. This route will significantly reduce walking and cycling times for residents of the existing Kings Chase development (Phase 1) and those of the proposed allocation (Phase 2) and allow them to cross Winchester Road towards Halterworth in a safe manner, encouraging more sustainable access to the schools at Halterworth and Mountbatten.
	10096	A current planning application for the development of the eastern part of the site allocation indicates that the existing Ganger Farm Lane access route will be retained for use by pedestrians and cyclists only, with no upgrades proposed to the route.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10738	The parcel of land to the west should be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane (not via Kings Chase North)-this connects it well with infrastructure
	10738	The proposed access will lead to traffic problems as Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way are already overloaded and used for on-road parking
	10738	The proposed access is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches-increasing the risks of road traffic accidents
	10738	The Proposed access is unsuitable for construction traffic with speed bumps and cars parked on the road at all times
	10738	The access proposed at Scoreys Crescent will route vehicles too close to residential properties causing noise and air pollution
	10738	The proposed access creates a potential shortcut for vehicles on the western side of Scoreys Crescent which is a privately maintained block paved road putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict
	10738	A total of more than 600 homes would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Ganger farm Way/Jermyn's Lane) making this a significant pinch point and potential for disruption in the event of an accident or prevent access to emergency vehicles
	10738	Scoreys Crescent is highly unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and construction traffic
	10740	The parcel of land to the west should be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane (not via Kings Chase North)-this connects it well with infrastructure
	10740	The proposed access will lead to traffic problems as Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way are already overloaded and used for on-road parking, the traffic survey submitted as part of application 23/00964/OUTS is severely flawed as it was conducted during COVID, on

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		a weekday and before the existing housing estate was completed or the sports facility opened
	10740	The proposed access is directly adjacent to a childrens play area and sports pitches-increasing the risks of road traffic accidents
	10740	The Proposed access is unsuitable for construction traffic with speed bumps and cars parked on the road at all times
	10740	The access proposed at Scoreys Crescent will route vehicles too close to residential properties causing noise and air pollution
	10740	The proposed access creates a potential shortcut for vehicles on the western side of Scoreys Crescent which is a privately maintained block paved road putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict
	10740	A total of more than 600 homes would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Ganger farm Way/Jermyns Lane) making this a significant pinch point and potential for disruption in the event of an accident or prevent access to emergency vehicles
	10740	Scoreys Crescent is highly unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and construction traffic
	10740	The proposed development when combined with the Kings Chase development will lead to an increase in vehicle movements on Jermyns Lane and surrounding rural roads
	10781	The parcel of land to the west should be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane (not via Kings Chase North)-this connects it well with infrastructure
	10781	The proposed access is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches-increasing the risks of road traffic accidents

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10781	The Proposed access is unsuitable for construction traffic with speed bumps and cars parked on the road at all times
	10781	The access proposed at Scoreys Crescent will route vehicles too close to residential properties causing noise and air pollution
	10781	The proposed access creates a potential shortcut for vehicles on the western side of Scoreys Crescent which is a privately maintained block paved road putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict
	10781	A total of more than 600 homes would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Ganger farm Way/Jermyn's Lane) making this a significant pinch point and potential for disruption in the event of an accident or prevent access to emergency vehicles
	10781	Scoreys Crescent is highly unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and construction traffic
	10782	The parcel of land to the west should be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane (not via Kings Chase North)-this connects it well with infrastructure
	10782	The proposed access is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches-increasing the risks of road traffic accidents
	10782	The Proposed access is unsuitable for construction traffic with speed bumps and cars parked on the road at all times
	10782	The access proposed at Scoreys Crescent will route vehicles too close to residential properties causing noise and air pollution
	10782	The proposed access creates a potential shortcut for vehicles on the western side of Scoreys Crescent which is a privately maintained block paved road putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10782	A total of more than 600 homes would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Ganger farm Way/Jermyn's Lane) making this a significant pinch point and potential for disruption in the event of an accident or prevent access to emergency vehicles
	10782	Scoreys Crescent is highly unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and construction traffic
	10787	Object to the proposed access on the Ganger Farm proposal through Scorey's Crescent and Ganger Farm Way due to being unsuitable such as traffic associated with the Sports Park
	10793	The proposed access on the Ganger Farm proposal via Scorey's Crescent is unfeasible due to current congestion along Ganger Farm Way from Jermyn's Lane and cars regularly parked along the roadside
	10819	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	10819	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	10819	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	10819	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	10819	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10819	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard sand without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.
	10819	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	10870	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	10870	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	10870	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	10870	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	10870	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.
	10870	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard sand without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.
	10870	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10880	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	10880	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	10880	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	10880	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	10880	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.
	10880	Access situated at the North side of Romsey creates an increased volume of traffic needing to double back to access Romsey, North Baddesley, Southampton and links to the M27/M3.
	10880	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard and without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.
	10880	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	10881	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10881	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	10881	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.
	10881	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	10881	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	10881	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.
	10881	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard and without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.
	10881	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	10883	Another road for access is required as Ganger Farm Way is already becoming a busy road.
	10883	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	10883	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10883	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.
	10883	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	10883	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	10883	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.
	10883	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard sand without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.
	10883	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	10886	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	10886	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	10886	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10886	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	10886	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.
	10886	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard and without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict. It is a single track road, which means industrial traffic has to mount verges to pass through.
	10886	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	10889	The road infrastructure could not sustain the proposed development, as the splay of the junction is already narrow with vehicles joining Ganger Farm Way partly on the wrong side of the road.
	10889	The sports facilities cause the road to be a single lane road, creating access issues for vehicles and potentially emergency vehicles.
	10889	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, making residents vulnerable to increase problems.
	10892	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	10892	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10892	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.
	10892	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	10892	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	10892	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.
	10892	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard sand without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.
	10892	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	10894	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	10894	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.
	10895	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10895	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	10900	The parcel of land to the west should be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane (not via Kings Chase North)-this connects it well with infrastructure
	10900	The proposed access will lead to traffic problems as Scoreys Crescent and Gnager Farm Way are already overloaded and used for on-road parking
	10900	The proposed access is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches-increasing the risks of road traffic accidents
	10900	The Proposed access is unsuitable for construction traffic with speed bumps and cars parked on the road at all times
	10900	The access proposed at Scoreys Crescent will route vehicles too close to residential properties causing noise and air pollution
	10900	The proposed access creates a potential shortcut for vehicles on the western side of Scoreys Crescent which is a privately maintained block paved road putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict
	10900	A total of more than 600 homes would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Ganger farm Way/Jermyn's Lane) making this a significant pinch point and potential for disruption in the event of an accident or prevent access to emergency vehicles
	10900	Scoreys Crescent is highly unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and construction traffic
	10902	The parcel of land to the west should be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane (not via Kings Chase North)-this connects it well with infrastructure

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10902	The proposed access will lead to traffic problems as Scoreys Crescent and Gnager Farm Way are already overloaded and used for on-road parking
	10902	The proposed access is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches-increasing the risks of road traffic accidents
	10902	The Proposed access is unsuitable for construction traffic with speed bumps and cars parked on the road at all times
	10902	The access proposed at Scoreys Crescent will route vehicles too close to residential properties causing noise and air pollution
	10902	The proposed access creates a potential shortcut for vehicles on the western side of Scoreys Crescent which is a privately maintained block paved road putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict
	10902	A total of more than 600 homes would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Ganger farm Way/Jermyn's Lane) making this a significant pinch point and potential for disruption in the event of an accident or prevent access to emergency vehicles
	10902	Scoreys Crescent is highly unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and construction traffic
	10903	The parcel of land to the west should be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane (not via Kings Chase North)-this connects it well with infrastructure
	10903	The proposed access will lead to traffic problems as Scoreys Crescent and Gnager Farm Way are already overloaded and used for on-road parking
	10903	The proposed access is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches-increasing the risks of road traffic accidents

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10903	The Proposed access is unsuitable for construction traffic with speed bumps and cars parked on the road at all times
	10903	The access proposed at Scoreys Crescent will route vehicles too close to residential properties causing noise and air pollution
	10903	The proposed access creates a potential shortcut for vehicles on the western side of Scoreys Crescent which is a privately maintained block paved road putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict
	10903	A total of more than 600 homes would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Ganger farm Way/Jermyn's Lane) making this a significant pinch point and potential for disruption in the event of an accident or prevent access to emergency vehicles
	10903	Scoreys Crescent is highly unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and construction traffic
	10909	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	10909	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	10909	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	10909	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	10909	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10909	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard sand without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.
	10909	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	10909	Assessment under Objective 3, Criteria I: this assessment appears to not reflect the significant concerns already raised and does not address that the site is two parcels of land with separate accesses. Refers to Ganger Lane which does not exist.
	10909	Assessment under Objective 3, Criteria I: Western field has single access from Ganger Lane, Eastern field single access from Scoreys Crescent on new development to North - but the size and nature of this access is unsuitable to support a development of this size.
	11039	The use of land south of Scoreys Crescent on Ganger Farm is not a brownfield site and therefore access for vehicles in unsuitable.
	11039	The proposed use of access via Scoreys Crescent is unsuitable as it is a private road and residents would likely be liable for the maintenance of the road.
	11049	There should be no development on the fields of Ganger Farm, south of Kings chase as there is no point of access and the construction traffic would have to travel through a busy domestic area.
	11080	The parcel of land to the west should be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane (not via Kings Chase North)-this connects it well with infrastructure
	11080	The proposed access is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches-increasing the risks of roa traffic accidents

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11080	The Proposed access is unsuitable for construction traffic with speed bumps and cars parked on the road at all times
	11080	The access proposed at Scoreys Crescent will route vehicles too close to residential properties causing noise and air pollution
	11080	The proposed access creates a potential shortcut for vehicles on the western side of Scoreys Crescent which is a privately maintained block paved road putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict
	11080	A total of more than 600 homes would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Ganger farm Way/Jermyn's Lane) making this a significant pinch point and potential for disruption in the event of an accident or prevent access to emergency vehicles
	11080	Scoreys Crescent is highly unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and construction traffic
	11090	The access point from Jermyn's Lane to Braishfield Road is already a problem and more houses would exacerbate this issue.
	11090	The exits from Kings Chase to the bus stops in Abbotswood and Hillier Gardens are unsafe and inaccessible to the disabled.
	11090	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	11090	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	11090	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11090	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	11090	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	11090	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.
	11090	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard sand without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.
	11090	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	11099	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	11099	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	11099	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.
	11099	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11099	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	11099	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.
	11099	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard and without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.
	11099	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	11101	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	11101	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	11101	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.
	11101	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	11101	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11101	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.
	11101	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard sand without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.
	11101	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	11104	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	11104	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	11104	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.
	11104	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	11104	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	11104	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11104	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard sand without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.
	11104	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	11106	The field to the West might be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane and would connect well with wider infrastructure.
	11106	The field to the East has only a single vehicle access, a road installed from the adjacent King Chase estate to facilitate agricultural access.
	11106	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.
	11106	Parking provisions are insufficient at the sports facilities at Ganger Farm, turning Ganger Farm Way into a single track road which makes it inappropriate as the sole access to a development of the proposed size.
	11106	Access to the proposed development is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches, and incremental vehicle movements could increase the risk of road traffic accidents.
	11106	The Scoreys Crescent access routes turns an access point only for residential vehicle access into a main access for an estate.
	11106	Proposed access creates a shortcut for vehicles on Scoreys Crescent, a privately maintained road not built to adoptable standard sand without a pavement, putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11106	All development would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Jermyn's Lane/Ganger Farm Way) and through one vehicle access (Scoreys Crescent), creating a single pinch point and potentially block access for Emergency Services.
	11112	The parcel of land to the west should be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane (not via Kings Chase North)-this connects it well with infrastructure
	11112	The proposed access will lead to traffic problems as Scoreys Crescent and Gnager Farm Way are already overloaded and used for on-road parking
	11112	The proposed access is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches-increasing the risks of road traffic accidents
	11112	The Proposed access is unsuitable for construction traffic with speed bumps and cars parked on the road at all times
	11112	The access proposed at Scoreys Crescent will route vehicles too close to residential properties causing noise and air pollution
	11112	The proposed access creates a potential shortcut for vehicles on the western side of Scoreys Crescent which is a privately maintained block paved road putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict
	11112	A total of more than 600 homes would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Ganger farm Way/Jermyn's Lane) making this a significant pinch point and potential for disruption in the event of an accident or prevent access to emergency vehicles
	11112	Scoreys Crescent is highly unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and construction traffic
	11128	The parcel of land to the west should be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane (not via Kings Chase North)-this connects it well with infrastructure

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11128	The proposed access will lead to traffic problems as Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way are already overloaded and used for on-road parking
	11128	The proposed access is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches-increasing the risks of road traffic accidents
	11128	The Proposed access is unsuitable for construction traffic with speed bumps and cars parked on the road at all times
	11128	The access proposed at Scoreys Crescent will route vehicles too close to residential properties causing noise and air pollution
	11128	The proposed access creates a potential shortcut for vehicles on the western side of Scoreys Crescent which is a privately maintained block paved road putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict
	11128	A total of more than 600 homes would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Ganger farm Way/Jermyn's Lane) making this a significant pinch point and potential for disruption in the event of an accident or prevent access to emergency vehicles
	11128	Scoreys Crescent is highly unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and construction traffic
	11137	The parcel of land to the west should be accessed from Braishfield Road/Ganger Farm Lane (not via Kings Chase North)-this connects it well with infrastructure
	11137	The proposed access will lead to traffic problems as Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way are already overloaded and used for on-road parking
	11137	The proposed access is directly adjacent to a children's play area and sports pitches-increasing the risks of road traffic accidents

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11137	The Proposed access is unsuitable for construction traffic with speed bumps and cars parked on the road at all times
	11137	The access proposed at Scoreys Crescent will route vehicles too close to residential properties causing noise and air pollution
	11137	The proposed access creates a potential shortcut for vehicles on the western side of Scoreys Crescent which is a privately maintained block paved road putting vehicles and pedestrians into direct conflict
	11137	A total of more than 600 homes would be connected to the road network through a single junction (Ganger farm Way/Jermyn's Lane) making this a significant pinch point and potential for disruption in the event of an accident or prevent access to emergency vehicles
	Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	Sole access is on to Jermyn's Lane and currently caters for all the new housing and sports field activity in the area. The addition of a further 300 plus dwellings will overload the existing road infrastructure.
	Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	A workable alternative would be to provide road access from Winchester Road which would also contribute to the site sustainability.
	Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	Somewhat prejudiced as an allocation by the current planning application.
	Romsey Town Council	RTC strongly opposed to the current undetermined application at land south of Ganger Farm and its allocation in the draft Plan. Object to the only access being down through the existing estate, consideration must be given to another access point

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Romsey Town Council	Channelling all traffic through the existing entrance at Jermyn's Lane, through the existing estate and Scoreys Crescent is unacceptable. There must be at least a second vehicular access for emergencies and preserve amenity. An access along Ganger Farm Lane would help
Accessibility	Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	The location is a 45-minute walk to the town centre and 37 minutes to the railway station. The bus service is once an hour at most times, with an alternative route running 3 times a day from different stops. This does not fall within the definition of frequent by definition (using Government Statutory Document 14: Local Bus Services in England (outside London)).
	Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	Buses sometimes do not run, and people are not prepared to use an unreliable service. Bus tracking apps do not always have the information on a particular service, leaving doubt on whether or when it will run. Local shops do not have a wide enough range of items for weekly needs.
	10816	The accessibility of the whole allocation should be assessed and not the distance to services and facilities from the closest edge of the site. This has resulted in unequally scoring this site within the Sustainability Appraisal.
Alternative Sites	10819	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	10870	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	10880	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10881	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	10883	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	10886	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	10892	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	10895	The Land South of Highwood Lane (SHELAA references 139, 182, 356 & 370) is a much more suitable site for development. It is rejected as a site as it is stated it is located in a Local Gap, which is invalid as it is stated in the Stephenson Halliday final report that "Consideration could be given to amending the Local Gap boundary in the west of this gap, where the existing settlement edge has eroded the rural character. Highwood Lane creates a natural gap... Amending this part of the Local Gap would not undermine the strategic intent or purpose underpinning it."
	10895	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	10909	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	11051	There are other non-green belt areas nearby such as Hilliers to utilise and reach the TV building goals without the need to build on the proposed site.
	11090	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11099	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	11101	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	11104	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	11106	Development of brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites, as the proposed housing development at Hillier Brentry Nursery would meet the same housing need.
	10661	The proposed allocation is in a less sustainable location than land south of Highwood Lane.
	Romsey Town Council	RTC object to the Ganger Frm phase 2 allocation, would Hilliers Brentry Nursery be preferable? We accept that if we object to the development of a site, then another will have to be found in Romsey
	11096	SA concludes by outlining that there are less constrained sites available with better potential for residential development. Consider the SA misrepresents the Fields Farm site given the number of similar characteristics that is shares with Ganger Farm, yet these features and buffers have been scored higher and these are not perceived to constrain the development potential of the site
	11096	Urge the Council to assess the Fields Farm sustainability appraisal more accurately to ensure that it is correctly assessed, when compared to other site allocations. Consider Fields Farm to be more sustainable than the Land South of Ganger Farm site. As a result, the evidence base to support the site allocations should be reviewed and the Fields Farm site should be identified for residential development within the Local Plan.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Assessment of distances to services/facilities should be reassessed and capacity reduced.	10343	Accessibility of the whole allocation should be assessed and should not be based on the distance to services and facilities from the closest edge of the site through the SA. The quantum of development should be reduced to recognise that the further locations of development within site, would be outside a comfortable walking distance to a range of facilities, services and bus stops. This would lead to higher levels of traffic during peak periods
Ancient Woodland	The Woodland Trust	support the requirement for an appropriate buffer to the ancient woodland located on the south and south eastern boundary.
Site selection - Ancient woodland	10454	The inclusion of land south of Ganger Farm has not taken full account of the deterioration that will happen to the ancient woodland
Biodiversity/Ecology	10343	Objection to allocation due to its relationship to ancient woodland, SINC and Mottisfont SAC/sensitive ecology.
	10454	The ecological surveys conducted do not reflect adequately the range of animals that use the site and as Romsey is becoming more developed, sites like this become more important for the wildlife. The site should be rehabilitated not turned into a housing estate.
	10640	The development is likely to have a huge impact on the wildlife such as the deer, bats and birds, etc
	10756	The proposed development is an important wildlife area.
	10756	The proposed development does not comply with TVBC's pledge to preserve the natural environment.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10870	The site is one of important biodiversity and nature recovery network value as it is located between ancient woodland, SINC's and has mature oak linear features and therefore is not suitable for development.
	10889	The site is a greenfield site which supports local agricultural production and surrounding ancient woodland and should not be developed upon.
	10915	Local wildlife has suffered from recent development and will suffer further from the additional developments.
	11039	The field needs to be maintained as a greenfield site and place for wildlife.
	10052	Concerned that policy BIO1 is not being applied in the allocation of Ganger Farm South. Parts of the site include 5 SINC's and an area of ancient woodland (also designated as a SINC) plus veteran trees. These are under risk of severance, increased recreational pressure, root disturbance, as well as hydrological affects on the wet woodland.
	10096	Following consultation on a current planning application for residential development on the eastern part of the site, there is not a requirement to provide SANG. On site mitigation would take the form of enhanced woodland management, provision of formal and informal public open space and contributions towards SPA mitigation to avoid any likely significant effect on the SACs and SPA. Suggest amending the policy wording to criterion e).
	Natural England	Falls within 13.8km of New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar, or within the wider 15km catchment, therefore necessary to address impacts of increased recreational pressure in accordance with policy BIO2. Mitigation will be expected to satisfy interim mitigation strategy, or the joint strategic solution.
	Natural England	Site falls within 7.5km of Mottisfont Bats SAC and should address potential impacts to habitats that could be functionally linked to this designation and which are in use by the designated

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Barbastelle bats species for foraging. Allocation would need to be in compliance with policy BIO2 and would expect necessary mitigation measures be secured
	Natural England	Proposed allocation proposed directly adjacent to areas classified as ancient, replaced woodland and / or ancient & semi natural woodland. Impacts should be considered in line with the NPPF paragraph 186 and standing advice.
	Romsey Town Council	Development would cause damage to important ecology of the area, in particular the footpath/cycleway
Brownfield	10738	The plan should prioritise development of brownfield land as opposed to developing greenfield land-propose that Land South of Ganger farm is replaced with the Hillier Bentry Nursery site as it would meet the same housing need
	10781	The plan should prioritise development of brownfield land as opposed to developing greenfield land-propose that Land South of Ganger farm is replaced with the Hillier Bentry Nursery site as it would meet the same housing need
	10782	The plan should prioritise development of brownfield land as opposed to developing greenfield land-propose that Land South of Ganger farm is replaced with the Hillier Bentry Nursery site as it would meet the same housing need
	10787	Object to the Ganger Farm proposal as existing brownfield sites should be developed instead
	10900	The plan should prioritise development of brownfield land as opposed to developing greenfield land-propose that Land South of Ganger farm is replaced with the Hillier Bentry Nursery site as it would meet the same housing need

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10902	The plan should prioritise development of brownfield land as opposed to developing greenfield land-propose that Land South of Ganger farm is replaced with the Hillier Brentry Nursery site as it would meet the same housing need
	10903	The plan should prioritise development of brownfield land as opposed to developing greenfield land-propose that Land South of Ganger farm is replaced with the Hillier Brentry Nursery site as it would meet the same housing need
	11080	The plan should prioritise development of brownfield land as opposed to developing greenfield land-propose that Land South of Ganger farm is replaced with the Hillier Brentry Nursery site as it would meet the same housing need
	11112	The plan should prioritise development of brownfield land as opposed to developing greenfield land-propose that Land South of Ganger farm is replaced with the Hillier Brentry Nursery site as it would meet the same housing need
	11128	The plan should prioritise development of brownfield land as opposed to developing greenfield land-propose that Land South of Ganger farm is replaced with the Hillier Brentry Nursery site as it would meet the same housing need
	11137	The plan should prioritise development of brownfield land as opposed to developing greenfield land-propose that Land South of Ganger farm is replaced with the Hillier Brentry Nursery site as it would meet the same housing need
	10740	The plan should prioritise development of brownfield land as opposed to developing greenfield land-propose that Land South of Ganger farm is replaced with the Hillier Brentry Nursery site as it would meet the same housing need
Bus facilities, services, frequency	Stagecoach South and Go	The nearest bus stops at the western end of Ganger Farm Lane offers an off carriageway walking and potential cycling route directly to the proposed main access at a distance of just over 600m. The Woodley Close stops are served by all service 66

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	South Coast Limited	journneys offering up to 2 buses per hour however, it is a concern there are no proposals to upgrade this link which is not lit or paved. Stops on Jermyn's Lane are about 600m from the northern access and served by service 66 at a lesser frequency, broadly every hour. These stops were upgraded in connection with Ganger Farm phase 1 but would benefit from lighting as they are unsurveilled on an unlit road.
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The proposal is broadly supportable in principle subject to significant augmentation of bus services and facilities.
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Discussion is needed with operators as extension or diversion of bus services into the site would not be appropriate due to there being only one vehicular access. Funding is likely to be necessary to ensure at least a half-hourly service is available consistently at Woodley Close and Jermyn's Lane to reflect the fact that most residents would be over 800m from these stops which is more than desirable.
Capacity / site capacity	10343	Objection to allocation SA4 which is unlikely to deliver its stated capacity of 340 dwellings, due to significant ecological and other constraints, therefore alternative sites should be considered.
	10343	Policy states there is a need for SANG in addition to a 50m buffer to ancient woodland and a sequential approach is indicated in the SA to direct development away from areas of surface water flooding. This brings into question the suitability of the site for 340 dwellings and the developable area.
	10816	If maintained as an allocation, the quantum of development should be reduced in recognition the furthest locations of development would be outside a comfortable

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		walking distance to services and facilities, in particular bus stops and destinations that generate higher levels of traffic during peak periods, such as local schools.
	11146	Support proposed allocation at Ganger Farm, but suggest that the site has greater capacity, for up to 420 homes, and therefore request an increased number of dwellings in the policy wording, across both parts of site.
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We note an application is lodged with the Council for 309 dwellings (23/00964/OUTS) being a lesser quantum than the draft allocation, it is not clear the basis for the Council's capacity assessment.
Constraints / site constraints	10816	The site is immediately adjacent Ganger Wood, a designated ancient woodland and SINC functionally linked with the Mottisfont SAC. Any reliance on a pedestrian link with Winchester Road would require access through the woodland.
	10816	There are significant constraints which reduce the developable area and question the suitability for the delivery of 340 dwellings, these constraints include SANG, a buffer to the ancient woodland and a sequential approach for surface water flooding.
	Environment Agency	No environmental constraints identified.
	10096	Site is largely agricultural/horticultural and contains hedgerows, trees and semi natural broadleaved woodland, adjoining existing residential development at Kings Chase, and bound by Hilliers Nurseries and Ganger Wood (Ancient and Semi Natural woodland), the A3090, and lying west of residential development at Hunters Close, Peel Close and Silverwood Rise. There is a level change across the site, and it slopes down to the eastern and western sides. There are some mature trees and oaks on site. For a scheme of this size, it will have few direct impacts on neighbours.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10096	Site constraints include four Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) on and adjacent to the site. There is one veteran tree on site and a more prominent TPO tree exists to south of Storeys Crescent. There is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) to the west, south and east boundaries (Ganger Farm Meadow, Ganger Farm Marsh and Woodland and Ganger Wood
	10738	The parcel of land to the East has constraints that make it unsuitable for housing development; it is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland & only a single potential vehicle access
	10781	The parcel of land to the East has constraints that make it unsuitable for housing development; it is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland & only a single potential vehicle access
	10782	The parcel of land to the East has constraints that make it unsuitable for housing development; it is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland & only a single potential vehicle access
	10900	The parcel of land to the East has constraints that make it unsuitable for housing development; it is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland & only a single potential vehicle access
	10902	The parcel of land to the East has constraints that make it unsuitable for housing development; it is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland & only a single potential vehicle access
	10903	The parcel of land to the East has constraints that make it unsuitable for housing development; it is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland & only a single potential vehicle access

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11080	The parcel of land to the East has constraints that make it unsuitable for housing development; it is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland & only a single potential vehicle access
	11112	The parcel of land to the East has constraints that make it unsuitable for housing development; it is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland & only a single potential vehicle access
	11128	The parcel of land to the East has constraints that make it unsuitable for housing development; it is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland & only a single potential vehicle access
	11137	The parcel of land to the East has constraints that make it unsuitable for housing development; it is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland & only a single potential vehicle access
Consultation / public engagement	10640	David Wilson Homes has not engaged with local residents at any stage of this proposal, for example the residents right next to Parcel D have not been consulted despite the impact the development will have on them
Countryside	10787	Object to the Ganger Farm proposal due to the land being countryside
	10819	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	10870	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10880	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	10881	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	10883	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	10886	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	10892	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	10895	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	10909	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	11090	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	11099	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	11101	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	11104	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11106	The land South of Ganger Farm is currently classified as countryside, and has been farmed to meet local agriculture needs for many years.
	10900	Land South of Ganger farm is currently classed as countryside in the adopted plan and it should remain so
criterion b) (SANG provision)	11146	Criterion b) in policy relates to SANG provision to provide ecological mitigation (recreational impacts on NFSPA) - but SANG is no longer required for this site and the criterion can be deleted, following consultation.
Delivery	11146	There are no legal, ownership or other constraints to prevent the site from coming forward in a timely manner. The site is currently open land in agricultural use.
	11146	Site thoroughly investigated and is unconstrained. A design has been advanced that provides appropriate mitigation and the owners are willing to develop it. It is deliverable in line with para 69 of the NPPF.
Evidence and technical work	11146	Application 23/00964/OUTN provides a wealth of evidence and technical work to inform the propose allocation and capacity, including transport, landscape, drainage, ecology, air quality, noise, archaeology and heritage evidence, which can also demonstrate its deliverability. The further 4 ha west of the application site, and within the allocation, is reasonably free of constraints and has the ability to accommodate a further 100-111 dwellings. Overall, the allocation makes a logical extension to the new housing and sports provisions already completed to the north.
Flooding	10785	An objection to application 23/00964/OUTS includes comments from Southern Water that the development would pose a risk of flooding and the sewage system in place could not handle the flows

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10880	The access to Ganger Farm Way/Jermyn's Land has insufficient flooding control and increasing water levels often flood the junction on Jermyn's Lane.
	10889	The junction from Ganger Farm Way to Jermyn's Lane is subject to flooding, a problem which would be exacerbated by increased traffic from the proposed development.
	10915	Development around Romsey has led to an increase in surface water flooding and this issue would be exacerbated by large scale development.
General comments	11157	The draft local plan is not good but its doable based on the need
	11157	Mainly concerned about the amendments to the proposal
	Romsey Town Council	There is a current undetermined planning application for this land to which RTC has objected
Green space	10756	The area which has been proposed for development is a SINC and there are several tree protection orders.
	10819	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	10870	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	10880	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	10881	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10883	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	10886	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	10892	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	10895	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	10909	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	10915	The developments planned in the Braishfield and Castle Rd area would lead to the loss of old woodland and countryside that should be protected.
	11090	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	11099	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	11101	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	11104	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.
	11106	The field to the East is unsuitable for housing development as the field is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Health and health infrastructure	10640	If the development goes ahead there would need to be more money spent on health care as its currently difficult to get an appointment at the GP surgeries
	10785	An objection to application 23/00964/OUTS includes the 3 GP practices would not be able to support the additional patient load without additional investments of over £240K
	10880	The proposed development will contribute to the pressure on doctor's surgeries, as it is currently difficult to get appointments with GPs.
	10894	There is a lack of healthcare infrastructure, such as doctor surgeries and pharmacies, to support the proposed development.
	10915	The local GP surgeries are already oversubscribed and would not be able to cope with the pressure of an increased population due to the new developments.
	11049	The risk to the health of the residents caused by the proposed developments is completely unacceptable.
	11067	There is already a growing demand for GPs that is not currently being met
	11067	There is already a growing demand for dentists that is not currently being met
	11090	The current infrastructure in Romsey cannot cope with the proposed development as there are no doctors.
	11090	The current infrastructure in Romsey cannot cope with the proposed development as there are no infrastructure.
	11067	TVBC should provide a space which can bring all local NHS & Private GP surgeries/dentists/pharmacies together as a one stop to meet people healthcare needs more efficiently

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure	Hampshire County Council	The site is over 3ha in area and lies almost wholly within the Minerals Safeguarding Area. Suggested additional supporting text wording: Applicants should aim to maximise the prior extraction of mineral resources on this site, in line with the policies of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. A Mineral Resource Assessment is required to be submitted to the Minerals Planning Authority as part of any application to develop this site.
	Hampshire County Council	Access to the site via sustainable and active modes should be considered within the policy to ensure safe and attractive connections to existing residential areas and facilities. Suggest adding the following criterion: "f. The provision of high quality active travel infrastructure to provide links through the site and safe walking, wheeling and cycling connections to existing facilities and services".
	Hampshire County Council	request for shared cycleway between site and A3090 to the south as would provide a largely off-road link to town centre
	Hampshire County Council	Ampfield Wood (Forestry Commission) is a large area of open access (including FP and BW) within 500m of the development site and is very popular. Use has increased since Abbotswood and Ganger Farm were built; this development will increase demand again.
	Hampshire County Council	Ampfield Wood - There is a need for parking (no formal car park at present), for surfacing many of the paths, for dog bins and for information boards with maps and guidance; suggest early discussion with Forestry Commission.
	Hampshire County Council	Ampfield Wood - The road is relatively narrow, busy (including a bus route) and has no footway on the approach to the woods; there will be a need to provide an off-road path for non-motorised users and possibly a formal crossing; this was recorded in the Countryside Access Plan research: "Provide pavement along length of lane - dangerous

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		rat run". The County Council own land next to the highway (Jermyn's Lane) which could assist.
	Hampshire County Council	Ampfield wood - Should Forestry Commission be willing, there is an excellent opportunity to create cycle routes through to Ampfield and via existing bridleway to the lanes to the north. Countryside Access Plan research gives request for this as "Link avoiding A3090 from N Romsey to the bridle path in Ampfield Wood and on to the quiet roads around Upper Slackstead".
	Hampshire County Council	Also demand for non-motorised user path to link through south part of the site to the service roads which parallel the straight mile
	Hampshire County Council	Other well-used paths nearby are the canal, Tadburn meadows and the ford near the railway line.
	Hampshire County Council	request addition - Provision of a new Bridleway or Public share active travel route across the site north-south linking Jermyn's Lane with the A3090 (including road crossing)."
	Hampshire County Council	request addition - "Contributions towards access to and enhancement of Ampfield Wood".
	Hampshire County Council	The catchment secondary school is the Romsey Academy. To mitigate the planned growth, applicants will be expected to contribute towards enhancing education capacity in accordance with Policy COM1- contributions towards Romsey Primary School & The Romsey Academy, recognising that significant secondary education needs are met for pupils outside the Local Education Authority's boundary currently.
	Hampshire County Council	Potential requirement to expand in the existing maintained nursery unit to meet the early years needs from the site.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Hampshire County Council	Shared cycle footway links would need to be provided linking to the Cupernham Schools, as they are located within an estate with limited areas for parking of those parents that need to drive to school.
	Hampshire County Council	Consideration should be given to funding measures for a school street on Bransley Close.
	10619	It is unsatisfactory that planning authorities are not obligated to listen to water boards' problems. TVBC should all developments in Romsey until Southern Water can provide adequate supplies.
	10640	The road infrastructure will not be able to cope with additional traffic
	10785	An objection to application 23/00964/OUTS includes the inability for Southern Water to supply Abbottswood consistently which has resulted in reduced water pressure in the area
	10785	Objections to application 23/00964/OUTS include additional car journeys would put a further strain on the already crumbling local road network bringing additional safety risks to pedestrians
	10785	Objections to application 23/00964/OUTS includes inadequate parking at local shopping facilities
	10785	The valid infrastructure concerns are expected to be addressed in the next version of the plan
	10880	An increase in housing without additional support to create smaller schools will increase pressures on parents, schools and students.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10880	The proposed development will have two secondary schools in catchment with many students not having the choice of what school would be best for them.
	10883	Romsey is overpopulated and the local infrastructure cannot deal with the current demand, and the proposed development would exacerbate this issue.
	10886	The road network is already overburdened and the increased amount of traffic has led to poorer road surfaces.
	10889	The junction and road are both unsuitable for a higher volume of traffic.
	10894	Concern that the necessary infrastructure will not be put in place to support the proposed development.
	10894	There is a lack of education infrastructure and schools to support the proposed development.
	10894	Romsey has insufficient road infrastructure to cope with the added volume of traffic and congestion caused by the proposed development.
	11067	There is already a water supply issue in Romsey-how will the current infrastructure cope with additional demand
	11090	The infrastructure has not been considered when planning the allocation of houses.
	11090	The road infrastructure in Romsey can not already cope with the traffic and this will become worse with the proposed development.
	11102	More housing development north of Romsey will cause problems to Jermyn's Lane and make it impossible for walkers and existing residents to use.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Allocation	10627	Fully supportive of new housing developments as the area desperately needs housing.
	10738	Land South of Ganger farm is currently classed as countryside in the adopted plan and it should remain so
	10781	Land South of Ganger farm is currently classed as countryside in the adopted plan and it should remain so
	10782	Land South of Ganger farm is currently classed as countryside in the adopted plan and it should remain so
	10902	Land South of Ganger farm is currently classed as countryside in the adopted plan and it should remain so
	10903	Land South of Ganger farm is currently classed as countryside in the adopted plan and it should remain so
	11080	Land South of Ganger farm is currently classed as countryside in the adopted plan and it should remain so
	11112	Land South of Ganger farm is currently classed as countryside in the adopted plan and it should remain so
	11128	Land South of Ganger farm is currently classed as countryside in the adopted plan and it should remain so
	11137	Land South of Ganger farm is currently classed as countryside in the adopted plan and it should remain so
	10740	Land South of Ganger farm is currently classed as countryside in the adopted plan and it should remain so

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10814	Is considered that this large strategic allocation is a less sustainable option for meeting the housing requirement in Southern Test Valley when compared with the Land at Corner of Highwood Lane and Botley Road
	10814	Land South of Ganger Farm is immediately adjacent Ganger Wood, a designated ancient woodland and SINC which is functionally linked with the Mottisfont SAC, as recognised in the draft policy text. Any reliance on a new pedestrian link with Winchester Road to access bus services would require a new pedestrian access through the woodland
	10814	There is the need for a SANG in addition to a 50m buffer to the ancient woodland and a sequential approach to direct development away from areas at high risk of surface water flooding. It is clear therefore that there are significant constraints on this site which reduces the extent of the developable area and questions the suitability of the site for the delivery of 340 dwellings
	10814	The site is considerably less accessible to key services and facilities than the Land at Corner of Highwood Lane and Botley Road. This is particularly with regard to pedestrian access to the nearest primary school, secondary school, employment opportunities and bus stops
	10814	Sustainability Appraisal has failed to equitably assess the site (Objectives 2 and 10). The accessibility of the whole draft allocation should be assessed and not the distance to services and facilities from the closest edge of the site. This has resulted in the Council unequally scoring this site within the Sustainability Appraisal
	10814	In the event that this site is maintained as an allocation, it is considered that the quantum of any development should be reduced in recognition of the furthest locations of development would be outside of a comfortable walking distance to a range of

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		services and facilities, in particular bus stops and destinations that generate higher levels of traffic during peak periods, such as local schools
Landowner support for proposed allocation	11146	Landowner support for proposed Ganger Farm allocation, to deliver around 340 homes over plan period, which is deliverable, suitable and available.
Local Gap	10915	Development around Romsey has meant there is now no buffer between villages, and further large scale development means these gaps would decrease further.
	11157	The local gaps are very important to Southern Test Valley and disagree with the Stephenson & Halliday Report for example the claim that Halterworth Gap is not a clear boundary when it has been in place for over 90 years- plus and incorporates Halterworth school boundary
	11157	The Halterworth Gap is priceless to school children as they see wildlife and have access to the countryside and provides a gap from Romsey
Overdevelopment	10915	There has already been significant development around Romsey in recent years, altering the nature of the town from small town to a large town.
Parking	10738	The parking provisions for the sports facilities at Ganger farm Sports Pavillion are insufficient leading to on road parking thus making Ganger Farm Way inappropriate as a sole access for the proposed development
	10781	The parking provisions for the sports facilities at Ganger farm Sports Pavillion are insufficient leading to on road parking thus making Ganger Farm Way inappropriate as a sole access for the proposed development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10782	The parking provisions for the sports facilities at Ganger farm Sports Pavillion are insufficient leading to on road parking thus making Ganger Farm Way inappropriate as a sole access for the proposed development
	10900	The parking provisions for the sports facilities at Ganger farm Sports Pavillion are insufficient leading to on road parking thus making Ganger Farm Way inappropriate as a sole access for the proposed development
	10902	The parking provisions for the sports facilities at Ganger farm Sports Pavillion are insufficient leading to on road parking thus making Ganger Farm Way inappropriate as a sole access for the proposed development
	10903	The parking provisions for the sports facilities at Ganger farm Sports Pavillion are insufficient leading to on road parking thus making Ganger Farm Way inappropriate as a sole access for the proposed development
	11080	The parking provisions for the sports facilities at Ganger farm Sports Pavillion are insufficient leading to on road parking thus making Ganger Farm Way inappropriate as a sole access for the proposed development
	11112	The parking provisions for the sports facilities at Ganger farm Sports Pavillion are insufficient leading to on road parking thus making Ganger Farm Way inappropriate as a sole access for the proposed development
	11128	The parking provisions for the sports facilities at Ganger Farm Sports Pavillion are insufficient leading to on road parking thus making Ganger Farm Way inappropriate as a sole access for the proposed development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11137	The parking provisions for the sports facilities at Ganger farm Sports Pavillion are insufficient leading to on road parking thus making Ganger Farm Way inappropriate as a sole access for the proposed development
	10740	The parking provisions for the sports facilities at Ganger farm Sports Pavillion are insufficient leading to on road parking thus making Ganger Farm Way inappropriate as a sole access for the proposed development
Pedestrian and cycle connections	10243	A pedestrian and cycle facility are proposed leading on to Halterworth Lane which provides access towards Mountbatten school and Bluestar services 4 and 5 available on Botley Road however, these stops are over 2.4km from the centre of the site and involve using a narrow lane with inconsistent pedestrian facilities and a level crossing. Better off-road links exist but they are somewhat tortuous, far from legible and need intimate local knowledge, highlighting the difficulties of integrating urban extensions into the existing built fabric.
	10343	Allocation relies on a ped/cycle link to bus route to south which will cut through ancient woodland.
Pollution	10640	The 2 previous developments and adding a 3rd will further increase pollution and impact people's quality of life
	10870	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
	10880	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
	10880	A single access to Kings Chase will result in increased vehicle pollution and road noise, causing health problems for young families moving into the development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10880	Proposed plans for housing without driveways does not offer any encouragement for residents to move towards EV and will result in a higher reliance on petrol vehicles contributing to further pollution.
	10881	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
	10883	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
	10886	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
	10892	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
	10894	The noise pollution and safety risk will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
	10909	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
	11049	The pollution that the proposed development will cause is completely unacceptable.
	11090	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
	11099	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11101	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
	11104	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
	11106	The noise and air pollution will be significantly increased by the Scoreys Crescent access routes and cause disturbance to residents.
Previous Developments / scale of development	10785	Over 1,200 houses have already been added to the area which has changed from a quiet semi-rural area to bordering urban sprawl
	10785	Local residents have already endured 13 years of noise, traffic and pollution and associated degradation of quality of life from previous developments, another 340 homes seems unfair
	10640	The area has already seen significant development. David Wilson homes built the Kings Chase development with no mention of an extension
Romsey	10785	I find it bizarre that members of the Romsey Planning Committee were not party to the decision to allocate this land within the Draft Local Plan
	10785	It is impossible to glean from the document what has changed or what is likely to change in Romsey to justify more large scale housing developments
	11067	Romsey train station that is inaccessible by bus and parking is insufficient
Run off	10052	South of Ganger Farm has a stream which could adversely affect St Swithun's Church and Crampmoor if uncontrolled runoff is allowed from developed areas.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Run off / slowing run off	Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	Note that within the SFRA this location is identified as an area for 'wider catchment woodland planting'. This would help slow runoff in the Tadburn Lake catchment. Developing this area would be counterproductive to working with natural processes.
Safety	11051	The proposed developments will cause the value of property in the area to decrease and for residents to feel less safe.
Sequential approach – flood risk	Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	Welcome acknowledgement of the sequential approach for locating development to areas with the lowest flood risk from all sources.
	10096	This is an unnecessary policy requirement. The site lies entirely within Flood Zone 1 in an area of low risk of flooding. The flood risk follows the water course running through the woodland on the eastern and south western sides of the site. They are within ancient woodland and would not be subject to development, other than a potential cycling and walking route towards Winchester Road to the south.
SINCs	Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	Note comments on Ganger Wood but no mention is made of the other six SINCs that would be impacted by the site - Ganger Farm Meadow, Ganger Farm Marsh & Woodland; Ganger Swamp; Small Copse; Ganger Wood Meadow and Ganger Wood Strip.
	Romsey & District Society: Natural	The purpose of designating SINCs is to protect their ecological value - this does not appear to be considered.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Environment Committee	
	Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	A suitable buffer is needed to each of the SINCs to ensure that they are protected for the future.
Site Allocation	10640	Other areas south or east of Romsey Centre would be more suitable as this would allow traffic to get to the M27 without having to block the roads in and out of Romsey- Why do the same areas get development?
	10819	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	10870	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	10880	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	10881	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	10883	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	10886	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10892	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	10895	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	10909	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	11090	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	11099	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	11101	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	11104	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
	11106	The Land South of Ganger Farm is recognised in the draft local plan as two parcels, though it would be better assessed as two sites in the local plan.
Site assessment	10738	Land South of Ganger farm is recognised as two parcels-suggest the two are assessed as two sites
	10900	Land South of Ganger farm is recognised as two parcels-suggest the two are assessed as two sites
	10902	Land South of Ganger farm is recognised as two parcels-suggest the two are assessed as two sites

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10903	Land South of Ganger farm is recognised as two parcels-suggest the two are assessed as two sites
	11112	Land South of Ganger farm is recognised as two parcels-suggest the two are assessed as two sites
	11128	Land South of Ganger farm is recognised as two parcels-suggest the two are assessed as two sites
	11128	the land south of ganger farm has been assessed under objective 3, criteria I (is the site able to connect to a highway?) -the assessment appears to not reflect the significant concerns raised and does not address that the site is two parcels of land with two separate accesses and refers to ganger Lane-which does not exist
	11137	Land South of Ganger farm is recognised as two parcels-suggest the two are assessed as two sites
	10740	Land South of Ganger farm is recognised as two parcels-suggest the two are assessed as two sites
	10740	the land south of ganger farm has been assessed under objective 3, criteria I (is the site able to connect to a highway?) -the assesment appears to not refelect the significant concerns raised and does not address that the site is two parcels of land with two separate accesses and referes to ganger Lane-which does not exist
	10740	Propose the site is better assessed as; Performance;Negative Commentary: Western Field Has potential single access from Ganger farm Lane. The Eastern field has single access from Scoreys Crescent on the new development to the North, however the size and nature of this access mean it is unsuitable to support a development of this size

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10740	The parcel of land to the East has constraints that make it unsuitable for housing development; it is surrounded by ancient woodland, SINC's and protected woodland & only a single potential vehicle access
Site surroundings	10096	Romsey is a major centre within the settlement hierarchy with a wide range of facilities, including sports facilities, schools, post offices, village halls, shops, supermarkets, employment opportunities, pubs, restaurants GP surgeries and a hospital. There are bus stops throughout the area, with services to Romsey and Winchester, and with less frequent services to villages. Romsey station, which is accessible by public transport, also connects to South Western and Great Western services. Romsey has nature reserves and gardens that provide excellent locations for outdoor exercise and walking.
	10096	There are two major towns (Andover and Romsey) in the Borough. They are the focus for development, where future housing growth is supported in the current and emerging plan. While villages can also grow and thrive, the most sustainable locations for housing will be the focus for development and this approach supports the significance of Romsey in accommodating future housing growth.
	10096	The selection of this site would not lead to coalescence with other settlements in the Borough and this is a benefit.
	10096	Technical work, including surveys and investigations, have been undertaken on Transport and Highways; Flood Risk and Drainage; Landscape (LVA); Ecology; Heritage (including archaeology); Nitrate Neutrality; Trees and Ancient Woodland and Air Quality and these demonstrate that the site is capable of delivering a quality housing scheme during the course of the plan period.
	10096	Discussions have taken place about the site with the Town Council and engagement has taken place with the local community.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Southern Water infrastructure and service connections	Southern Water	SW have undertaken preliminary assessment of capacity of existing SW infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for proposal which indicated that existing local sewerage infrastructure to site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development
	Southern Water	Proposal for 340 dwellings on site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network to provide additional capacity to serve the development. This reinforcement would be provided through New Infrastructure charge to developers
	Southern Water	connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation
	Southern Water	SW infrastructure crosses the site which needs to be taken into account for the layout of the proposed development as an easement of 6 metres or more, depending on the pipe size and depth would be required which may affect site layout or require diversion. Easements should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting
	Southern Water	Add criteria stating 'occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of wastewater network reinforcement, in consultation with the service provider'
	Southern Water	Add criteria stating 'layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes'
Sustainability	Barratt David Wilson Homes	The site is in walking distance of a variety of local facilities, including educational facilities, shops, public transport infrastructure and leisure facilities, making the site an accessible location, adjoining the approved and completed Kings Chase Phase 1. Suggest amending the policy wording to criteria c).

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Traffic	Barratt David Wilson Homes	To ensure sustainable means of access we would suggest flexibility in criteria to allow a choice of means of access.
	Romsey Ltd	The site is located on the north east edge of Romsey which would mean traffic heading to the town centre, south or west would use Winchester Road and Southampton Road which experience congestion at peak times. The allocation of land at Ganger Farm should be deleted.
	10619	Most houses in the area do not have sufficient parking leading to congested surrounding roads, which would be exacerbated by any development.
	10640	There already has been a significant increase in the traffic and adding another 1000 homes will exacerbate the problem
	10719	The spine road in Oxlease Meadows was not designed to carry more than cul-de-sac traffic and was originally designed for a smaller number of houses than was eventually built by Bellway
	10719	The increased traffic will negatively impact local residents
	10738	The proposed development when combined with the Kings Chase development will lead to an increase in vehicle movements on Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads
	10819	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.
	10819	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10870	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.
	10870	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.
	10880	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.
	10880	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.
	10881	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.
	10883	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.
	10886	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.
	10892	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10894	There is existing road congestion from the Kings Chase development and onto Jermyn's Lane, and the development would add a further 600 cars to this route.
	10900	The proposed development when combined with the Kings Chase development will lead to an increase in vehicle movements on Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads
	10902	The proposed development when combined with the Kings Chase development will lead to an increase in vehicle movements on Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads
	10903	The proposed development when combined with the Kings Chase development will lead to an increase in vehicle movements on Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads
	10909	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.
	10909	Increased use of sports facilities and allotments due to development will lead to 5,000 additional vehicle movements a day of Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads.
	10915	The roads are already significantly congested and further development would exacerbate this issue.
	11039	The sports facilities already cause issues for traffic and pedestrians, and the roads would be unsuitable for such a significant increase in traffic.
	11049	The main road of King's Chase, Ganger Farm Way, already struggles with the current traffic especially at the sports pavilion - this problem will be exacerbated by the proposed development.
	11051	The current development was not built to be a main road leading to hundreds of homes - the width of the roads is too narrow to cope with 340 homes and 2000+ vehicles.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11052	Opposed to the development of housing in the fields south of Ganger Farm and the King Chase Estate because the traffic footfall is already high and further development will be dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists, will cause pollution and further degradation of the road surface
	11066	Opposed to the development of Velmore farm because the extra road design from School lane roundabout will cause more traffic issues
	11067	TVBC should address the traffic pinch point at Crampmoor level crossing especially with the proposed development at Ganger farm- this will provide a way for all vehicles to easily navigate south from the straight mile down to Luzborough Rounsbaout and alleviate traffic from elsewhere
	11090	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.
	11099	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.
	11101	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.
	11104	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11106	300 homes equates to approximately 2,400 additional vehicle movements a day on Scoreys Crescent and Ganger Farm Way, when the roads are overloaded and utilised for parking.
	11112	The proposed development when combined with the Kings Chase development will lead to an increase in vehicle movements on Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads
	11123	The site is located on the north east edge of Romsey which would mean traffic heading to the town centre, south or west would use Winchester Road and Southampton Road which experience congestion at peak times. The allocation of land at Ganger Farm should be deleted.
	11124	The site is located on the north east edge of Romsey which would mean traffic heading to the town centre, south or west would use Winchester Road and Southampton Road which experience congestion at peak times. The allocation of land at Ganger Farm should be deleted.
	11128	The proposed development when combined with the Kings Chase development will lead to an increase in vehicle movements on Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads
	11137	The proposed development when combined with the Kings Chase development will lead to an increase in vehicle movements on Jermyn's Lane and surrounding rural roads
Trees and woodland buffers	Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	The hazel in ancient woodland margins and understorey at the Ganger Farm South site for example have evidence of use by dormice, which should be protected.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10096	This policy criteria is agreed and supported. A buffer can be supported and still deliver the appropriate quantum of homes and ensure the protection and enhancement of the ancient woodland.
	10738	The trees bordering Scoreys Crescent are subject to TPO's and constant road disturbance poses a threat to these trees and wildlife
	10781	The trees bordering Scoreys Crescent are subject to TPO's and constant road disturbance poses a threat to these trees and wildlife
	10782	The trees bordering Scoreys Crescent are subject to TPO's and constant road disturbance poses a threat to these trees and wildlife
	10900	The trees bordering Scoreys Crescent are subject to TPO's and constant road disturbance poses a threat to these trees and wildlife
	10902	The trees bordering Scoreys Crescent are subject to TPO's and constant road disturbance poses a threat to these trees and wildlife
	10903	The trees bordering Scoreys Crescent are subject to TPO's and constant road disturbance poses a threat to these trees and wildlife
	11080	The trees bordering Scoreys Crescent are subject to TPO's and constant road disturbance poses a threat to these trees and wildlife
	11112	The trees bordering Scoreys Crescent are subject to TPO's and constant road disturbance poses a threat to these trees and wildlife
	11128	The trees bordering Scoreys Crescent are subject to TPO's and constant road disturbance poses a threat to these trees and wildlife

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10740	The proposed development when combined with the Kings Chase development will lead to an increase in vehicle movements on Jermyns Lane and surrounding rural roads
	10454	The inclusion of land south of Ganger Farm has not taken full account of the deterioration that will happen to the ancient woodland

Policy SA5 Land South of the Bypass, Romsey
Paragraphs 4.178-4.186

Key Issue	Officer Response
Vehicular access and Highways	Access to the site from the Bypass Road is considered acceptable in highway safety terms and the additional traffic generated can be acceptably accommodated on the highway network
Sustainable Transport Modes/Active Travel	Development would include provision of pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre and would include a pedestrian/cycle access to the surrounding areas including Rapids/Romsey Sports Centre, Whitenap and beyond
Biodiversity	Development would be subject to an ecological study including of habitats and protected species. Mitigation would be provided to satisfy site designated under the Habitats Regulations. The site is not itself covered by any statutory nature conservation designations
Flood Risk	Development would be subject to a FRA and require emergency access. Further evidence will be undertaken to inform the Regulation 19 stage.
Heritage	Development would be subject to a heritage study taking account of the nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets. Further evidence will be undertaken to inform the Regulation 19 stage.
Infrastructure – Education	The site would make a financial contribution towards the expansion of school places provision in local schools
Infrastructure - Health	The site would make a financial contribution towards the enhancement of local primary care provision

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	11145	The exit road from this estate would be another hazard on to an already extremely busy road for example the exit road from Broadlands gives an excellent indication of what would happen if a new roundabout is inserted to the bypass
Allocation	10115	Support for the identification of land at Bypass Road, Romsey, for the delivery of approximately 110 dwellings within walking distance of the facilities and services of Romsey Town Centre
Alternative site use	10511	The proposed site should be instead used to build the new community hall in place of the Crosfield Hall, due to its central location and access for vehicles.
Bats	10052	Area important for roosting, foraging and commuting bats.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	
Biodiversity	11140	The development poses a risk to woodland habitat
	10756	The loss of this land for the proposed development will be devastating to the local wildlife.
Bypass	11145	Crossing the bypass should only be considered as a solution of last resort
	11145	The crossing of the bypass doesn't seem to be an issue when it comes to the Crossfield Hall which could be refurbished on its current site
	11145	If the development of this area is essential, then the Bypass could be re-sited from the Palmerston roundabout to the rapids
Cycle/Footpath/Transport	11145	Suggest that no further development occurs to the east of Romsey until a dedicated safe path and cycleway to the town centre has been designated and the Sun Arch footpaths have been put right
	11140	There are no footpaths beyond Upton Lane, no cycle way along Romsey Road leading to Romsey and there's a lack of public transport along Romsey road which will be an issue with increased housing and traffic
Flood risk	10068 Environment Agency	Not demonstrated that this site provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk.
	10068 Environment Agency	A site-specific flood risk assessment should demonstrate that the site will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and where possible will reduce flood risk overall.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10068 Environment Agency	Very small area of flood risk zone 3. The access to and from the site may go through this area and this will need to be considered for any development.
	10052 Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	No mention of the flood risk assessment being considered. Along the western boundary, the site is in Flood Zone 3. Part of the site is shown to have low risk of surface water flooding but not nil. This should all be considered in a Flood Risk Assessment.
Facilities	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The allocation is supported as the land is highly sustainable being within immediate reach of the town centre, other facilities and the bus station about a 600m walk away.
Green Spaces	10756	The proposed development will take over land which has been used for agricultural purposes.
Greenfield	10052 Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	Greenfield site.
Active Travel	10099 Hampshire County Council	Safe and active travel to school will need to be facilitated by provision of a crossing point on Bypass Road.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Access to the site via sustainable and active modes should be considered within the policy to ensure safe and attractive connections to existing residential areas and facilities.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Suggest adding the following criterion: “g. The provision of high quality active travel infrastructure to provide links through the site and safe walking, wheeling and cycling connections to existing facilities and services”.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Romsey Extra Footpath 503 is an important link between the town centre and the leisure centre, and is tarmacked, with a lit pedestrian crossing of Bypass Road at its northern end. The development will increase use of this path both to the Leisure centre and the town centre. There is a strong demand for cycle use of this path; it is anticipated that Highways colleagues will seek to provide an off-road shared use pedestrian/cycle route in the verge of Bypass Road to the west of the site. FP503 would form the final section of this route.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Provision of a non-motorised path linking Bypass Road and the leisure centre, on or parallel to Romsey Extra Footpath 503, to be of sufficient width and in a green corridor, in accordance with IDP SA5. Provision of or contribution of off-site enhancements, potentially including resolving claim for modification of the Definitive Map to add north-south routes between Bypass Road and Lee Lane.
Infrastructure Schools	10099 Hampshire County Council	The catchment secondary school is the Romsey Academy.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	To mitigate the planned growth, applicants will be expected to contribute towards enhancing education capacity in accordance with Policy COM1- contributions towards Romsey Primary School & The Romsey Academy, recognising that significant secondary education needs are met for pupils outside the Local Education Authority's boundary currently.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	Potential requirement to expand in the existing maintained nursery unit to meet the early years needs from the site.
Minerals and Waste	10099 Hampshire County Council	The site is over 3ha in area and lies almost wholly within the Minerals Safeguarding Area. Suggested additional supporting text wording: Applicants should aim to maximise the prior extraction of mineral resources on this site, in line with the policies of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. A Mineral Resource Assessment is required to be submitted to the Minerals Planning Authority as part of any application to develop this site.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Public Rights of Way	10099 Hampshire County Council	Romsey Extra Footpath 503 runs the length of the eastern boundary of the site; its definitive width is 2 metres.
	10099 Hampshire County Council	The County Council is holding claim 1251 to add the old Southampton Road (which lies just west of the site) to the Definitive Map of Rights of Way; should this come under the same landownership as the development site then a discussion would be welcome at an early stage.
School Travel Plan	10099 Hampshire County Council	A new school travel plan would be required to ensure active and safe travel for new residents to both schools.
Transport Highways	10099 Hampshire County Council	Policy DM2(h) of LTP4 states that the Local Highway Authority will only support new accesses onto A roads where the strategic flow of traffic is prioritised and all other reasonable option have been considered. Suggest amending criterion b: "b. Access to the development via A27/ A3090 (Bypass Road), where it can be demonstrated the strategic flow of traffic is prioritised".
Heritage evidence base	10049 Historic England	object - we do not object to development of this site in principle, the plan's evidence base needs to ensure that potential heritage impacts have been appropriately considered.
Historic England: heritage impact assessment	10049 Historic England	We consider HIA is particularly needed for the site, informed by liaison with the Council's conservation team and its archaeological advisers
	10049 Historic England	In our exchanges in 2023, we recommended proportionate HIA to inform the allocation. We re-assert our recommendation for proportionate HIA at this stage.
House value	11140	Object to the development of housing on this site because it could affect the resale value of properties adjacent to it
Housing requirement	10115	by applying for 110 dwellings compared to 100 dwellings, Alfred Homes has to provide an extra 4 affordable housing units and 5 serviced plots for the return of a single Open Market property

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure-dentists	11140	The development will have an impact on availability of dental appointments
Infrastructure-GPs	11140	The development will have an impact on availability of doctors appointments
Infrastructure-schools	11140	The development will have an impact on school places
Land south of the Bypass	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	110 dwellings proposed and yet access, noise levels, linkages to the town, heritage impact etc studies to be done, so how can the figure of 110 be calculated, suggested or feasible?
	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	The site is by definition south of the bypass, contrary to the whole structure of the settlement of Romsey in this particular location.
	11096	Fields Farm site has scored incorrectly in SA in relation to a number of the ecological and bio-diversity matters compared to Land South of Bypass. If the Fields Farm was assessed correctly it would be seen as a more suitable site for development, where the sustainability appraisal concludes that due to the TPO trees and buffers to the SINC and ancient woodland there are less constrained sites with better potential for residential development
	11096	Strongly disagree that Site Allocation SA5 is considered to be considered a much more suitable site due to the number of constraints that the design will need to accommodate, which includes buffers to the western and southern boundaries towards heritages assets, noise mitigation matters and developing a drainage strategy that accommodates surface water flooding on approximately 25% of the site

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Land south of the Bypass - Amenity	10812 Romsey Town Council	Layout should preserve the amenity of existing residents of Burma Road. The indicative heritage buffer needs to be extended to the south and east of the boundary of Burma Road to preserve the historic character
Landscape	11140	Object to the development of housing on this site because of the impact it will have on the landscape, the view will be ruined and
Mottisfont Bats SAC	10140 Natural England	Site falls within 7.5km of Mottisfont Bats SAC and should address potential impacts to habitats that could be functionally linked to this designation, and which are in use by the designated Barbastelle bats species for foraging. Allocation would need to be in compliance with policy BIO2 and would expect necessary mitigation measures be secured
New Forest SAC, SPA, Ramsar	10140 Natural England	Falls within 13.8km of New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar, or within the wider 15km catchment, therefore necessary to address impacts of increased recreational pressure in accordance with policy BIO2. Mitigation will be expected to satisfy interim mitigation strategy, or the joint strategic solution.
River Test SSSI	10140 Natural England	May need to consider hydrological impacts on the River Test SSSI and demonstrate changes to groundwater would not adversely affect the designated site, due to its proximity.
Solent SPAs	10140 Natural England	Falls within 5.6km of the Solent SPA sites, therefore necessary that address recreational impacts on the SPA sites in accordance with policy BIO2.
New bus service	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	It is possible a new direct service towards Southampton might in time be provided to the east of the site on the A27 therefore, links to new stops on the A27 should be assumed as part of any proposals for the site.
Proposed Development	11102	Disappointed to see the inclusion of this land for development but understands it's inclusion.
	10511	Concerned as to the proposed development of 110 houses in south of the Romsey bypass.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Scale of development	10737	Object to any more housing in Romsey (by the by-pass) as Romsey is a small market town that was never designed to cope with such a large population
Self build	10115	any triggering of the provision of the 5 serviced plots alongside the 40% affordable housing would bring into question the delivery of these 10 homes, and consequently, under such a scenario that the Local Planning Authority losing importantly 4 affordable housing properties
	10115	if standalone sites are not adopted for custom build / self build properties, there needs to be sufficient headroom beyond 100 dwellings, with that threshold re-set to ensure no Strategic Allocation falls just above the threshold, such is the case of Bypass Road
Settlement Boundaries	10756	The land proposed for this development has always been observed as the boundary for the town's expansion and any proposals have been objected.
Site allocation	11135	Disagree with the allocation of land south of the bypass as it will essentially change the character of Romsey and the site is an ecological/historical sensitive site for development
Southern Water	10022 Southern Water	SW infrastructure crosses the site which needs to be taken into account for the layout of the proposed development as an easement of 6 metres or more, depending on the pipe size and depth would be required which may affect site layout or require diversion. Easements should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting
	10022 Southern Water	Add criteria stating 'layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes'
Infrastructure - sewer	10022 Southern Water	SW have undertaken preliminary assessment of capacity of existing SW infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for proposal which indicated that existing local sewerage infrastructure to site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development
Infrastructure - wastewater	10022 Southern Water	Proposal for 110 dwellings on site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network to provide additional capacity to serve the development. This reinforcement would be provided through New Infrastructure charge to developers

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10022 Southern Water	connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation
	10022 Southern Water	Add criteria stating 'occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of wastewater network reinforcement, in consultation with the service provider'
Support	10101 Broadlands Estate	Support strategic housing allocation
Sustainable transport	10052 Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	The location does have more sustainable transport links.
Traffic	11140	The access to the development will contribute to traffic congestion and could result in accidents
	10737	Object to any more housing in Romsey (by the by-pass) as Romsey is a small market town that was never designed to cope with such a large amount of traffic-it is impossible to find parking at peak times
Woodland protection	10052 Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	The woodland needs protecting for use by bats and a suitable buffer for the parkland beyond.

Policy SA6 Land at Velmore Farm, Valley Park
Paragraphs 4.187 to 4.200

Key Issue	Officer Response
Alternative sites (including brownfield land)	In selecting the proposed preferred allocation sites, the Council undertook an assessment of a range of sites to deliver the housing requirement for the plan period – this included consideration of brownfield sites. As a result of this process, which was documented separately, Velmore Farm was identified as a preferred allocation. This process has been updated in shaping the next iteration of the Local Plan, which needs to make provision for a significantly higher level of housing growth over the plan period. As a result of this consideration of options, Velmore Farm remains a preferred site for allocation.
Consultation	The draft Local Plan was considered by the Council to seek approval to undertake the consultation. The consultation itself was undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The Council has also been engaging with neighbouring local planning authorities in line with the Duty to Cooperate and as part of wider discussions through the Partnership for South Hampshire.
Site capacity, scale of development and masterplanning	The Council has considered information provided by the site promoters in proposing the scale of development for this site, accounting for the range of factors that need to be taken into account. This capacity will be kept under review as further work is undertaken as part of the preparation of the Local Plan.
Vehicle access	The proposed policy wording has been updated so as to include a second vehicular access from Castle Lane, alongside the previously proposed access onto Templars Way.
Highway capacity and infrastructure	The Council has undertaken modelling of likely traffic flows when accounting for this site and others proposed at the Regulation 18 Stage 2 and engaged with Hampshire County Council as the Highway Authority. Additional modelling will be undertaken in advance of the Regulation 19 stage. The traffic levels, particularly at peak times, are recognised and reflected in the modelling undertaken. Opportunities will be taken to maximise the potential for use of active and sustainable travel modes.
Flood risk and drainage	As part of the assessment process for identifying proposed allocations, consideration has been given to flood risk from all sources. There are parts of the site identified to be at risk of flooding from rivers and surface water. The council is also mindful of existing issues in the area, as identified through the comments received.

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The site would need to be brought forward taking account of national planning policy and guidance on flood risk, as well as other policies in the Local Plan on this matter. A site specific flood risk assessment would need to accompany planning application to indicate how all risks have been taken into account and set out appropriate mitigation measures. This would include the management of surface water (taking account of the geology and soil types) and ensuring that development does not increase risks elsewhere.
Implications for local gap and separation of settlements	The site is within the extent of a local gap in the adopted Local Plan. The appropriateness of retaining local gaps and their extent need to be reviewed as part of the preparation of each local plan in the context of national policy and guidance, including ensuring that development needs can be accommodated. The Council has undertaken such a review and in light of this, and having regard to the comments received, continues to propose a local gap but with a reduced extent relative to the adopted Local Plan and proposed to allocate land at Velmore Farm for development. This is not the only local gap that is proposed to be altered compared to the adopted Local Plan.
Loss of green space and open space	There is a need for development of greenfield sites in order to meet the housing requirement for Test Valley borough. The site is in private ownership with public access limited to the right of way network, although it is recognised that there are views across the site from public vantage points. The policy seeks the provision of a significant area of greenspace as part of the masterplanning of the site and there would be additional policy requirements that affect the design and layout of the site.
Pollution (including air, noise)	The comments are noted in relation to concerns on increased pollution, including associated with additional traffic as a result of this scheme. In selecting preferred allocations, regard has been had to opportunities to enable active and sustainable modes of travel, as well as including policies that seek to ensure infrastructure to support this is provided as part of future planning permissions. The council is continuing to work with Hampshire County Council, as highway authority, on the approach to transport and travel for the Local Plan.
Biodiversity and nature conservation (including ancient woodland, SINC's)	Biodiversity and nature conservation assets have been taken into consideration through the assessment leading to the identification of preferred allocation sites. Any future planning application would need to be accompanied by relevant ecological assessments and appropriate mitigation measures, taking account of legal requirements, as well as national and local policy provisions. It is intended to add an additional criterion to the policy in relation to Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC's) that would need to be considered alongside other policies on biodiversity and nature conservation.
Archaeology and heritage (including Roman road)	The heritage assets within the site, including the Roman road, have been taken into account in the identification of the site as a preferred allocation. The proposed policy wording highlights that

Key Issue	Officer Response
	additional evidence would be required to accompany a planning application to demonstrate how such assets have been taken into account through masterplanning of the site.
Overhead pylons	The presence of overhead pylons and other utility infrastructure will need to be taken into account in masterplanning the site, however they do not preclude the site coming forward. Regard would need to be had to guidance of the relevant infrastructure provides, including the National Grid.
Employment land proposal	The Local Plan is making provision for a range of uses over the whole plan period, this includes housing and employment space. The council is continuing to update its evidence in relation to employment needs, taking account of the change in level of housing growth that needs to be planned for, which will inform the preparation of the Regulation 19 stage.
Infrastructure	The Council has engaged with a number of infrastructure providers as part of the preparation of the Local Plan and this will continue as we progress with the document to ensure sufficient investment and timely delivery of additional infrastructure. This includes in relation to education, health, travel and water utilities. This will include the approach for a local centre, community facilities and open space. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be updated alongside future iterations of the draft Local Plan. Any proposal that comes forward would be considered against all the policies within the Local Plan, including in relation to infrastructure.
Infrastructure - health including GPs, dentists, pharmacies, hospitals and other health services	The Council has been liaising with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Integrated Care Board (HIOW ICB) to identify the additional infrastructure required to support this proposal which are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council secures developer contributions on behalf of HIOW ICB to support existing healthcare practices and the Council will continue to engage with the HIOW ICB as the preparation of the Local Plan progresses to ensure sufficient provision is made in local healthcare services, including dental services, to support additional housing. The regulation of pharmacies, which are business entities, including where they are located is governed by a number of organisations including the NHS.
Infrastructure - education	The Council is engaging with Hampshire County Council, as education authority, to understand the needs for additional education infrastructure as a result of this development. The policy proposes a new primary school on site as a consequence of this. The education's needs would be kept under review, including at the point any future planning application is submitted.
Infrastructure – transport and travel	As part of bringing forward a proposal for this site, based on proposed policy requirements there would be a need to undertake a site specific transport assessment and prepare a travel plan. This information, along with engagement with the highways authority, would inform a package of transport and travel infrastructure measures to come forward as part of the development. This would include provisions to integrate with existing pedestrian, cycle and public transport connections including

Key Issue	Officer Response
	existing public rights of way. Such assessments would not be restricted to the Test Valley borough boundaries.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	10994	Why has only one access point been planned for the Velmore Farm development of 1000+ houses? It will be extremely problematic.
	10898	The proposed point of access for the site along Templars Way is unsuitable and will cause an increase in traffic congestion.
	10794 Wates Development Limited	The site promoter would suggest a second and possible even third access point is required, one to serve the north western parcel of the site that has been separately promoted, off Castle Lane, and a second access for the land at Velmore Farm to the south of the main access, north of Montgomery Way.
	10448	There should be at least two entrance/exit points.
	10494	How could the Velmore Farm development be allowed with one access point at School Lane/Templars Way which is overloaded at peak hours?
	11060	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as there is only one access point which is on an already very busy roundabout
	10983	Against the Velmore Farm proposal as a single entrance will not be enough
	10481	The proposed development will not contain sufficient vehicle access points.
	10589	There is only one access road into the proposed development and it is already extremely congested.
	10601	It is implausible for the proposed development to have only one access point to such large development, especially as it is proposed to be used for commercial and residential purposes.
	10624	The main access point to the development at the Templars Way/School Lane roundabout is insufficient for the proposed scale of the development, due to current issues with parking and flooding.
	10911	There is currently one proposed access point to the proposed development at the Templar's Way/School Lane roundabout which would suffer from an additional 2000 vehicles.
	10872	Object to the singular access on the Velmore Farm proposal, an extra access could be added connected to the A27 or Botley Road to diffuse traffic build up
	10650	To have one access for the Velmore Farm proposal for at least 2,500 people is self-evidently insufficient.
	10734	The Velmore Farm proposal would need another access point to allow for rush hour requirements

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10501	The single route in and out of the development makes no provision for when this will become blocked, as it is the main access to the site.
	10837	Object to the one access point off Templars Way in the Velmore Farm proposal due to traffic around the industrial estate and Asda roundabout
	10758	Having a single access point for any major development via already very busy School Lane roundabout is untenable.
	10484	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as it has not taken into account a suitable access point
	10485	The access to the Velmore Farm proposal may need to be rethought
	11042	The entrance to the Velmore Farm proposal off School Lane/Templars Way roundabout would adversely affect this area.
	10978	The proposal access at Velmore Farm would massively increase traffic congestion within the immediate locality
	11061	The proposed access entrance off the roundabout on Templars Way will cause more traffic issues on Wolvesey Place - the main road should be redirected through the new estate.
	10804	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the access will add to the congestion and create traffic chaos
	10635	Suggest that a transportation plan seek alternative access points, however the area is hemmed in by motorways
	10888	Templers Way and Castle Lane are both diversion routes for traffic from the M3 and M27 in the event of accidents.
	10857	Why is there no access point for vehicles in Chilworth?
	10794 Wates Developments Limited	The site promoter agrees with the proposed point of access off Templars Way.
	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	Indicative main access from Templars way supported in principle
	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	Junction modelling demonstrates the proposed access has been undertaken of the 2028 baseline plus development scenario. The results of the modelling indicate that the access would operate well under capacity, with low queue lengths (maximum of 0.3 car lengths) and delays of less than 14 seconds on all arms. The highest RFC (0.25) is on the site access in the AM peak. Modelling of the access confirms that a simple bell mouth arrangement is sufficient to accommodate

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		the proposed development without significant impact on Castle Lane or the surrounding highway network.
	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	For an allocation of this scale and associated uses, would firmly endorse that a second point of access to the site is required for the allocation, to ensure strong permeability and accessibility throughout the new neighbourhood. Site has a direct and unbroken boundary with Castle Lane so strong advocate a secondary point of access is provided directly from Castle Lane. Secondary access would allow for access to new development within our site, together with an emergency access from there into the wider allocation and pedestrian and cycle links between both. Recent dialogue with Hampshire and IoW Fire and Rescue Service (HIWFRS) has confirmed the importance of secondary accesses to residential developments of this scale.
	11087	Using Castle Lane as an alternative would not be a viable option as the road bends and traffic backs up at the North Baddesley end.
	11098	The primary access point for the proposed site is at capacity as it is already joining a primary access road for the existing community which often brings traffic congestion.
	10984	Concerned the one entrance to the Velmore Farm proposal is off School Lane roundabout, which can already get congested at times
	10898	The eastern side of the Velmore Farm site is an unviable access point as it is a narrow track that leads onto Bournemouth Road, used only for occasional farm vehicle access.
	10978	Any access from Bournemouth Road on the Velmore Farm proposal should be purely pedestrian or bicycle access as it is a very narrow track
Roads – at capacity /congestion	10788	Adding another road onto the roundabout is a recipe for further congestion
	10845	Strongly object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the proposed access would result in considerable traffic disruption
	10547	The entrance to the Velmore Farm proposal would exacerbate the problems of gridlock seen. Move the entrance to Bournemouth Road or block School Lane at the junction of Eagle Close forcing the industrial traffic to exit via the northern entrance.
	11139	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as the access would lead Templars Way to be in constant gridlock. If moved to Bournemouth Road the added congestion would be bad but not as catastrophic.
Active and sustainable travel	10601	The proposed development should include wide footpaths/cycle ways with planting in verges to benefit pedestrians and residents.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10243 Stagecoach and Go South Coast Limited	We strongly agree that a comprehensive development strategy covering the entire area is necessary not least to maximise the use of walking, cycling and public transport through a comprehensive optimised access and movement strategy.
	10510	The claim that Velmore Farm is within a "15 minute cycling distance" is false and lends itself to confirmation bias.
	10816 Elivia Homes Ltd	There is a need to assess the accessibility of the site as a whole and not just the closest edge of the allocation
	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	A continuous footway / cycleway is provided on the northern side of Castle Lane. This route is segregated from the road by some vegetation and trees, and forms part of National Cycle Network Route 24.
	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	Pedestrian / cycle movements will increase in their frequency once new development comes forward at Velmore Farm, due to new residents and existing Valley Park residents seeking to access facilities, services and open space on foot.
	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	Opportunities should be explored to improve the non-motorised network and improve not only pedestrian and cycle connectivity, but also the bridleway and public right of way network for existing and new users. Such enhancements will generate increased uptake of active travel modes, and support healthy lifestyles
	11000	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as additional traffic will make cycling towards and away from Asda roundabout less safe and there are no provisions of a cycle path
	11160	The Council should ensure that there are pedestrian and cycle paths away from roads and that these paths actually reach key infrastructure destinations and that the local rights of way network is expanded
	10978	The cycle time from Velmore Farm to Eastleigh station on Google maps is 19 minutes and via National Cycle Route is 24 minutes therefore, 20 minutes is more accurate
	10453	There is no provision to solve existing traffic bottlenecks or provide satisfactory cycle paths - this is counterproductive and possibly irresponsible. The plan discourages cycling to work.
	10650	Access to direct services to Southampton would require a substantial walk and Chandlers Ford station is beyond a feasible walking distance
	10734	The Velmore Farm development should include good and separate pedestrian and cycle routes
Bus services	10052 Romsey & District Society Natural	There is reference to a frequent bus service (Bluestar 5) - this does not fall within the definition of frequent (using Government Statutory Document 14: Local Bus Services in England (outside London)). An hourly service cannot be described as frequent.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Environment Committee	
	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	We challenge the assertion that Bluestar service 5 is “frequent”, at an hourly core frequency the service can be considered “regular”. However, development on this scale combined with growth committed on the route at North Baddesley and Whitenap, is likely to present the opportunity for substantial enhancements.
	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Substantial investment in revenue support should be sought to boost the frequency and hours of operation and a need to establish new and improved bus stops on Templars Way and Castle Way, including high quality pedestrian crossing facilities which would also serve existing development better to the north.
	10659	A bus shelter on Harvest Road was agreed last year by the Parish Council but still hasn’t been installed.
Connectivity	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	An internal pedestrian route within the site could provide access out to the junction of Templars Way/Castle Lane/Knightwood Road/Raglan Close, and strong connectivity to the remainder of the allocation and new neighbourhood.
Accommodation mix	10794 Wates Developments Limited	Site promoter would support the premise of part of the housing offer including accommodation for the elderly.
	11114	Planning seems to provide a lot of 3,4 and 5 bedroom homes and a few maisonettes and 2 bedroom homes, insufficient affordable homes and this then forms the basis of actual critical need.
Affordable housing	11098	There should be provisions for affordable housing on the proposed site which would allow young families to move in.
	10583	The proposed development should meet standards for affordable housing, targeting younger locals rather than bigger profits for developers.
	10699	There is a need for affordable housing, though this area of Test Valley has seen considerable urbanisation and development should be fairly allocated through the borough and in fully resourced areas.
	11072	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as there is no provision for affordable housing proposed
	10702	The plan should concentrate more on affordable housing spread through rural communities with the capacity to expand, rather than further urbanisation of developed areas.
	10643	Why isn’t Chilworth shouldering its responsibility to build affordable houses?

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Agricultural land	10628	The agricultural land at Velmore Farm is too valuable in producing food to be used for a housing development.
	10700, 10701	The proposed development will impact agricultural land and reducing our national self-sufficiency.
	10491	Rather than developing Velmore Farm we need farms and locally produced food
	10515	The Velmore Farm proposal will cause a loss of good farmland
	10857	What happens to the farm on the site, farmland is needed?
	10709	Ideally the green space should remain active farm land for locally produced food
	10456	The site is regularly full of crops and livestock-non productive land would be more beneficial than building on this farming land.
House prices	10499	Against the Velmore Farm development as it is not believed the homes will be affordable due to the affluent location
Pollution	10869	The position of our house to Templars Way means we are subject to vehicle noise and fumes all day and the Velmore Farm proposal will only increase this
	10646	The development will increase air pollution for current residents
	10901	The proposal will be actively contributing to tackling the air pollution problem that is currently plaguing Southampton and the surrounding area. More houses will lead to more cars on the roads and therefore more air pollution.
	10829	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the traffic impact and air pollution
	10547	The Velmore Farm proposal would exacerbate air pollution in the area
	10469	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the increase in air pollution it will cause.
	10534	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as an increased population density may impact life for residents such as, air quality
	10199	The Velmore Farm proposal would increase air pollution and reduce the air quality
	10987	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as it would reduce the air quality in the area
	11002	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the development and congestion will cause / add to air pollution.
	11000	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as any additional traffic will worsen air quality
	10873	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as the increase in traffic will add high levels of harmful air pollution
	10850, 10867	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the effect on air quality and pollution from an already overcrowded road system
	10678	Strongly oppose Velmore Farm as it will increase air pollution which is concerning for the wellbeing of residents

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10652	Existing congestion has a detrimental effect on air quality and the Velmore Farm proposal will worsen the situation
	10649	The traffic seen on Templars Way and surrounding roads contributes to air pollution and development at Velmore Farm will worsen this
	10735	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as the increased traffic will create further stationary/queuing cars leading to an increase in air pollution and a reduction in air quality
	10453	The existing traffic congestion has a detrimental effect on the air quality and additional traffic will worsen the situation
	11069	Opposed to the development of Velmore Farm because it will adversely affect the quality of air from the increase in traffic
Alternative sites and distribution of development	10898	Eastleigh is substantially developed residentially and commercially and could accommodate a mixed residential/commercial development on a brownfield setting rather than using undeveloped farmland at Velmore Farm in Valley Park. The planning authority should liaise jointly with Southampton City Council and Eastleigh to produce an overarching regional plan for Southern Test Valley and not seek to allow a development of this size at Velmore Farm.
	10959	Velmore Farm is not the correct location for a development, more suitable sites which will not impact an already busy residential area.
	11016	Romsey has been spared from a massive scale development in comparison to Chandler's Ford, the political reasons for which should be challenged.
	11048	Romsey and Valley Park have received a large proportion of developments, when they should be spread to Stockbridge for example which is situated between Southampton and Winchester.
	10175	It is time for other neighbourhoods such as Ampfield, Chilworth, Braishfield, King's Somborne or Stockbridge to take the strain of development.
	11091	Were the allocation of 1,070 homes at Velmore Farm to be adopted, then Valley Park will have seen the development of 5,000 homes in forty years. Whereas the Mid Test Area around Stockbridge has received no allocation of homes.
	10599	Other areas such as the rural parts around Stockbridge should be considered for development instead, due to better school infrastructure.
	10600	It would be fairer as a solution to the housing problem to spread housing across small villages who could each take a smaller amount of houses, rather than another large development in Valley Park.
	10601	There are no proposed developments in more appropriate rural areas, whereas developments have been allocated in areas which have received significant recent developments.
	10624	Development proposals should be suggested in Stockbridge where there is more open space and there has been less development than in Valley Park.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10986	If the proposed development at Velmore Farm goes ahead, Valley Park will have had 5,000 homes over the last 40 years whereas the Mid Test area around Stockbridge has received no allocations.
	10904	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as Valley Park has had around 4,000 homes allocated over the years however, there has been no allocation of homes around Stockbridge
	10626	The Stockbridge area is far more suitable than Valley Park to facilitate housing developments.
	10685	The plan avoids smaller developments throughout the Borough in rural parishes and villages such as Stockbridge, and as a result are disadvantaging the rural economy.
	10687	Development should instead be proposed on the green space around Stockbridge, where it does not affect the green lung strategic gap, and where Test Valley would see the economic benefit rather than Southampton and Eastleigh.
	10911	The Land North of Flexford Road creates a site more suitable for development locally and does not join Valley Park to a neighbouring settlement.
	10913	The proposal continues the original 1980s development plan for the land North of Flexford Rd as a continuation of Valley Park, which instead of housing has now been identified as a Local Gap area.
	10911	Romsey should be considered for further development as it is uniquely placed and largely unbounded by other large settlements.
	10911	Most existing communities are opposed to further development, so a solution to this would be to create large completely new development. This would avoid issues with improving existing infrastructure as the new development would contain new infrastructure to support the homes needed.
	10500	Chandler's Ford has had enough development and other sites should be considered to support the load of proposed development.
	10513	The Velmore Farm development proposal should be scrapped, and a site with greater access and less impact on existing infrastructure.
	10661 Orchard (Highwood Lane) Ltd	In proposing Velmore Farm, the Council has relied upon it providing a more balanced distribution of development in the south of the borough. There is no explanation of how and why the allocation of the site for over 1000 homes achieves a balance of provision across southern Test Valley or what criteria were used to arrive at that judgement.
	10661 Orchard (Highwood Lane) Ltd	There is no clear justification why an extension to Eastleigh within Test Valley should be singled out as an issue to be considered when assessing the merits of the site.
	10199	Development should take place in towns or small villages rather than large unsustainable ones like the Velmore Farm proposal.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10746	Velmore Farm is ill thought, Mid Test areas should have an equivalent allocation spread into a number of separate areas.
	10988	If the proposed development at Velmore Farm goes ahead, Valley Park will have had 5000 homes over the last 40 years whereas the Mid Test area around Stockbridge has received no allocations.
	10836	The council seems to be avoiding spreading the load of housing across other parts of the Borough where in some, no proposals have been made at all. Could it be that some Borough residents and other vested interests have a greater influence than others in decision making?
	10726	The Velmore Farm proposal should consider better distributed developments throughout the borough for a sustainable solution to address the housing deficit.
	10736	Please reconsider the Velmore Farm proposal and spread the housing needs further around Test Valley.
	10847	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as the area cannot cope, it is not fair to enlarge an area that has had nearly 4,000 homes allocated over the last 40 years whereas, other areas have not been allocated development at all.
	10715	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as there are plenty of empty homes in the area and nationally, building new homes does nothing but line the pockets of developers
	11085	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the disproportion of allocations for the rest of Test Valley compared to Valley Park, Andover and Ludgershall
	10433	It is noted that there are planning appraisals in place for land either side of Flexford Road in Valley Park - this will bring more houses and little infrastructure.
Alternative sites – brownfield	10978	Eastleigh could accommodate development of over 1,100 homes in a brownfield setting rather than using undeveloped farmland at Velmore Farm.
	10887	The plan should be pursuing options to build affordable housing on brownfield sites such as Eastleigh Borough Council are doing.
	10561	Cities with brownfield sites should be prioritised for development over essential greenfield sites.
	10607	There are available brownfield sites such as unused office buildings and shops in Eastleigh borough which should be developed instead of greenfield sites such as Velmore Farm.
	10628	Brownfield Sites should be utilised first where there needs to be development.
	10693	Brownfield sites should be utilised over greenfield sites - there is a brownfield site at Castle Lane which has not been considered.
	10536, 10537	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the focus should be on brownfield locations
	10440	Oppose the proposal at Velmore Farm on account of the use of farmland as opposed to brownfield land.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10847	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as brownfield sites should be proposed over greenfield sites
	10850	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as more consideration should be given to development on brownfield sites at a smaller scale which could provide affordable homes and not line the pockets of private landlords
	10863	Oppose Velmore Farm as more consideration should be given to development of existing brownfield sites
	10199	Proposed developments such as Velmore Farm should be on brownfield sites
	10494	Should Test Valley be enforcing the use of empty brownfield sites?
	10845	Strongly object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the land is currently a farm which is unsuitable for redevelopment, a brownfield site would be better
	10534	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as brownfield sites should be prioritised for development
	10849	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as we must protect greenfield sites which are appreciated by local residents, no doubt there are plenty of suitable brownfield sites.
	10986	Strongly oppose this plan, shouldn't brownfield land be used before destroying more open green spaces?
	11114	Test Valley Council has no will to oppose greenfield development thus enabling developers to pursue profit over responsible development. The Council should be developing on brownfield land not greenfield, Whitbread site in Romsey is brownfield yet it remains undeveloped.
	10709	The Council should use brownfield sites rather than greenfield as brownfield sites have the infrastructure such as clean & wastewater pipes, local services, schools, doctors, dentists already in place.
	10735	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as all potential brownfield sites should be considered before building on green land.
Character and amenity	10978	The Velmore Farm site is of high local amenity value.
	10853	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it will destroy the character and attraction of the area
	11002	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the overdevelopment will degrade the area's character
	10534	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as greenfield land is crucial in maintaining aesthetics of communities
	10978	The predominant character of the immediate area of the Velmore Farm proposal is partly rural but mainly residential

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10545	Bought house under attraction that it was in a rural setting, the over development of this area now means that the area is becoming increasingly urbanised.
	10397	Velmore Farm is contrary to document section Development in the Countryside, the Council is failing in its commitment to create and maintain sustainable rural settlements by permitting this development
	11072	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as the new housing would need to be very densely packed together.
	10746	Velmore Farm is an ill thought out plan detrimental for the local area and residents
	10693	The plan should include assurances that the development will be designed appropriately in conjunction with the rest of Valley Park.
	10845	Strongly object the Velmore Farm proposal as it will cause major disruption to residents in the area
Site location	10788	It seems that the Council have chosen to site housing developments on its outer boundaries
	11060	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as Test Valley always plan to increase development on the fringes of its boundaries where the residents will use facilities outside of Test Valley
	10845	Strongly object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the proximity to the borough boundary, other large scale developments are close to the proposed area with other in the pipeline which needs to be considered
Archaeology and heritage	10049 Historic England	States that "The likelihood of surviving earthworks has been identified"; what is that likelihood? Low or high?
	10510	The site of the Roman Road should be fully assessed before any development takes place - it is not enough that the historic site will be "retained as a feature of the layout and design".
	10753	A Roman Rd (no.422) runs from Templars Way on the northern boundary into Hut Wood on the southern boundary - paragraph 5.153 states that Roman Roads are classified as Scheduled Monuments.
	10794 Wates Development Limited	The site promoter would concur with the need to undertake an archaeological assessment of the site, albeit would question whether the policy wording can insist on conservation of the heritage assets as that would prejudice the outcome of the archaeological assessment.
	10986, 10888, 11091, 10988	Request that a full archaeological assessment is carried out on Velmore Farm as a Roman road runs across the farm. The national Historic Society should be consulted.
	10845	An archaeological assessment of the Velmore Farm site should be completed due to the Roman Road

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10004 Valley Park Parish Council	Request that a full archaeological assessment is carried out on Land at Velmore Farm as a Roman road runs across the farm. The national Historic Society should be consulted.
	10869	I agree with Valley Park Parish Council's response such as the issues on archaeology studies.
	10148	In the context of the Roman Road, it is essential a full archaeological assessment is completed on this farmland prior to the Local Plan proposal being adopted.
	10397 Chilworth Parish Council	Important roman roads and ox droves across the settlement, with the likelihood of surviving earthworks identified and should be acknowledged as a feature of layout design of the development. Prior to any development an archaeological assessment will be required, impacts must not be disregarded.
	10934	The Roman Road and Iron Age settlements make this an area of historic interest.
	10177	The site of the Roman road and the land surrounding it needs surveying and protecting -has an archaeological survey been arranged? What were the findings and recommendations?
	10710	There are a number of infrastructure issues that make this proposal detrimental to existing developments such as risk to archaeological remains
	11017	There is no recognition in the plans for the history of the area, as a Roman Road spans the development site and there is also valuable Wessex heritage.
	10884	Velmore Farm is of archaeological importance with a Roman Road running across it.
	10890	There has not been an archaeology study conducted despite the placement of the Roman Road through the proposed site.
	10616	The Roman Road runs over the land at Velmore Farm - this site should not be damaged or compromised in any way.
	10704	There is a Roman Road which runs through the site which needs to be protected.
	10911	There is a Roman Road through the proposed site - development over the largely unknown artefact is in contradiction of current Local Plan policy E9: Heritage.
	10745	Archaeology studies are needed due to the Roman Road that crosses Velmore Farm
Assessment and consultation	11002, 11132	The Velmore Farm proposal requires further assessments and community consultations to develop a more inclusive and sustainable plan that aligns with the community's interest.
	11143	There should be more consultation with residents and councillors and potential house builders should walk around the area to see what the development would actually entail
	10479,10480	The community outside the borough affected by the proposed development can only contribute opinion through written comment and has no representation in Test Valley Borough Council. Such tactics seem undemocratic.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10636	It seems no active engagement has taken place with Eastleigh Borough Council even though the impact on services such as the recycling centre, Places Leisure, public libraries, etc will be shared between Eastleigh and Test Valley residents.
	10913	Policy SA6 and the interactive map reference the number of housing units per ha but not the proposed housing density. The policy should state housing density as otherwise housing developers will use cheap materials to build as much housing on a small piece of land as they can.
	10913	The relevant policy for the site is SA6, whereas the Interactive Map states that the relevant policies are NA4-NA8 and SA4-SA7. The map should only state the relevant policy as SA6 and not the others.
	10913	There is no inclusion of the grade of agricultural land in the interactive map, Policy SA6 or the SHELAA. The grade of agricultural land and comparisons with other sites and their agricultural land grade should be included in both the interactive map and Policy SA6.
	10788	Fully support the response of Valley Park Parish Council and like them, I am disappointed that the democratically elected councillors had no input on the preferred sites for housing prior to being presented by Test Valley Borough Council officers.
	11056 Chandler's Ford Parish Council	Call for significant consultations by Test Valley Borough Council with Eastleigh Borough Council and Chandler's Ford Parish Council on any further progress of this proposal.
	11056 Chandler's Ford Parish Council	Call for Test Valley Borough Council to address our concerns if progressing the proposal
Biodiversity and wildlife	10422	Object to the Velmore farm proposal on account of the loss of the biodiversity and woodlands.
	10677	Object to Velmore Farm as the development would result in irrevocable species loss seen in the woodlands of Hut Wood and Chilworth
	10423	The Local Plan should be shelved as its proposals have no regard for pressure on wildlife
	10421	The Velmore Farm proposal is unsustainable on account of the impact on loss of biodiversity
	10427	Opposed to the proposal at Velmore Farm on account of the loss of biodiversity and disruption to the local ecosystems
	10431	Against the Velmore Farm proposal on account of the impact on biodiversity.
	10441	The proposal for homes in Chandler's Ford is in the wrong place as it will displace the wildlife.
	10436	Object to the development of 1,070 homes at Velmore Farm because Hut Wood would be ruined and the development will scare away deer and animals and other wildlife.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10437	Object to the development of 1,070 homes at Velmore Farm because of the loss of biodiversity and wildlife
	10439	Object to the development of 1070 homes at Velmore Farm because of the impact on nature and biodiversity
	10635	The proposal to build 1070 homes on Velmore Farm will result in the loss of biodiversity
	10004 Valley Park Parish Council	The proposed scale of development at Velmore Farm will cause damage to the biodiversity and wildlife habitats
	10612	There will be damage to biodiversity and wildlife habitats.
	10449	Opposed to the development at Velmore Farm because of the loss of wildlife and biodiversity currently present on site.
	10452	It is wrong to reduce biodiversity, is there no brownfield land available?
	10506, 10608, 10609, 10523	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to loss of biodiversity
	10508, 10562	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the impact on local biodiversity
	10859	Express concern to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the damage it would cause to biodiversity and wildlife
	10853	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it will cause irreversible damage to local wildlife and biodiversity
	10483	The Velmore Farm proposal would lead to a loss of biodiversity
	10530	Oppose the Velmore Farm development as it should be preserved for maintaining biodiversity, local ecosystems and habitats
	10524	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the community enjoys the biodiversity
	10505, 10155, 10964	The Velmore Farm development is concerning due to the loss of biodiversity.
	10536, 10537	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the reduction in biodiversity it will cause
	10459	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the loss of wildlife and biodiversity
	10489	The Velmore Farm proposal would be a loss of biodiversity
	10786	Object to the Velmore Farm development due to wildlife habitats dwindling
	10829	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the damage it would cause to biodiversity and wildlife
	10469	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the wildlife that will lose their habitat
	10532	Do not support the Velmore Farm development due to the loss of animal habitats
	10531	Object to the Velmore Farm development due to the impact of wildlife

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10518	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it would destroy the wildlife habitat
	10515	The Velmore Farm proposal will cause a loss of wildlife and habitat
	10534	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as greenfield land is crucial in maintaining biodiversity
	10970, 10971	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the site borders Forestry Land, the increased population, noise and activity would affect wildlife beyond the development
	10969	The Velmore Farm proposal should not go ahead as there would be no space for wildlife such as deer and cows
	11085	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as it will have detrimental effects on natural habitat and wildlife
	11062	The Velmore Farm proposal would impact biodiversity
	11058	If the Velmore Farm proposal goes ahead where will the wildlife go?
	10984	A lot of wildlife use the Velmore Farm proposal and it would be a shame to see them moved on
	10987	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as it would cause a loss of habitats
	11002	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the negative implications it will have on the local ecosystem disrupting wildlife habitats
	11048	A detailed study should be made on the green land proposed for development to survey the range of biodiversity on the site, after the discovery of Nightjars.
	11054	Have the birds/bats and other animals that use the farmland for foraging from Hut Wood to the North of the site been accounted for? Hut Wood holds several pairs of Nightjar (protected under Annex 1 of the EC Birds Directive) and other birds including those in Titlark, Great Covert, etc. There's at least 1 Skylark territory, Buzzards, peregrine, deer, etc.
	10659	As the housing in Valley Park has increased over the years there are less sightings of deer, hedgehogs, birds and this will be exacerbated with the new development
	10887	Building more housing on the proposed site would take away space for the wildlife in the area and negatively impact biodiversity.
	11091	Concerned about the damage to biodiversity and wildlife habitats due to the proposed development at Velmore Farm.
	10177	Development at Velmore Farm will adversely impact the diminishing green spaces for wildlife
	10601	Green areas should be created between developments and linked to benefit the local wildlife.
	10629	Habitats and wildlife in the local area will be destroyed by the proposed development.
	10177, 10659	Has the proposal for development at Velmore farm included an independent survey for protected species of plants and animals? Where are the findings?
	10643	Object to the proposed development at Velmore Farm because of the loss of biodiversity and wildlife
	10904	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the effect on biodiversity and wildlife

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10831	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the loss of biodiversity which forms a vital component and should be protected
	10679	Object to Velmore Farm due to the loss of valued biodiversity
	10824	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as it would damage biodiversity
	10861	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as it would damage the biodiversity and wildlife habitats on the site
	10836	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as the green space is important for wildlife habitats
	10850	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the impact on wildlife and biodiversity
	10867	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the negative impact it will have on biodiversity, elimination of more nature would be devastating. Why not be a council who takes a step to preserve nature for future generations?
	10863	Oppose Velmore Farm due to the impact upon wildlife and biodiversity
	10638	Serious concerns about the proposal for development at Velmore Farm because of the loss of biodiversity and wildlife
	10848	Strongly object the Velmore Farm proposal as the habitats will be destroyed which will adversely impact the environment
	10914	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the damage on biodiversity and wildlife habitats
	10873	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the loss of biodiversity
	10678	Strongly oppose Velmore Farm as the green space it vital for local biodiversity
	10702	The consistent development on the countryside will lead to the degradation of habitat and biodiversity.
	11160	The Council can prevent the loss of biodiversity if it actively pushes for its preservation
	11048	The development of 1070 homes will destroy the nature of this area.
	10955	The development of farmland at Velmore Farm cannot be completed without impacting the local environment, wildlife and habitat.
	10552	The green space contains wildlife and their habitats which would be destroyed by the proposed development.
	10630	The local fauna and flora will be destroyed by the proposed development.
	10553	The loss of green space in the local area would lead to the destruction of wildlife and their habitats.
	10951	The loss of local green space caused by the proposed development will have a detrimental effect on local wildlife, contradicting the priorities of green open space and environment highlighted by Test Valley.
	10571	The loss of the green belt will destroy the local wildlife.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10884	The loss of Velmore Farm to development would be adverse to the wildlife and biodiversity (such as deer, Goshawks, Buzzards and Sparrowhawks) of the area.
	10693	The plan should include assurances that trees and hedge screens are planted to provide protection for wildlife surrounding the proposed development, along with assurances that wildlife gaps will be created and maintained in conjunction with the proposed development.
	10570	The proposal will destroy biodiversity, which is an important feature of the area.
	10481	The proposed development is concerning due to the loss of wildlife and habitats it will cause.
	10962	The proposed development will be to the detriment of local wildlife.
	11088	The proposed development will breach the Local Gap which will result in damage to wildlife habitats and a reduction in biodiversity.
	10616	The proposed development will cause significant damage to biodiversity and wildlife habitats.
	10558	The proposed development will cause the loss of biodiversity which inhabits the green space at Velmore Farm.
	10577	The proposed development will destroy green space in the area, impacting the local wildlife and their natural habitat.
	10581	The proposed development will destroy local wildlife.
	10604	The proposed development will have a detrimental impact on nature and the wildlife.
	10685	The proposed development will have a negative impact on residents through the loss of biodiversity and habitats and the nitrogen run-off to the Solent Basin.
	10579	The proposed development will have a significant impact on local wildlife and biodiversity due to the loss of green spaces.
	10574	The proposed development will have a significant impact on local wildlife.
	10575	The proposed development will lead to a destruction of local wildlife.
	10614	The proposed development will lead to a further decrease in biodiversity in the area.
	10632	The proposed development will lead to a loss of biodiversity and habitat, and subsequently wildlife in the local area.
	10565	The proposed development will lead to a loss of biodiversity in the area.
	10596, 10700, 10701, 10535, 10597, 10618, 10624	The proposed development will lead to a loss of biodiversity.
	10607	The proposed development will lead to a loss of flora and fauna which exists on the farm.
	10631	The proposed development will lead to a loss of local biodiversity.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10699	The proposed development will lead to a significant loss of biodiversity which will be detrimental to the environment and residents.
	10567	The proposed development will lead to the destruction of wildlife in the local area.
	10687	The proposed development will see a loss of habitat and subsequently wildlife.
	10583	The proposed development would be detrimental to local wildlife.
	10593	The proposed development would destroy a significant amount of natural habitats for wildlife.
	10955	The proposed development would have a negative impact on wildlife which inhabits the green space.
	10620, 10621	The proposed development would lead to a substantial loss of habitat and biodiversity.
	10890	The proposed development would lead to the destruction of local habitats and negative impact on wildlife as it is opposite woodland and meadows, containing varied wildlife and protected bird species.
	10594, 10595	The proposed developments will destroy natural habitats for wildlife and decrease biodiversity.
	10888	The proposed scale of development at Velmore Farm will cause damage to the biodiversity and wildlife habitats
	10986	The proposed scale of development at Velmore Farm will cause damage to the biodiversity and wildlife habitats, the ecosystem needs to be protected
	10988	The proposed scale of development at Velmore Farm will damage the biodiversity, wildlife habitats and displace these animals, the ecosystem needs to be protected
	10175	The reduction in the local gap will restrict the indigenous fauna already at threat
	10832	The scale of the Velmore Farm proposal will have an adverse impact on biodiversity
	11050	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the loss of biodiversity
	10668	The Velmore Farm proposal is disappointing as the area is a breeding site and feeding station for deer, mice, voles, moles, grass snakes and slow worms. Also due to the negative impact on pollinators such as bees, butterflies and other insects.
	10668	The Velmore Farm proposal is disappointing as the impact on wildlife and residents will be immense and destructive to RED listed birdlife, the UK ranks in the bottom 10% of EU countries on biodiversity and this will cause a further decline.
	10668	The Velmore Farm proposal is disappointing as the loss of green space will have a detrimental effect on species that use the area which volunteers and rangers have worked to protect
	10668	The Velmore Farm proposal is disappointing due to the loss of all the following birds: skylarks, swallow, greenfinch, swift, house martin, house sparrow, stonechat, osprey, red kite, buzzard, hobby, lapwing, corvids, raven, crossbill, goshawk, woodcock and peregrine falcons

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10843	The Velmore Farm proposal is unsuitable as birds, bats and other animals use the farmland area, development will remove or disrupt the foraging area and biodiversity of the site does not seem to have been accounted for yet
	10500	The wildlife in the area will be significantly impacted and cannot be relocated.
	10710	There are a number of infrastructure issues that make this proposal detrimental to existing developments such as risk to biodiversity
	10177	There is a lower number of wildlife and birds around Knightwood since the new developments and this will be made worse with Velmore Farm
	10913	There is no provision in the interactive map or Policy SA6 regarding the biodiversity value of the proposed site for development and a comparison with other sites. The biodiversity value of this site should have prevented it from receiving housing allocation.
	11017	There is no recognition of the valuable flora and fauna in the area selected for development.
	10456	If the proposal goes ahead it will lead to depletion of the natural woodlands and fields between Bournemouth Road , Templars Way, Castle Lane and Chilworth Road and this will displace wildlife
	11066	Opposed to the development of Velmore farm because it will result in displacement or loss of wildlife
	10451	The development will result in the loss of biodiversity.
	10712	The loss of the gap between Valley Park and Chilworth would greatly diminish local biodiversity.
	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	The site currently comprises two fields of semi-improved neutral grassland with woodland boundaries - grassland and scattered scrub is of low ecological value.
	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	Any new development on the subject site will address the site constraints via an ecological mitigation hierarchy and considered design. Valuable habitats will be strengthened and retained on site, including the wet ditch and woodland boundaries. Adequate buffers will be provided where necessary, along with a sensitive scheme of lighting design. Compensatory measures will be designed into the proposals where necessary.
Biodiversity Net Gain	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	10% Biodiversity Net Gain will be delivered on site
	10397 Chilworth Parish Council	In the context of the requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), requires careful consideration to be given to the opposition to existing large development proposals and the considered disproportional development at Velmore Farm where BNG would be difficult to achieve.
SINC's	10978	Hut Wood and The Rough SINC's will be affected during and after the development reducing the local rural amenity

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10753	The proposed development at Velmore Farm would cause damage to the SINCs at Hut Wood and The Rough.
	10427	Opposed to the proposal at Velmore Farm on account of its proximity to a SINC site at Hut Wood and the Rough
Ancient woodland	10843	There is no account of the ancient woodland at Spring Copse, while there is potential for environmental enhancement in this area this woodland needs to be accounted for.
	10223 The Woodland Trust	Object to allocation as ancient woodland is at risk of loss or harm. Ask that either this site is removed from the plan, or that the site boundaries are redrawn to exclude the ancient woodland.
	10223 The Woodland Trust	Concerned that the current policy requirements in SA6 make no mention of protection and buffering of the areas of ancient woodland at Austins Copse and Spring Copse to the south and west of the site, parts of larger areas of priority habitat (deciduous woodland). Review reference to nearby ancient woodland in policy
	10223 The Woodland Trust	Recommend a precautionary buffer of 50m unless it can be demonstrated that a smaller buffer would suffice: this buffer can be used for natural woodland regeneration, contributing to biodiversity net gain and/or providing accessible natural green space for residents.
	10710	There are a number of infrastructure issues that make this proposal detrimental to existing developments such as risk to ancient woodland
	10843	The proposal is unsuitable as there seems to be no account of the ancient and veteran trees along the path up from Valley Park to the Chilworth Arms to the west. A proper arboricultural assessment of the site and adjacent areas is needed.
Environmental impacts	10532	Do not support the Velmore Farm development as it will cause significant harm to the local environment
	10536, 10537	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the negative impact on the environment it will cause
	10739	Object to Velmore Farm as development will environmentally impact the area in an unmeasurable way
	10484	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as a viable option due to the negative impact it could have on the local environment
	11126, 11127	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as we should be improving the environment not make it worse
	10794 Wates Developments Limited	Development of land at Velmore Farm can be accommodated without any adverse environmental impacts and provide an opportunity for significant environmental improvements.
	10534	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as greenfield land is crucial for the environment

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10545	The development, along with the extra people and traffic would cause environmental issues.
	10571	The proposed development will be hugely detrimental to the natural environment of the area and the existing residents.
	10626	The proposed development will further the gradual degradation of the local environment in Valley Park.
	10604	The proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the environment.
	10553	The proposed development would have a significant environmental impact on the local area.
	10497	The Velmore Farm development should be scrapped to protect the environment
	10509	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the environmental impact, the land is agricultural and wildlife friendly
	10964	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the impact it will have on the environment
	10147	The Velmore Farm proposal is difficult to understand as we are told we need to look after the environment however, this plan is not compatible with nature or the environment
	10539	There will be an increased impact on the environment as the ground in the area is clay, meaning the use of more concrete for the proposed development.
	10397 Chilworth Parish Council	Velmore Farm in direct conflict with the policies which aim to respect the environment by the removal of green spaces and effective removal of the local gap
Site capacity	10794 Wates Developments Limited	The site promoter believes that land at Velmore Farm, Valley Park could accommodate approximately 850 dwellings, and associated uses including 1.5ha employment land, potentially up to 2.2ha for a 2FE primary school, a community hub, SANG and public open space, as assessed within the SHELAA (site reference 82).
	10814 Westcoast Developments Ltd	The site's capacity is constrained by the sloping topography, high voltage power lines and route of a Roman Road that dissect the site. It is clear therefore that there are significant constraints on this site which reduces the extent of the developable area and questions the suitability of the site for the development of 1,070 dwellings
	10816 Elivia Homes Ltd	We have serious concerns regarding the suitability to accommodate the scale proposed due to the significant constraints which question whether 1070 dwellings is achievable or deliverable. These constraints include a SANG, sequential approach for surface water flooding, landscape buffers for SINCS, noise from the M3/M27, visual impacts from public rights of way, sloping topography, high voltage power lines and a Roman Road.
	10816 Elivia Homes Ltd	If maintained as an allocation, the quantum of development should be reduced in recognition of the western extent being outside of a comfortable walking distance to a range of services and facilities.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10735	The proposed developments account for less than half of the supposedly reported total required by government, this is concerning as Velmore Farm may increase with time to cover this shortfall
	10343 Belfield Homes (Ampfield)	The quantum of development should be reduced to recognise that the further locations of development within site to the west, would be outside a comfortable walking distance to a range of facilities and services.
Site delivery	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	Remainder of Velmore Farm promoted by Wates and both parties have discussed allocation and intend to collaborate to bring site forward.
	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	The site benefits from no constraints to its delivery, with just two promoters bringing the overall allocation forwards.
	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	Draft delivery timeline for Land south of Castle Lane (indicative yield of 220 dwellings) includes 20 dwellings in 2025, 50 dwellings in 2026, 50 dwellings in 2027, 50 dwellings in 2028 and 50 dwellings in 2029.
	10794 Wates Development Limited	The site promoter for Velmore Farm believes the site to be eminently suitable, available and deliverable, and remains committed to working with the Council to facilitate delivery in accordance with the predicted housing trajectory.
	10794 Wates Development Limited	Wates would like to work with Test Valley Borough Council on the delivery of the site land at Velmore Farm, Valley Park.
	11134	All development contracts must be properly scrutinised to prevent corruption and subject to competitive bidding
	10498	Oppose the Velmore Farm development due to the disregard for the area just for profits of developers
	10955	House building on the site needs to be heavily regulated.
	10980	The Velmore Farm development should be undertaken by a reputable firm and have opportunities for apprenticeships or similar schemes.
	10510	The viability of the site should be reassessed as it was originally conducted based on the construction of 850 homes, and not the 1070 dwellings now proposed.
Climate change	10845	Has the impact of future climate change been taken into account on the infrastructure around the Velmore Farm proposal?

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11017	The proposed development will contradict the climate change priority set by the council and will make the area hotter and wetter.
Local gap and coalescence	10424	Against the Velmore farm proposal on account of the breach of a local gap.
	10612	Any development at Velmore Farm will comprise the role, character and integrity of this Local Gap.
	11092, 11100	Any development of Velmore Farm compromises the policy of maintaining a Local Gap which was so strongly supported by residents in the last local plan. Strongly believe in maintaining the local gap between Chilworth and Valley Park.
	10148	Breaches Local Gap that presently exists. Local Gaps were previously the most supported policy by Test Valley residents.
	10468	Disagree with the Velmore Farm proposal due to the breach of local gap which should be maintained
	10004 Valley Park Parish Council	It is disappointing that the local gap between Chilworth and Valley Park has been breached. The development at Velmore Farm breaches a local gap and if adopted will have significant impacts on residents of Valley Park. The proposed development at Velmore Farm compromises the role, character and integrity of the Local gap and is contrary to Policy E3.
	10869	I agree with Valley Park Parish Councils response such as the issues on local gaps
	10992	I hope this will not go ahead, I am concerned about there being no gap between settlements
	10869	If the Velmore Farm proposal was to go ahead, the loss of green belt land would lead to one large housing estate with thousands of houses
	11154	If this development goes ahead then might as well rename the area to 'Greater Southampton'
	10728	Is the Velmore Farm proposal a breach of a local gap?
	10986, 10988	It is disappointing that the local gap between Chilworth and Valley Park has been breached.
	10788	It seems that TVBC have chosen to site housing developments with little concern for local gaps
	11143	It would be a shame to lose a green belt area that people depend on for exercise
	10711	Joining Valley Park with Chilworth is contrary to all guidance in the Local Plan relating to strategic gaps
	10814 Westcoast Developments Ltd	Land at Velmore Farm would have a far greater impact in the integrity of the Local Gap. Whereas the presence of Hut Wood provides a degree of visual containment to Velmore Farm, there would be views into the site from the northern boundary with Castle Lane resulting in a greater degree of perceived coalescence.
	10397 Chilworth Parish Council	Land is in the local gap, this proposed site is unacceptable and effectively the removal of the existing gap with a replacement narrow border, would be a poor attempt to define the settlement of Chilworth and the proposed 1070 homes. This suggested amended local gap is not acceptable

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10986	Local gaps were the most supported policy in the last plan, the woodland, open fields, rural areas were vital during the pandemic, I benefit from this every day
	10524	Object the Velmore Farm development as it breaches the local gap which should be maintained
	10134, 10437, 10439, 10475, 10683, 10486, 10609, 10786, 10192, 10506, 10462, 10464, 10829, 10598, 10426, 10679, 10522, 11069	Object to the development of Velmore Farm because of the breach of the local gap.
	10505	The Velmore Farm development is concerning as it breaches the local gap
	10421	The Velmore farm proposal is unsustainable on account of the impact on and the breach of a local gap.
	10436	Object to the development of 1070 homes at Velmore Farm because of the loss of the local gap separating areas
	10687	Object to the proposals and TVBC must ensure that the lines of the strategic gap remain in place and cannot be encroached upon.
	11143	Object to the proposed development at Velmore farm because it is an infringement of the local gap
	10970, 10971, 10523, 10853, 10536, 10537, 10525	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it affects the local gap
	10562, 10508	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it breaches the local gap which I support the retention of.
	10726	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it infringes the local gap
	10739	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it will impact the space between Chandler's Ford and Southampton
	10494	The Velmore Farm development would take green belt land which maintains the gap between Test Valley, Eastleigh and Southampton
	10518	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it would destroy the green gap
	10904	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the local gap will disappear
	10831	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the breach of local gap which is vital to be maintained

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10674	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the breach of local gap, it is unacceptable to destroy the countryside
	10858	Object to Velmore Farm as it would damage the local gap
	11091	Objection to the Local Plan 2040, as the preferred site of Velmore Farm for 1,070 homes and 2.2 hectares for employment breaches a Local Gap.
	10445	Oppose the development of over 1000 houses at Velmore Farm because it will take away a significant local gap
	10440	Oppose the proposal at Velmore Farm on account of further erosion of the local gap
	10861	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as if residents are to continue engaging on consultations it is expected in return that the council applies the policies when considering development, especially ones expressed being of high importance such as, local gaps
	10861	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as it contravenes Policy E3 in the existing plan and Policy ENV4 in the proposed plan
	10836	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as it will close an extremely important green gap
	10847	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as it will significantly reduce the gap between local communities
	10987	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as it would mean a loss to the green space that breaks up the housing already in place
	10824	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as the development would fill in a local gap
	10850	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as the local gap will be significantly impacted
	10861	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the breach of local gap which is vital for physical and mental wellbeing especially as Valley Park has a higher population density (27 per hectare) than the rest of the borough (2 per hectare)
	10863	Oppose Velmore Farm due to the breach of local gap which will impact general wellbeing of residents
	10713	Opposed to the development of Velmore Farm as it breaks the strategic gap between the urban areas of Chilworth, North Baddesley and Stoneham Lane which are important for recreation, wildlife conservation and preservation of natural woodland and is a space for people to enjoy, meet other people and socialise enabling good mental health
	10974	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the removal of green space, starting the process of spreading the city of Southampton to engulf Chandler's Ford
	10472	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it is important to maintain a green gap between Southampton, Eastleigh and Chandler's Ford

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11000	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it is placed on the strategic gap which contradicts the previous local plan and it sets a dangerous precedent that will see Eastleigh and Chandler's Ford absorbed in a suburban sprawl of Greater Southampton
	10467	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it will cause North Baddesley, Chilworth and Valley Park to become one
	10459	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it closes the green gap between Chilworth and Valley Park
	10845	Strongly object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the breach of local gap which is crucial to be preserved, if developed there would be little differentiation between Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, Chilworth, North Baddesley.
	10709	Opposed to the proposed development of Velmore Farm because it is in a local gap between Chandler's Ford and Southampton
	10786	Object to the Velmore Farm development as it will cause Chandler's Ford to become a town joining up with North Baddesley and Chilworth
	10552	The area of the proposed development would breach the local gap and merge Valley Park and North Baddesley.
	11114	Object to the inclusion of Velmore Farm as it breaches the local gap between Valley Park and Chilworth
	10901	The breach of the local gap is clearly evident from the Council's map which shows local gaps as green stars between North Baddesley and both Valley Park and Chilworth. However, between Chilworth and Valley Park a pink triangle indicates a housing development -where has the green star (local gap) gone?
	10587	Losing the strategic gap between Valley Park and Chilworth is detrimental as it helps to ensure that developments have their own identity.
	10898	Fundamentally disagree that Velmore Farm should be developed for housing and commercial use as the local gap between Southampton and Eastleigh preserves the partly rural nature of Valley Park.
	11065	Against the proposal for development at Velmore Farm because the local gap with Southampton will be too small.
	10499	Against the Velmore Farm development as thought this land was to be kept clear so there was a definition between Chandler's Ford and Chilworth
	10849	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the incursion into the current green gap, the communities will soon lose their identities and exist as conurbations of Southampton
	10911	The area for the proposed development is the current Local Gap between Chandler's Ford, North Baddesley and Chilworth, the removal of which creates continuous development between the Horton Heath and Abbotswood developments.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10901	The development contravenes TV's local gap policy and according to p.4.194 the local gap between Southampton and Eastleigh is proposed to be amended to reflect this site but in the Adopted plan 2011-2029 a local gap is supposed to allow for a clear visual and physical break and prevent coalescence between urban areas -the houses in Chilworth and the proposed houses at Velmore Farm will both be readily visible when stood on the proposed green space at the edge of the proposed development.
	10637	The development will have an impact on the countryside and the 'local gap' between Valley Park and Chilworth will disappear-the previous plan has more emphasis placed on strategic gaps
	11048	The distinct gap of green fields between Valley Park and Chilworth is what provides a distinct separation between the settlements. Hut Wood does not provide this separation to the same extent.
	10175	The gap between Chandler's Ford and Chilworth/North Baddesley was given much importance when the Knightwood development was permitted but it has now been cut in half.
	10884	The land at Velmore Farm provides a natural green corridor and strategic gap between Valley Park and Chilworth/North Southampton, creating a buffer for residential areas and for wildlife to move around.
	10453	The Local Plan sets a dangerous precedent for future plans that could see Eastleigh and Chandler's Ford absorbed into Greater Southampton
	10626	The proposed development is a further loss of the strategic gap between Chandler's Ford and North Baddesley.
	10632	The proposed development will lead to the loss of the green local gap between Valley Park and North Baddesley.
	10495	The proposed development is on Velmore Farm which is the strategic gap between Chandler's Ford and Southampton.
	10516	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning because the gap between Southampton and Chandler's Ford is essential
	11088, 10588	The proposed development will breach the Local Gap between Chilworth and Valley Park.
	10702	The proposed development will lead to the breach of the Local Gap and the important separation of communities between Chilworth and Valley Park.
	10620, 10621	The proposed development will be in breach of the Local Gap linking North Baddesley, Valley Park and Chilworth.
	10589	The proposed development would lead to the loss of the strategic gap between Valley Park and Chilworth.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10601	The proposed development would mean a breach of the Local Gap, creating a continuous developed area from 'Asda roundabout' to Castle Lane, and it would also reduce the gap between Valley Park and North Baddesley.
	10685	The proposed development is a significant encroachment on the local gap between Southampton and Eastleigh and will have significant visual impact on Chilworth.
	10452	The proposal is in the Local Gap separating the area from Southampton, is it permitted to override this provision?
	10671	Velmore Farm is not a sensible option as development would lead to greater Southampton
	10599	The proposal to amend the local gap between Southampton and Eastleigh is an erosion of assurances made to preserve the gap.
	10843	The proposed new gap between Southampton and Eastleigh is insufficient for its intended purpose
	10515	The Velmore Farm proposal will mean the greenbelt dividing Eastleigh and North Baddesley will be lost
	10931	The proposed developments will mean there is no strategic gap between Southampton and Romsey.
	10967	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the loss of local gap, the area will become connected to Southampton changing the character
	11016	The Velmore Farm along with the Hut Wood in the Southampton-Eastleigh Local Gap offer a reprieve from overspilling urbanisation from Southampton.
	10980	Opposed to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the loss of green belt
	11064	Strongly agree with the importance of maintaining local gaps and keeping the openness provided by arable land.
	11054	Opposed to the development of Velmore Farm because the site is in a green gap that should be retained
	10805	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm development as it is contrary to the adopted plan providing a strategic gap in the countryside and as the distinct physical and visual separation will be diminished and set a strong precedent to other developers.
	10873	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the breach of local gap
	11083	The allocation at Velmore Farm takes breaches the local gap between Chilworth and Valley Park which has been enjoyed by residents for walking, bike riding and is vital to healthy living
	10978	The amended local gap for the Velmore Farm proposal will significantly denigrate the overall quality of the Valley Park locality for existing residents
	11086	The area is an important local gap that if destroyed will have a huge impact on the historical significance and the appearance as noted in the Council's Local Gap report

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10893	The closing of a local gap will have a negative impact on the area.
	10753	The designation Local Gaps become pointless if they can be amended to suit a proposed development. The Local Gap is being amended to the south of the site.
	10888, 10988	The development at Velmore Farm breaches a local gap and if adopted will have significant impacts on residents of Valley Park
	10558	The local gap and separation between communities will be lost as a result of the proposed development.
	10510	The local gap is important to the area and should remain.
	10618	The Local Gap that the proposed development breaches is unsuitable for development, despite the need for affordable housing and development this would be unsuitable.
	10423	The Local Plan should be shelved as its proposals have no regard for urban sprawl.
	10639	The proposal north of Castle Lane was rejected on the basis of loss/breach of the local gap and Castle Lane not being able to cope with additional traffic-so how is the development South of Castle Lane any different?
	10441	The proposal for homes in Chandler's Ford is in the wrong place as its on the green belt and eroding the countryside
	10427	The proposal to amend the local gap will lead to urban sprawl and diminish the green buffer.
	10635	The proposal to build 1070 homes on Velmore Farm will result in the breach of a local gap which is essential to maintaining the character of the area and will result in reduction in people's health and further burden the overstretched NHS
	11055	The proposal to build at Velmore Farm breaches the local gap between Valley Park and Chilworth which will have a detrimental effect on residents as it provides an open landscape and buffer for water absorption and run-off.
	11061	The proposal to build on Velmore Farm will breach a strategic gap
	10986, 10988	The proposed development at Velmore Farm compromises the role, character and integrity of the Local gap and is contrary to Policy E3
	10553	The proposed development breaches a local gap, and this could set a dangerous precedent for future developments.
	10597, 10565, 10583, 10624, 10746, 11042, 10489	The proposed development breaches the local gap.
	10614	The proposed development will lead to the breach of a local gap.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10631	The proposed development breaches an important local gap.
	10890	The proposed development breaches the Local Gap as it effectively adjoins Valley Park which means residents lose space between their area and Chilworth/North Baddesley.
	10689	The proposed development breaches the Local Gap between Chilworth and Valley Park, after previous promises to protect these gaps.
	10616	The proposed development breaches the Local Gap between Chilworth and Valley Park.
	11092	The proposed development breaches the Local Gap which has provided open space for residents and their interactions with wildlife.
	10594	The proposed development contradicts the Local Gap policy and fails to maintain the separate identities between villages and communities.
	10595	The proposed development contradicts the Local Gap policy and fails to maintain the separate identities between villages and communities.
	10596	The proposed development contradicts the Local Gap policy.
	10901	The proposed development including the green space, expands Valley Park within 100m of the houses in Chilworth, which is directly connected to Southampton as a result Chandler's Ford will become connected to Southampton
	10630	The proposed development is a significant encroachment on the local gap.
	10479, 10480	The development on the strategic gap green space between Southampton and Chandler's Ford contradicts the previous local plan - at that time emphasis was placed on the gaps and their importance in preserving the separation and identity of communities. Sets a dangerous precedent that could see further erosion in green separation that will see Eastleigh and Chandler's Ford absorbed in greater Southampton.
	10699	The proposed development will lead to a breach of the strategic gap which will be detrimental to the environment and residents.
	10600	The proposed development will lead to the erosion of the local gap and the green gap which separates communities.
	10629	The proposed development will lead to the loss of green space and as a result the benefit of the local gap to existing residents.
	10685	The proposed development would harm the local character and integrity of the Strategic Gap - the landscape character would be affected by multi-storey developments and the loss of biodiversity and wildlife characters.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10685	The Stephenson Halliday December 2023 LGA suggests that the wooded and agricultural areas within the Southampton-Eastleigh local gap has a valuable strategic function, though could allow development to the agricultural land.
	10986	The Velmore Farm proposal breaches a local gap and I appreciate the outdoors, nature, wildlife and rural landscape of Valley Park
	11136	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as it will close the rural gap between communities
	10735	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as it will reduce the local gap which may breach the requirement to be maintained
	10855	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as the strategic gap will be breached
	10199	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the breach of the local gap
	10968	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the loss of the local gap which will impact the community feel
	10668	The Velmore Farm proposal is disappointing due to the loss of local gap, despite 30+ years of assurances from the Council it would be protected the valuable space is being destroyed
	11058	The Velmore Farm proposal is supposed to be part of the local gap
	10843	The Velmore Farm proposal is unsuitable due to the breach of local gap which is there to provide green space, views and openness, development will destroy the character of the area
	11062	The Velmore Farm proposal would compromise the character and integrity of the local gap
	10496	The Velmore Farm proposal would remove even more of the local gap
	10710	There are a number of infrastructure issues that make this proposal detrimental to existing developments such as loss of local gaps
	11048	It seems that those areas with the motorway are better off because the housing companies don't want to build there as readily but see profit from developing green space.
	10736	Velmore Farm was a designated green space, what has changed?
	11056 Chandler's Ford Parish Council	Were any development on Velmore Farm to be progressed we ask the following issue be addressed; the proposal breaches the local gap, affecting Eastleigh borough, any plan should be subject to agreement by Eastleigh Borough Council on this point
	10453	The proposal to develop on the strategic gap between Southampton suburbs and Chandler's Ford contradicts the previous plan.
	10816 Elivia Homes Ltd	Land at Velmore Farm will have a far greater impact on the integrity of a local gap and the landscape character in general.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10816 Elivia Homes Ltd	The presence of Hut Wood provides a degree of visual containment there would be views into the site from the northern boundary with Castle Lane resulting in a greater degree of perceived coalescence.
	11048	Inappropriate to reduce the green gap between these areas to a matter of a few hundred meters because of the presence of a woods. The green space distinctively separates these areas.
Impacts on community	10495	The proposed development will significantly increase the pressure on the community.
	10752	The community in Valley Park will change drastically with the Velmore Farm proposal, more residents, traffic and noise
	10982	More homes will destroy such a nice community
	10148	Allocation although situated in parish of Chilworth will have significant impacts for Valley Park residents and those in wider area.
	10612	Development would have a significant impact on Valley Park residents. Proposed high number of houses compounds all of the negative impacts.
	10433	Object to the development of 1070 homes at Velmore Farm because of the lack of statements on the impact on the community specifically Valley Park
	10494	This development would have a detrimental effect on residents of Test Valley and our neighbours in North Baddesley and Eastleigh.
	11091	The plan offers no positive policies to maintain the viability of villages such as Valley Park, and to cope with the proposed development.
	10703	The proposed development at Velmore Farm will have a negative impact on existing residents in Chandler's Ford.
	11050	The Council should rethink the Velmore Farm proposal as it will not serve existing or new residents
	10843	The Velmore Farm proposal is situated at the edge of Test Valley and most residents will not use certain Test Valley facilities
Infrastructure – community facilities	11098	The proximity of the Local Hub and community centre is only a 5 minute walk from the boundary of the proposed site.
	10794 Wates Development Limited	The site promoter has indicated that subject to further liaison with the local community and viability testing, the site could make provision for a community hub / local centre to enhance its sustainability. This could be referred to within policy SA6, with wording suggested: Policy SA6 could refer to "A Neighbourhood centre with a range of community facilities falling within Use Class E including, but not limited to library, retail, employment, and potential healthcare.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11134	Community facility space must be set aside for social needs for all age levels including schools, surgeries, sports facilities, local shops, police stations, cemeteries, faith communities, etc and should take into account current deficiencies or excesses in existing neighbouring communities
	11134	There should be plans dedicated to the upgrade of facilities in neighbouring communities to cope with stress
Construction impacts	10845	Strongly object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the construction will cause noise pollution, access issues, roadworks and large lorries in the area.
Flood risk and drainage	10068 Environment Agency	A site-specific flood risk assessment should demonstrate that the site will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and where possible will reduce flood risk overall.
	10068 Environment Agency	Not demonstrated that this site provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk.
	10863	Oppose Velmore Farm as recent flooding on Castle Lane indicates drainage issues emanating from the site
	10798 Barratt David Wilson Homes	Wet ditch runs north to south through the eastern part of the site, which is flanked by woodland, with further established planting on the north east corner of the site where it meets with Templars Way / Castle Lane.
	10449	Where will all the surface rainwater go if the site is developed?
	10362 Eastleigh Borough Council	Specific locations in the Chandler's Ford area have experienced localised flooding events. This is understood to be as a result of surface water flooding and sewers being at over capacity. Concerned proposal to allocate 1,070 dwellings and other developments at Velmore Farm will exacerbate this situation.
	10362 Eastleigh Borough Council	Welcome Criterion i) which states that development will be directed to part of site at lowest risk of flooding. However, criterion i) should also state that development should not increase the risk of flooding off site.
	10362 Eastleigh Borough Council	Evidence base should assess (proportionate to a plan level) the wider flood risk issue to identify the measures that need to be put in place to ensure that flood risk in the wider area is not increased, in dialogue with the Environment Agency. This may need some further assessment following from PfSH SFRA1. Objection in principle at this stage.
	11065	Against the proposal for development at Velmore Farm because there is already flooding at the roundabout of the junction between School Lane and Templars Way due to the presence of clay soil in the area and more housing will exacerbate the problem

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10429	Against the proposed development at Velmore Farm and it will require additional infrastructure to cater for flooding around the School Lane / Templars Way junction
	10462, 10464	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the proposed site entrance is a known flooding zone.
	10931	School Lane has a consistent problem with flooding, and it will be the main access road to the new development and another access road in Castle Lane also has a problem with flooding.
	10934	The access at the roundabout on School Lane is unsuitable due to it being the diversion route and susceptible to flooding.
	11126, 11127	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the proposed access, the poor road design has caused accidents and near misses at the Castle Lane junction
	11086	The plan to have a single exit/access for more than 1000 homes onto a roundabout which is regularly flooded is poor planning
	10499	Against the Velmore Farm development as weather related issues causes this area to flood as the drainage is poor
	10983	Against the Velmore Farm proposal as issues with surface water flooding need to be resolved
	10424	Against the Velmore farm proposal on account of the flooding on the local highways.
	10431	Against the Velmore farm proposal on account of the impact on flooding
	10709	Although the underground pipes are being repaired, they will not be able to cope with the amount of rainwater that will be collected if the new housing is built especially due to the prevalence of clay soils in the area
	10578	Building the proposed development on a slope will raise the water table and increase the danger of flooding in the area.
	10625	Building the proposed development on fields adjacent to Templars Way will reduce the natural scope for rainfall soaking into the ground and exacerbate existing issues along Templars Way and School Lane.
	10784	Car parks and the area have been heavily puddled and roads are regularly puddled leaving traffic veering off the natural drive line to avoid
	10706	Concerned and opposed to the proposal to build 1070 homes on Velmore farm because the development will lead to more flooding during heavy rainfall
	10425	Concerned that the proposal on Velmore Farm will exacerbate the already existing flooding on the roundabout junction of Templars Way / School Lane as far as the industrial estate.
	10555	Concerned that the Velmore Farm proposal would worsen the flooding seen along Templars Way and Castle Lane
	10984	Concerned the one entrance to the Velmore Farm proposal floods at times

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10560	Considerable flooding from Templars Way and into School Lane consistently blocks roads and pedestrian footpaths. The removal of existing plans to hold water would mean a risk of additional surface water adding to the existing flooding problems, which could cause damage to properties.
	10453	Currently all of the storm drainage goes via Monks Brook, Chandler's Ford railway station and Bournemouth Road near Asda and on to Flemming Park. In addition to the development at the Old Sawmill site on Baddesley Road drains through to Chandler's Ford and parts of Eastleigh. This may trigger a review of flood risk zones with some or all of Pennine Way and Skipton road being raised to Flood Zone 3, which will influence home insurance costs.
	10488	Detailed water management plans will be required for the Velmore Farm proposal due to the issue with flooding
	10478	Disagree with the Velmore Farm proposal as it would only increase the current problem the local area has around School Lane and Templars Way with flooding
	10468	Disagree with the Velmore Farm proposal as the land is clay soil, School Lane and the roundabout is regularly flooded
	10632	Existing flooding problems in Valley Park would be exacerbated if the proposed development commences on clay soil.
	10510	Disingenuous to state there is a small area at risk of surface water flooding - Templars Way floods whenever there is heavy rainfall. There will be significant impact on existing residents from the runoff water from hard surfaces in the proposed development.
	10532	Do not support the Velmore Farm development due to the existing flooding issues
	10397 Chilworth Parish Council	Document states small areas at risk of surface water flooding on site and sequential approach will be taken to locate development. Well known that proposed site slants towards Castle Lane and Templars Way which has been the location of deep flooding which additionally affects School Lane.
	10612	Existing and ongoing issue from surface water from the site. Surface water flows onto Templars Way, School Lane and Castle Lane, adding to rising water table, creating deep flooded areas cross these highways. Attempts to rectify this have been unsuccessful.
	10691	Existing flooding issues on Castle Lane and Templars Way make access to these roads for cyclists and pedestrians difficult, which will be made worse by additional traffic from the proposed development.
	10862	Existing flooding seen in School Lane and Templars Way proves the vulnerability of the area, the runoff from the development could lead to further flooding especially if climate change leads to heavier rainfall
	10859	Express concern to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the existing flooding at School Lane roundabout and the development will only increase this

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10893	Flooding has become a worsening problem in the School Lane/Castle Lane area.
	10959	Flooding has become an increasing issue on footpaths and roads - an issue exacerbated by other developments. The proposed development would worsen this issue.
	10951	Flooding has not been given sufficient provision for the future in the plan.
	10515	Flooding is a concern around the Velmore Farm site, Castle Lane and Templars Way always flood and the fields currently act as floodplains
	10884	Flooding is a frequent occurrence in School Lane, proving current drainage is inadequate. Were Velmore Farm to be put under concrete, flooding would worsen as the current land absorbs the rainwater.
	10489	Flooding is a major issue in the area around the Velmore Farm proposal due to the predominance of clay, School Lane had to close as it was impassable and development on this land would only exacerbate the issues
	10746	Flooding is a major problem at the School Lane and the roundabout which has never been resolved, development at Velmore Farm will exacerbate an already serious problem.
	10614	Flooding is a significant problem in the area and the development of housing well exacerbate this.
	10644	Flooding is already an issue and building more houses will worsen the situation
	10962	Future proofing for flooding has not been addressed in the plan.
	10494	How could the Velmore Farm development be allowed when there is severe flood risk in the area by run off from the fields of this site?
	10808	How is surface water going to be dealt with - the roundabout at School Lane and Templars Way already has severe flooding issues
	10869	Agree with Valley Park Parish Council's response such as the issues on surface water flooding
	10992	I hope this will not go ahead, there is too much standing water when it rains
	10709	If any new housing is to be built on Velmore Farm, balancing ponds similar to the ones at Knightwood Park would have to be built with more adequate drainage to local rivers as well
	10784	Impossible to navigate from Park Pharmacy to Valley Park Community Centre in normal footwear using footpaths from flooding, the water has been fast and gushing above shoe level
	10918	Issues of flooding and traffic are not significant obstacles to the proposed development.
	10666	It seems there has been no independent impact assessment on the drainage around Velmore Farm, School Lane/Templars Way roundabout is prone to flooding and development would exacerbate this unless there is sufficient drainage and sewers.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10636	Local flooding is a known problem on School Lane and the junction with Templars Way because of the clay soils in Valley Park causing drainage issues- the loss of ground for the rainwater to soak through will exacerbate flooding.
	10535	Local flooding will be worsened by the additional 1070 homes from the proposed development.
	10148	Long standing surface water issues (over ten years) that will be made worse by the proposed development. Surface water from this site flows onto Templars Way, School Lane roundabout, and School Lane causing deep flooded areas across the highway. In past, School Lane has to be closed off with water taken away in tankers. Pavement and roadway have been damaged requiring repairs. Also flooding of Castle Lane. Flooding increased taking account of weather conditions caused by climate change.
	10688	Major flooding issues off of the land at Velmore Farm cause problems on Templars Way and School Lane roundabout, which will be exacerbated by the development of 1070 homes.
	10784	Many houses in the area are at high risk for surface water flooding, further run off from the site will leave existing homeowners defenceless.
	10542	More houses will cause more flooding issues to the bogged land.
	11092	Much of the Valley Park area is vulnerable to surface water flooding and local roads to the proposed development along Templars Way, School Lane are regularly subject to flooding. What measures are being taken to stop this issue from worsening with the proposed development.
	11100	Much of the Valley Park area is vulnerable to surface water flooding and local roads to the proposed development along Templars Way, School Lane are regularly subject to flooding. What measures are being taken to stop this issue from worsening with the proposed development.
	10599	No mention of the increased flood risk to roads such as School Lane and Templars Way that are permanently flooded, and the development being on a hill means the water will run off down to the existing developments. An assessment should be made by an independent flood surveyor before development permission is granted.
	11048	No work has been done to combat the flooding on School Lane which will face more pressure with the proposed development.
	10433	Object to the development of 1070 homes at Velmore Farm because it will put existing homes in Valley Park and Knightwood at greater risk of flooding from ground water and storm drains since it is at an elevated position
	10134	Object to the development of 1070 homes at Velmore Farm because of flooding issues on Templars Way and Castle Lane.
	10439	Object to the development of 1070 homes at Velmore Farm because of the flooding on Templars Way which will be worsened

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10603	Object to the Velmore Farm development due to flooding around the area and Templars Way roundabout
	10562	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it will exacerbate current drainage and flooding issues, particularly along Templars Way
	10437	Object to the development of 1070 homes at Velmore Farm because of the flooding on School Lane and around School Lane roundabout along with Castle Lane which will be exacerbated with new development
	11143	Object to the proposed development at Velmore farm because of the flooding already experienced on Templars Way and Castle Lane that runs off the incline from Velmore Farm
	10677	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as Templars Way is already subject to frequent flooding which is a serious hazard, development would lead to dangerous surface and groundwater flooding
	10831	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as Templars Way, other local roads and the site are frequently flooded, the land is simply not suitable for development
	10853	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the area is prone to flooding particularly around the roundabout and School Lane junction
	10829	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to flooding especially at the roundabout near Templars Way which is the proposed access point
	10508	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the current drainage and flooding issues, particularly along Templars Way
	11084	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the constant flooding such as on School Lane
	10459	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to flooding which can be seen at the junction and roundabout at School Lane and Templars Way, building on this land which is clay soil will make this problem worse.
	10786	Object to the Velmore Farm development as it will make drainage matters worse around the roundabout near Chandler's Ford Industrial Estate and Templars Way where flooding is already an issue.
	10726	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as roads surrounding Templars Way flood regularly making it difficult for cars to pass causing traffic disruption. Development will exacerbate this issue and worsen over time with climate change
	10435	Object to the development of 1070 homes at Velmore Farm because of the flooding on Templars Way and School Lane. The land on Velmore Farm is really boggy and floods easily.
	10643	Object to the proposed development at Velmore Farm because there is already serious flooding on the roundabout on Templars Way/School Lane due to the clay soils and drains that always seem overwhelmed probably due to poor maintenance.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10192	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it would increase flooding by reducing the ability for the ground to absorb heavy rainfall. As the area is clay, flooding is already seen on School Lane and the roundabout at Templars Way / School Lane junction.
	10987	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as flooding on School Lane and the roundabout is horrendous and causes much disruption and would only be worse with this development
	10420	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal on account of flooding which is already an issue on Templars Way at the School Lane roundabout and also where School lane crosses Castle lane.
	10861	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as Templars Way, School Lane and Castle Lane frequently suffer from deep surface water flooding which has remained unresolved
	10850, 10867	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as the area has caused major flooding on the road system which has remained unresolved, lack of grassland will increase this. Flooding issues on Castle Lane indicate significant drainage problems.
	10525	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the increased risk of flooding, the roundabout at the south end of School Lane, School Lane and the western Templars Way exit from the roundabout routinely floods and no consideration has been given to this within the proposal
	10974	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as flooding is a risk especially along Templars Way and School Lane, building on clay soil will make this worse
	10904	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the flooding on Templars Way and roundabout on School Lane, surface water accumulates and has worsened due to climate change, this needs to be addressed with some urgency
	11085	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as flooding is already an issue around School Lane and Templars Way, how will this be managed?
	10679	Object to Velmore Farm as Templars Way and the roundabout is subject to flooding every time it rains making the area almost impassable, development will further increase the risk of severe flooding
	10521	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the frequent flooding around School Lane and the roundabout, more homes will only make this worse
	10535	School Lane is considerably flooded and there is no evidence to suggest the council would create the infrastructure to solve this problem, which would become worse with the proposed development.
	10524	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the current flooding, the drainage cannot cope, School Lane roundabout is an example where this is seen
	10650	School Lane roundabout is often flooded
	10443	Object to the proposed development at Velmore Farm because there are already flooding issues in School Lane which will be made worse as the site is on higher ground

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10788	School Lane, Templars Way and Castle Lane are often under water due to run off from the Velmore Farm site, the existing surface drainage can barely cope
	10836	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as the runoff from the site contributes to frequent and significant flooding in Templars Way and School Lane, development will have a serious impact on local drainage
	10997	Opposed to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the flooding issue on School Lane, Templars Way and the roundabout which will be exacerbated by this development. Developers and Local Authorities do not account for the way in which drainage is so detrimentally affected by development.
	10639	Opposed to the proposal for development at Velmore farm because Templars Way and Castle Lane already suffer from regular flooding. The loss of green space that currently soaks and drains the water runoff will add further pressure on the roads and increase flooding.
	10647	Opposed to the proposed development at Velmore Farm because Chandler's Ford already experiences severe flooding on the adjoining roads and through the industrial estate
	11126, 11127	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the flooding issues, climate change is increasing surface water and flooding and School Lane can become impassible
	10601	Paragraph 4.199 mentions flood risk in parts though does not address the significant longstanding flooding problems between Templars Way and School Lane - the most proposed development will make this worse.
	10651	Strongly disagree with the Velmore Farm proposal as the School Lane roundabout is continually flooded, development will exacerbate this to the extent nearby houses would turn into a floodplain
	10465	Object to the development of Velmore Farm because adding 1070 more homes it will exacerbate flooding in the area
	10475	Object to the development of Velmore farm because flooding is already very bad
	10520	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it will likely lead to further flooding
	10531	Object to the Velmore Farm development due to the existing flooding issues
	10643	Object to the proposed development on Velmore farm on account of the impact on flooding risk.
	10429	Object to the proposed development on Velmore Farm on account of the impact on flooding risk.
	10486	Object to the Velmore Farm development as it will exacerbate existing flooding of local highways and land
	10609	Object to the Velmore Farm development due to existing flooding issues
	11000	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as areas are in flood risk zone 2, additional insurance cost is a possibility and would be a burden on fixed income households

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10469	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it will be detrimental to the current state of blocked drains causing flooding
	10866	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as road infrastructure is already unable to cope, they are repeatedly flooded
	11000	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as Templars Way and School Lane already have a flooding issue, this development would make it worse and threaten several areas and may trigger a review of flood risk zones. Storm surge protection is needed but it is not mentioned at all.
	10872	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as Templars Way floods after a small amount of rain which will only be exacerbated by the runoff from this development
	10678	Strongly oppose Velmore Farm due to the flooding along Templars Way and adjacent areas as well as the proposed access, exacerbating the issue downstream towards School Lane posing a safety risk
	10004 Valley Park Parish Council	Surface water from Velmore Farm already accumulates onto Templars Way, School Lane and Castle Lane causing flooding and this has been worsening over the past 10 years and has not been addressed. The large scale development west of Knightwood Road needs large balancing ponds to alleviate surface water flooding of homes east of Knightwood Road.
	10914	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the surface water flooding on Templars Way and School Lane
	10474	Templars Way already has flooding issues which will be exacerbated
	11088, 11091	The current surface water flooding in Castle Lane and School Lane is not a small issue and has been consistently increasing for many years. Developing on the land at Velmore Farm will only worsen the problem as the proposed site is on clay soils at a higher point to Valley Park. Surface water will channel downhill, raising the risk of flooded homes in Valley Park.
	10453	Templars Way and School Lane currently flood and additional drainage from the development will make it worse.
	10624	Templars Way and School Lane has flooding problems and the proposed development will exacerbate this as it the development will be built on predominantly clay soil.
	11087	Templars Way has an issue with flooding which can increase traffic congestion, so is unsuitable as an access road to the proposed development.
	10994	Surface water flooding is a big issue around Templars Way / School Lane roundabout, how will this be sorted?
	11030	Templars Way/School Lane is frequently flooded and the runoff from new houses will make this worse.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10977	Surface water flooding on Templars Way roundabout has been an issue for years and the increase in impermeable ground will only exacerbate this.
	10804	Surface water drains down and floods Templars Way and School Lane, building on Velmore Farm will add to this already serious problem
	10986, 10988, 10888	Surface water from Velmore Farm already accumulates onto Templars Way, School Lane and Castle Lane causing flooding and this has been worsening over the past 10 years and has not been addressed.
	10702	The access point to the proposed development at the Templars Way/School Lane roundabout is frequently flooded, and additional houses on this land will exacerbate this issue.
	10442	Strongly object to the proposal for development at Velmore Farm as building on the green space will exacerbate the flooding issues in School Lane.
	10833	Strongly oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the flooding already seen on the road and roundabout joining Templars Way and School Lane, which has never been dealt with.
	10970, 10971	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the area is prone to flooding and the plan does not take into account or describe the measures needed to alleviate this issue.
	10518	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the area suffers extreme flooding and the development would only increase this
	10482	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the local roads regularly flood
	10837	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to existing flooding issues
	10608	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to existing flooding on local highways and land
	10536, 10537	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the current flood issues, this development will increase flooding due to the high levels of clay in the area
	11060	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the existing flooding and this will only make it worse
	10523	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the existing flooding of local highways and land
	10504	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the flooding in the area, it is unsafe and developing the land will make it worse
	11002	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the inadequate planning for flood management
	10462, 10464	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the increase in local flooding
	10430	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal on account of increase in flooding risk
	10426, 10422	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal on account of the impact on flooding.
	10487, 10598	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal on the grounds of the increased risk of flooding
	10506	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal which will result in more flooding

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10445	Oppose the development of over 1000 houses at Velmore Farm because it will increase flooding of the roads.
	10805	Oppose the Velmore Farm development as surface water flooding should be considered
	10847	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as flooding has been getting progressively worse, development would increase this to detrimental levels potentially reaching homes
	10718	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as the area is prone to flooding, development will make it worse
	10824	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as there is already a lot of flooding from the site onto nearby roads which would be bound to increase
	11072	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the consistent and prevalent flooding on the eastern boundary at the access point. Building on this land will increase run off worsening an already problematic drainage situation.
	10522	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal due to the risk of flooding due to clay through the land in the area
	10752	The clay land at Velmore Farm causes flooding on School Lane roundabout and development will only make it worse if drainage is not sorted
	10711	The flooding at School Lane roundabout will be exacerbated if the higher area the site is on is built on with concrete
	10863	Oppose Velmore Farm as the site which runs into Templars Way has caused major flooding to the road system for years, development and climate change would increase these issues which remain unresolved
	11054	Opposed to the development of Velmore Farm as the surface water will be increased and could compound flooding issues on school Lane and Templars Way if drainage is not properly designed in.
	10546	The flooding on the roundabout at Templars Way/School Lane will get worse than it already is if houses are built on the slope at Velmore Farm as there will be more run off water.
	10589	The issue of consistent flooding at the School Lane/Templars Way roundabout will be exacerbated by the proposed development.
	10479, 10480	The draining issue caused by the 100 acres of new houses and new school will make the flooding on School Lane and Templars Way worse.
	10473	The infrastructure is struggling around the Velmore Farm proposal such as flooding particularly on School Lane and Templars Way
	11062	The local roads around the Velmore Farm proposal such as Templars Way flood regularly
	10700, 10701	The proposed development on Velmore Farm will increase the water runoff and exacerbate the current flooding problem at Templars Way and School Lane.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10580	The main access point to the proposed development at Templars Way roundabout is prone to flooding, which will be increased by the housing being built on heavy clay which struggles from drainage problems.
	10713	The increase in tarmac and concrete from the development will cause more flooding on the School Lane roundabout as the soils are clay and it already floods repeatedly
	10626	The flooding experienced on Templars Way and local roads will be exacerbated by the proposed development.
	10887	The proposed area for development on Templars Way has caused major flooding in recent years, and replacing grassland with concrete would increase flooding levels.
	10709	The planned access coming from the roundabout at Templars Way/ School Lane floods on a regular basis leaving mud across the whole road and roundabout and if the development goes ahead the traffic will increase on these poor road conditions
	10637	The proposed development has only one access from the roundabout which is constantly flooded, if the development goes ahead, the planning department needs to ensure that the developers provide sufficient resources and funding to resolve the flooding like is happening in Abbotswood and Colden Common
	11061	The proposal to build on Velmore Farm will take away a vital soakaway land and cause more flooding that already occurs on the roundabout and School Lane
	10559	The loss of the Velmore Farm fields will lead to more water run off onto School Lane, which already suffers from consistent flooding.
	10659	The land at Velmore Farm is higher than most of Valley Park and Knightwood and the run-off from there causes habitual flooding especially along the Templars Way roundabout and School Lane leading to the industrial estate
	10618	The existing issues of flooding on the main access point to the proposed site (School Lane roundabout onto Templars Way) will be exacerbated as it will be developed on predominantly clay soil, and it is situated on higher ground with access for heavy vehicles.
	10710	The failure to maintain drainage at School Lane roundabout leads to flooding and mud when it rains and School Lane, Flexford Road (in both directions from Knighthood Road), Baddesley road towards North Baddesley and the junction with Hursley Road all flood
	10427	Opposed to the proposal at Velmore Farm on account of environmental and flooding concerns
	10980	Opposed to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the additional flood risk
	10850	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as climate change has already had a significant impact on flooding which will only get worse

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10397 Chilworth Parish Council	Question how growing rainwater and proposed wastewater is anticipated to successfully feed into treatment works linked to the River Itchen SAC requiring appropriate mitigation. Existing flooding is significant, how can runoff be coped with that there would be no effect on Valley Park and surrounding areas
	10458	Roads around the Velmore Farm proposal are commonly flooded
	10601	Serious concern that building is considered on land that is predominantly clay soil and given recent climate change effects - any development will make flooding worse. Flood mitigation should be pursued including balancing ponds and wetland areas.
	11105	The predominance of clay soils in the area means that flooding is more regular and the roads adjacent to the roundabout that leads onto Templars Way and is the proposed access to the new development is consistently flooded.
	10177	The presence of heavy clay soils at Velmore Farm extending to Knightwood adds to the flooding issue
	10638	Serious concerns about the proposal for development at Velmore Farm because increased building on this land along with paved gardens will cause greater runoff and increase flooding
	10794 Wates Development Limited	Site promoter supports the need to adopt a sequential approach to the development site itself, taking into account flood risk from all sources, including surface water flooding.
	10635	Southern Water infrastructure will not cope with additional volumes of surface water due to the hardstanding that will be created with the development
	10479, 10480	Storm drainage goes via Monks Brook, Chandler's Ford train station and Bournemouth Road which threatens areas in Chandler's Ford and may see areas such as Pennine Way or Skipton Road to be raised into flood risk zone 3, meaning they can only obtain insurance underwritten by the government.
	10453	Storm Surge protection will be needed to protect Chandler's Ford but this is not mentioned in the Plan.
	10848	Strongly object the Velmore Farm proposal due to the drainage issues and without an increase in water run off areas, there is a risk of adjacent homes and local roads flooding
	10845	Strongly object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the proposed access is prone to flooding and due to the considerable issues of surface water flooding on Templars Way, School Lane and Castle Lane, development would increase this and without drainage works it would be a disaster for local infrastructure.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10635	Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) will not resolve the flooding issue due to the prevalence of clay soils
	10488	The access to the Velmore Farm proposal floods year round and adding substantial hard surfacing will only exacerbate the situation
	10479, 10480	The additional insurance cost for areas such as gardens and open spaces in flood risk zone 2 will be a burden on households on fixed incomes.
	10784	The amenities at the local sports centre are saturated by current water levels which will be further impaired with additional developments
	10448	The area already floods without more tarmac runoff
	10491	The area around Velmore Farm floods and concreting over it will not help
	10659	The area is in a high risk flood zone and this will become worse with expected climate changes which will affect local wildlife, flora and fauna
	10955	The area is regularly impacted by flooding and this issue will be worsened by the proposed development.
	10583	The area proposed for development has experienced flooding for years and any development will exacerbate this issue, as the land is predominantly clay and holds water.
	11017	The council/utility infrastructure has failed in preventing severe flooding on the roads and to sort the problem of blocked drains/sewers on the roads and footpaths, a problem which will be worsened by the proposed development.
	11138	The development will increase already existing flooding issues especially in Pennard Way which is located at the bottom of a continuous slope from the Velmore Farm site - will the council build drains into gardens on streets such as this one? The development will exacerbate already existing flooding issues.
	10646	The development will result in increased run off into Monks Brook, currently Velmore Farm mitigates against flooding, once built on will impact local rivers and cause more frequent flooding
	11160	The draft plan has highlighted the problem of flooding of local highways -how will this be handled differently when currently the flood warning signs have not been collected and have become a permanent feature of the roadside without any visible attempts to clear the drains
	10982	The drainage problem which already causes tremendous issues with flooding will only worsen with more homes
	11007	The environmental changes have resulted in saturation of surrounding areas, the Velmore Farm proposal can only negatively impact this

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10553	The erection of housing on clay-based land would exacerbate the current issue of flooding in this area.
	10620, 10621	The proposed development of housing on predominantly clay soil will exacerbate flooding issues, especially on surrounding roads such as Templars Way and School Lane which will be access points to the development.
	10539	The existing roads and footpaths are regularly flooded, including the entrance and main access point to the proposed development.
	10607	The flood risk will increase due to the proposed development being built on land which is predominantly clay soil.
	10584	The flooding in the area causes concern for the Velmore Farm proposal due to the soil composition
	10565	The major issues with flooding in the area will be exacerbated by building proposed development on this land as most of the land in this area is clay.
	10637	The flooding on roads in Valley Park has become worse every year and this had knock-on effects with streams and brooks being unable to cope with the excess water due to the inability to absorb the amounts of rainfall because of the clay soils prevalent in the area and these problems will be made worse with climate change
	10888, 10986, 10988	The large scale development west of Knightwood Road needs large balancing ponds to alleviate surface water flooding of homes east of Knightwood Road.
	10590	The local area has consistent flooding issues and this will be exacerbated by the proposed development.
	10686	The local plan does not do enough to address ecological concerns such as flooding.
	10599	The new development is described as sustainable despite the proposed development increasing the flood risk.
	10507	The problem of flooding on Templars Way will be exacerbated by the development of over 1000 houses on the slopes above the road.
	10753	The proposed access point of the site is particularly susceptible to flooding after moderate rainfall.
	11097	The proposed development at Velmore Farm will have a significant impact on the current flooding issues on the roads surrounding Valley Park, as roads and paths are sometimes currently impassible.
	10617	The proposed development of a greenfield site will lead to an increased flood risk in an area already prone to flooding.
	10579	The proposed development on this land will exacerbate the issue of flooding.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10513	The proposed development site is elevated and therefore the runoff from ground water and storm drains would see an increased flood risk for existing residents.
	10616	The proposed development will be located on higher ground and will be built on clay based soil, increasing the flood risk and surface water that runs onto Templars Way, School Lane and Castle Lane.
	10567	The proposed development will bring with it drainage problems and an increased flood risk.
	10481	The proposed development will cause significant drainage problems, exacerbating to existing flooding issues.
	10699	The proposed development will exacerbate flooding issues on Templars Way/School Lane and School Lane/Warwick Close as the allocated land is significantly higher, as well as being on hard surfaces with drainage issues.
	10582	The proposed development will exacerbate issues with flooding.
	10581	The proposed development will exacerbate the current problem with flooding.
	10574, 10578	The proposed development will exacerbate the issue of local flooding.
	10594, 10595, 10596	The proposed development will greatly increase flooding, due to building on predominantly clay soil which offers poor drainage.
	10685	The proposed development will have an effect on hydrology, exacerbating an area already susceptible to ground water flooding as Velmore Farm is higher elevations.
	10588	The proposed development will lead to an increased risk of flooding.
	10558	The proposed development will lead to more water flowing down the road to School Lane, which already suffers from consistent flooding.
	10934	The proposed development will make the problem of flooding in the area worse due to new roads and concrete drives.
	10687	The proposed development will see an increase in existing flooding issues in the area.
	10631	The proposed development will significantly increase the amount of flooding on local highways.
	10495	The proposed development will worsen the issue of flooding, particularly at the roundabout identified as the entry point to the development.
	10896	The proposed development would exacerbate the flooding issue along Templars Way and School Lane, as the lower ground of Valley Park will be overwhelmed by the run-off of flood water from the higher ground south of Templars Way.
	10593	The proposed development would increase the flood risk around Templars Way and School Lane, causing drainage issues and giving run off water nowhere to absorb.
	10891	The proposed development would worsen the issue of flooding in the area.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10939	The proposed developments turning green land into roads and buildings increased the flood risk as it reduces the natural area to soak up excess water.
	11098	The proposed site will move from primarily vegetation and grassland to paving, which will dramatically increase the running surface water, worsening the drainage problem.
	10911	The removal of permeable farmland and countryside and replacement of this with houses and roads will lead to an increased risk of flooding in the immediate area to the proposed development.
	10629	The replacement of green spaces and trees with building sites and concrete will significantly increase the local flood risk.
	10496	The roads around the Velmore Farm proposal already have significant issues with localised flooding
	10683	The roads in the area flood when it rains and this will be exacerbated with the development of housing
	10570	The roads surrounding the development have significant flooding issues which cause further traffic and congestion.
	10734	The roundabout and adjoining roads by Velmore Farm flood regularly disrupting traffic flow, the sewer system cannot cope and Hampshire County Council have never addressed this issue
	11058	The roundabout at the end of School Lane and between the pedestrian crossing and Warwick Close flood badly and the Velmore Farm proposal will exacerbate this
	10707	The roundabout at the end of the industrial estate is often flooded even with a small amount of rain, building on the site will increase flooding
	10901	The roundabout between Templars Way and School Lane floods after half a day of mild rain and on a stormy day cars are blocked and traffic is at a standstill therefore by building on the higher ground at Velmore farm, the flooding will be exacerbated
	10552	The roundabout on Templars Way/School Lane is prone to flooding, and this will be made worse by the development of housing on predominantly clay soil.
	11088	The scale of the proposed development will exacerbate existing issues such as the flooding from surface water across roads.
	10689	The soil in the surrounding area to Velmore Farm is chalked based and drainage problems mean flooding is common, which will be exacerbated by the proposed development.
	10890	The soil locally is clay based and heavy rain along Templars Way, School Lane and Castle Lane causes heavy flooding which will worsen with the proposed development.
	10600	The surrounding the area to the site's access suffers from extreme flooding and would increase due to the proposed development. The impact on existing residents should be considered.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10505	The Velmore Farm development is concerning as flooding is a major issue in Templars Way and School Lane
	10629	The Velmore Farm development is proposed to be built on clay soil which does not drain well and adds to existing drainage issues. The pictures enclosed show drainage and flooding issues in the area.
	10649	The Velmore Farm development will only worsen the flooding seen on local roads which has failed to be resolved
	10421	The Velmore farm proposal is unsustainable on account of the impact on flooding
	11050	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as flooding is often experienced off the roundabout which is the proposed access
	10989	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as it will only add to the flooding at the roundabout joining Templars Way and School Lane which runs down School Lane causing significant flooding
	11136	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as it will only exacerbate the flooding seen on the School Lane/Templars Way roundabout and in School Lane itself
	10735	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as the access point and School Lane suffers from flooding and poor drainage which will be exacerbated, there is no indication of mitigation such as balancing ponds
	10985	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as the areas flood often with poor weather
	10855	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as the roundabout at School Lane already floods badly often down to Castle Lane, development will increase this causing further disruption
	10865	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as there is a long standing issue with flooding around School Lane and the roundabout, development would increase this risk with less area for water to absorb
	10509	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to flooding at School Lane and Templars Way, more building work would increase the run off as the area is clay based
	10874	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the existing flooding on Templars Way which the council has not resolved, development will not help this
	10968	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the flooding issues
	10967	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the flooding issues which can be seen at the mini roundabout, this would make matters worse
	10964	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the flooding on the roundabout and School Lane which had to shut recently and the crossing was impassible, this development would exacerbate this issue

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11006	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the increased risk in flooding
	11139	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the rapidly growing flooding issue, School Lane can be almost impossible and Templars Way can see the whole southbound lane flooded. This development would increase surface water run off and overburden the drainage system
	10668	The Velmore Farm proposal is disappointing due to the flooding on Templars Way/School Lane, the consequence being chaotic traffic with large delays. Development will increase this and significant investment will be required to reverse this situation
	10908	The Velmore Farm proposal is ill-considered as the roads around the site are liable to flooding including Castle Lane, what will be done to avoid this getting worse?
	10526	The Velmore Farm proposal is not practical as it will make flooding even worse
	10728	The Velmore Farm proposal is ridiculous as the access point and the roundabout in School Lane experiences flooding and has for many years, it has become hazardous and has never been rectified
	10843	The Velmore Farm proposal is unsuitable as surface water will increase and compound the issues on School Lane, Templars Way and the roundabout at the proposed access. The drainage system in its current form cannot cope.
	10155	The Velmore Farm proposal is very concerning due to flooding
	10199	The Velmore Farm proposal would increase the problems with flooding seen in both Castle Lane and School Lane due to the runoff from the field
	10517	The Velmore Farm site is not appropriate as the loss of farmland will increase the flooding issues seen at School Lane roundabout
	10823	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning as School Lane and the roundabout regularly flood and this development would only make it worse
	10635	There are already issues with flooding of local highways, Castle Lane consistently when it rains due to the clay soils prevalent in the area
	10632	There are inadequate current flooding provisions that would need to be addressed to prior to any local development, as the balancing ponds are under stress and Monks Brook is overtopping, putting existing residents at risk.
	10597	There are significant flooding issues with runoff water on local roads.
	10632	There has been insufficient provision to surface water drainage problems which will be worsened by the additional houses on the proposed development.
	10887	There have been flooding issues along Castle Lane due to significant draining problems from the proposed site which are already not being addressed.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11042	There have been ongoing issues with flooding on the roundabout and along School Lane near Warwick Close which is caused by run off from the Velmore Farm site
	11016	There have been several issues with flooding on roads near to where the proposed development will be situated.
	11004	There is a flooding issue on School Lane and the roundabout at the end of Templars Way which will only be exacerbated by the Velmore Farm proposal
	10996	There is a massive flooding problem on School Lane and Templars Way including the roundabout where the access is proposed, this development would lead to more run off
	10712	There is already a flooding issue because of the rainwater run-off adjacent to the roundabout at the junction of templars way and School Lane and therefore development of the site would result in an increase the need for rainwater disposal
	10857	There is an issue of flooding around the area of Velmore Farm, this should be solved before any building, could balancing ponds take account of the flooding?
	10704	There is consistent flooding on the access point at the Templars Way/School Lane roundabout, the construction of housing will exacerbate the issue of run-off surface water.
	10461	There is currently significant surface water and flooding around the industrial estate and the new housing development may cause additional flooding.
	10591	There is currently significant surface water and flooding around the industrial estate and the new housing development may cause additional flooding.
	10745	There is existing flooding which flows down Templars Way, School Lane and Castle Lane and Velmore Farm sits higher than Valley Park
	11018	There is flooding at the roundabout at the junction of Templars Way and School Lane, the Velmore Farm proposal would increase run off and flooding will only get worse
	10549	There is flooding consistently on the roundabout and School Lane.
	10739	There is flooding on the roundabout on Templars Way and along School Lane, unless addressed the Velmore Farm development will exacerbate the problem
	10822	There is insufficient infrastructure to support the increased drainage the Velmore Farm development will cause
	11015	There is no mention in Policy SA6 of the Draft Local Plan on how local issue of flooding will be addressed and the increased impact the proposed development will have on this issue.
	10901	There is regular and extensive flooding on the roundabout between Templars way and School Lane which is the proposed access point to the housing development and this problem is exacerbated by broken and blocked drains that have not been fixed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10736	There is substantial flooding at the roundabout at the junction of School Lane and Templars Way which has never been dealt with, development at Velmore Farm will only add to this
	10544	There needs to be serious consideration of the flood risk - water run off for the proposed development will make the current flooding problems on Templars Way worse.
	11134	There should be measures to stop repetitive flooding especially in School Lane
	11055	There was significant flooding along Templars Way and at the junction with School Lane last winter which led to flooding of cycle paths, footways, gardens and made School Lane impassable. There will be a requirement for flood prevention measures at the Templars Way/Castle Lane end of the site.
	10613	There will be increased levels of runoff water from the concrete on the proposed development when there is already significant flooding on the School Lane/Templars Way roundabout.
	10559	There would need to be improved drainage and sewage systems to deal with the increase surface water as a result of the proposed development.
	11098	This paragraph of the plan misses the consistent and prevalent flooding on the eastern boundary of the site, located at the proposed site's indicative main access.
	11097	Valley Park has been noted for some time as a floodplain and that no houses should be built. The issue of flooding and drainage will worsen for local inhabitants were the proposed development at Velmore Farm to go ahead.
	10671	Velmore Farm is not a sensible option due to the flooding which has not been resolved in 30 years, roads feeding School Lane Industrial Estate flood 'kerb to kerb' due the clay soil
	10709	Water drains off the proposed site and regularly floods the roundabout on Templars Way and Castle Lane and further along School Lane Road. The housing will exacerbate the situation
	11056 Chandler's Ford Parish Council	Were any development on Velmore Farm to be progressed we ask the following issue be addressed; there are existing flooding issues in the area, any proposal should contain specific work to reduce existing issues and prevent the new development causing additional problems
	10659	With increased flooding resulting from the development being built and prevalence of clay soils, there will be a greater need for the water company to divert sewage and ground water into rivers such as the Itchen, thereby exacerbating pollution problems
	10451	Currently there are a lot of flooding of the local highways and on Castle Lane and land around Valley Park because of the predominance of clay
	10451	Existing Southern Water infrastructure will not be able to cope with additional volumes of surface water flooding that will occur due to all the hardstanding that will be created, and sustainable drainage systems will not help.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10457	Object to the development at Velmore Farm because the site entrance is already known for flooding and the development will increase local flooding
	10455	The area already floods along Templars Way and School Lane which usually are blocked in the winter. There has been an increase in road traffic accidents due to flooding and the council carries out regular leaf clearing to stop flooding in the winter. These situations will be made worse as the current infrastructure is unable to cope with the current development.
	10455	The proposed site is underlying with clay which causes issues with water runoff and water table levels and the southern area of the site is 66m above sea level and the lowest part of the site on the northern site, along Templars way is 32m above sea level
	10455	The development will need a lot of flood relief work to mitigate flooding issues as it is on a site with a continuous downhill gradient along 1.5 hectares of local businesses, pavements and driveways that all lead to Templars Way. The waters levels around this development site have risen considerably over the years causing the ditches to flood and overflow onto the roads.
Economic impacts	10004 Valley Park Parish Council	The proposal to develop at Velmore Farm will not bring any economic benefits to Test Valley as it will be Chandler's Ford and Eastleigh that will benefit economically.
	10843	The economic case of location for the Velmore Farm proposal near the science/corporate parks does not seem to have been stated with evidence, how many vacant jobs are currently available at these sites?
	10888, 10988, 10986	The proposal to develop at Velmore Farm will not bring any economic benefits to Test Valley as it will be Chandler's Ford and Eastleigh that will benefit economically.
	10794 Wates Developments Limited	Having regard to NPPF paragraph 74, the site promoter has indicated that Velmore Farm is able to draw upon and support the area's economic potential and associated planned investment infrastructure.
	10612	It would be the closer businesses that new residents use, so Chandler's Ford and Eastleigh would be the economic beneficiaries.
	11083	The plan has not laid out how the proposed development at Velmore Farm will help the economy and if local businesses and residents have been consulted on this
	10869	Agree with Valley Park Parish Councils response such as the issues on economic vitality
	10890	The proposed development will take away from the towns instead of improving the economic activity in struggling, smaller towns.
Electric pylons	10712	Building housing alongside 11kV overhead cables is unacceptable and rerouting the supply underground would entail a very substantial additional cost to the development of the site

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11143	Building near or under pylons is a bad choice as they cause issues with people's health
	11091	Electric pylons go straight through the site for proposed development when Government Ministers are recommending housing should not be built under or close to electricity pylons. The Draft Local Plan should be amended to make sure overhead electric cables are located underground on any new developments.
	11092, 11100	Electric pylons go straight through the site for proposed development when it is recommended housing should not be built under or close to electricity pylons.
	10578	Electric pylons in the proposed development make it less desirable to live in. How will the electric pylons be maintained?
	10004 Valley Park Parish Council	There are pylons across the land at Velmore Farm - the Local Plan should be amended to state that overhead electric cables should be located underground.
	10869	Agree with Valley Park Parish Council's response such as the issues on the overhead electricity pylons
	10148	If development takes place, the electricity pylons should be removed or relocated underground for public safety reasons.
	10852	If the Government maintain their policy on power lines, the Velmore Farm application fails
	10890	It is recommended that homes are not built under or close to electric pylons, and there are electric pylons that go straight across the land at Velmore Park.
	11055	It is unclear how the pylons overhead a significant proportion of the site will be accommodated
	10659	It is understood that the pylons on the site will have to be removed and the electricity run underground which is a specialised, costly process that will compromise the archaeological remains of the Roman road
	10433	Object to the development of 1070 homes at Velmore Farm because the site has major power lines and pylons crossing it which have an adverse effect on people's health
	11060	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it must be wrong for the houses to be in close proximity to the overhead pylons, will they be put underground?
	10970, 10971	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as there is insufficient information for the overhead pylons
	11002	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the overhead electric pylons that would be a potential safety hazard
	10805	Oppose the Velmore Farm development as the placing of power cables underground as per Government guidance should be considered

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10824	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as other considerations should be made such as, the electricity power lines
	10746	Overhead pylons cross Velmore Farm and the Government recommends houses should not be built under or near them
	10845	Strongly object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the pylons are a potential safety risk and against government guidelines
	10687	The area for the proposed development has HT power lines, which can cause considerable health effects.
	10901	The government advises against building homes under or close to pylons carrying power due to their being potential health and safety risks, therefore the homes at Velmore Farm should not be built near the pylons
	10636	The HV overhead cables will need to be diverted as those living underneath/adjacent to them will suffer from increased health problems
	11083	The plan should state clearly how the pylons on site will be handled and if they will be relocated
	10704	The proposed development goes against the Government recommended approach that housing should not be built beneath power lines, which run through the Velmore Farm site.
	10513	The proposed development site has major power lines and electric pylons crossing it, causing an adverse effect on people's health.
	10918	The pylons are the only obstacle to the proposed development and this issue can be easily diverted.
	10177	The pylons need to be removed and the electricity run underground
	10857	The pylons will need to be moved underground, has this been considered and how will it affect the properties being built?
	10510	The saleability and profitability of the proposed development will be significantly impacted by the National Grid overhead power lines running through the estate, impacting developers' intentions to provide community facilities.
	11132	The site has existing overhead pylons and no housing should not be built under or close to the Pylons
	10911	The site is bisected by two sets of electric pylons - the proposed development therefore contradicts Central Government policy/guidance that no development should occur near pylons.
	11042	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the power lines which cause health issues for people in close proximity
	10855	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the pylons

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10735	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the pylons across the site which are not good policy to build under or adjacent to, is there consideration for these to be moved underground?
	11136	The Velmore Farm proposal is concerning due to the pylons as there is still a debate on housing in proximity to these on health grounds
	10986	There are pylons across the land at Velmore Farm and the plan should be amended to state that overhead electric cables should be located underground.
	10988	There are pylons across the land at Velmore Farm which should be amended to state that overhead electric cables should be located underground.
	10888	There are pylons across the land at Velmore Farm- the Local Plan should be amended to state that overhead electric cables should be located underground.
	10689	There are pylons across Velmore Farm, despite the government statement 'that homes should not be built under or close to electric pylons'.
	10745	There are pylons the cross the site with the Government advising homes should not be built under or close to them
	10709	There are two lines of overhead pylons running across the proposed site which are national grid pylons that the government does not recommend building under due to the high voltages they carry
	11098	There should be provisions for burying overhead power lines as they make the proposed development less attractive to prospective buyers.
	10852	To place pylons underground means massive civil engineering works which will be cost prohibitive and impractical for the Velmore Farm proposal
	10651	What if anything is proposed for the pylons that exist on Velmore Farm?
	10736	What will happen to the pylons across the Velmore Farm site, they are a health hazard both physically and mentally
	11072	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as the overhead pylons will likely need to be buried leading to major cost implications and electricity disruptions
Employment land	10794 Wates Developments Limited	For the proposed employment land, given the multifunctional nature of the use class E, in an attempt to clarify what is required, whilst providing flexibility to reflect the length of the build program, and ensuring a sustainable development, it is suggested that the 1.5ha employment land is cross referenced to a range of employment uses falling within Use Class E(c) and E(g).
	10978	Disagree with the 1.5ha of commercial industrial space on the Velmore Farm site, any permitted development should be residential alone
	10884	No need for industrial units given the unoccupied units in the area from School Lane to Eastleigh, Hampshire Corporate Park.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11085	Oppose the Velmore Farm proposal as there are often for rent/sale signs in the industrial park and Templars business park
	10980	The employment provision on Velmore Farm should be a mix of unit sizes from 5,000 sqft+ and include industrial/office including garage and manufacturing
	10980	The employment provision on Velmore Farm should consider employment opportunities including apprenticeships or similar schemes
	10911	The proposed development will create another car-dependent community as there is no plan included for increased employment opportunity in Chandler's Ford.
	10685	The proposed development would have little economic benefit to Test Valley, as the employment site proposed would be competing with more convenient employment sites in Chandler's Ford and Eastleigh where 33% industrial space is not currently being used.
	10601	The use of the land adjacent to Hampshire Corporate Park and School Lane Industrial Estates for further 'employment use' cannot be justified when there are many units in these existing developments available for sale or rent.
	10668	The Velmore Farm proposal is disappointing as there are already vacant industrial sites in the area, it is important these are utilised before an employment provision is considered
	10746	There are empty shops and commercial units in the area local to Velmore Farm, these should be filled prior to building further units
	11033	There are not enough employment opportunities to accommodate the 1000 additional homes suggested in the proposed developments.
	10438	There are not enough jobs for the amount of people this development will bring.
	10583	There is less need for office development in the area due to people working from home. The lack of business parking impacts local residents.
	10629	There is no necessity to create new job in the area through new employment sites, as there are existing job sectors that are struggling to recruit.
	10745	There is no need for more industrial units with empty units at School Lane and Boyatt Wood
	10671	Velmore Farm is not a sensible option for an employment site as a large number of units lay empty in the area
	10951	No evidence to support the necessity for additional business premises suggested by the plans for the proposed development.
Green space	10424	Against the Velmore farm proposal on account of the lack of green space.
	10431	Against the Velmore farm proposal on account of the loss of green space

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11091	Concerned about the loss of open aspect, green space due to the proposed development at Velmore Farm.
	10555	Concerned that the Velmore Farm proposal will lead to a loss of green space
	11048	Depositing a large volume of houses onto green space should be rethought, as it will change the nature of the existing village forever.
	10177	Development at Velmore Farm will adversely impact the diminishing green spaces for conservation and recreation
	10468	Disagree with the Velmore Farm proposal as the green space should not be lost
	10532	Do not support the Velmore Farm development due to the loss of green space
	10397 Chilworth Parish Council	Existing green space already provides opportunity to access the countryside, the development will significantly diminish the size of publicly available green space. Suggested additional work for Reg 19 is nothing more than compensation for the loss of majority of existing green space
	10859	Express concern to the Velmore Farm proposal as it will change the open green space
	10510	Green areas in the proposed area for development are overused by the current amount of residents, and this issue would be exacerbated by the increased population.
	10857	Green space is being given up for buildings, what plans are there for Valley Park residents and their need for recreational land? Will play areas be part of the plan?
	10550	Green spaces should be preserved in the area instead of developments which decrease this open space.
	10649	Greenfield sites should be protected and maintained
	11042	If the Velmore Farm proposal goes ahead the last remaining area of green space will be lost
	11058	If the Velmore Farm proposal goes ahead there will soon be no green space in the area
	10397 Chilworth Parish Council	It is located in the green space adjacent to Valley Park, the land includes Hut Wood and The Rough SINC to the south and west. There are public rights of way along the south and west. Allocation of green space in the southwest corner of the site is considered poor compensation for the loss of already important green space
	10452	It is wrong to remove green space for development, is there no brownfield land available?
	10959	Maintaining a green break between the city and town is essential in keeping good air quality and to soak up CO ₂ emissions.
	10604	Moved to Valley Park because of its semi-rural location and dark skies for astrology, which are of benefit. The proposed development will take away advantages from existing residents of living in Valley Park.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10457	Object to the development at Velmore Farm because of the loss of valuable green space and footpaths
	10437, 10134, 10475, 10642, 10609, 10506, 10608,	Object to the development of Velmore Farm because of the loss of green space
	10643	Object to the proposed development at Velmore Farm because of the destruction to the green space and trees and the lack of accessible green space that will result from this development which is a major disadvantage for the community
	10739	Object to the Velmore Farm development as it will result in a loss of green space amenity
	10531	Object to the Velmore Farm development due to the loss of more green space
	10804	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as it's located on the only green space between central Southampton, northern Chandler's Ford and villages through to Shawford. It will have a massive impact on the countryside in Valley Park as green spaces are key to maintaining and enhancing the natural environment
	10524	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as the community enjoys the green space
	10974	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as there will be little green space left in the area
	11084	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal as we should be saving green spaces and nature
	10459	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the loss of green fields
	10715	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the loss of green land, trees and woodland
	10462, 10464, 10472, 10508, 10521, 10523, 10536, 10537, 10562, 10726, 10853, 10904	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the loss of green space
	10469	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the loss of green space and farmland
	10970	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the loss of green space that is important for exercise and wellbeing and cannot be replicated by the proposed green space
	10971	Object to the Velmore Farm proposal due to the loss of green space that is important for exercise and wellbeing and cannot be replicated by the proposed green space

Infrastructure – education	11072	The FE acronym is confusing as this usually stands for Further Education, please can this be clarified
-------------------------------	-------	--

Policy SA7 King Edward Park
Paragraphs 4.201-4.207

Key Issue	Officer Response
Access	Wording amended to reflect that access is via the existing care village site and not directly from Baddesley Road.
Ecology – buffer to SSSI and Ancient Woodland	Ancient woodland and Trodds Copse SSSI directly adjoin the site but are not within the site. The policy includes a requirement for a buffer to the woodland to protect the sensitive ecology. The policy does not prescribe the buffer size, but an indicative buffer is shown on the accompanying map.
Specialist housing (older people)	Support for the provision of specialist housing for older people. Comments made the name of the site is not correct. This has been updated to Ampfield Meadows.
Infrastructure – wastewater	Wastewater from this site is anticipated to feed into treatment works which are linked to the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Appropriate mitigation will be required.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	10194	The site is surrounded by developed land, can only be accessed via the existing care village and is well contained
Access	10194	the wording used in Policy SA7 should be worded to state that access to the development is to be provided via the adjacent care village site, which is accessed from Baddesley Road.
Ancient woodland	10223	We object to the allocation of this site for development where ancient woodland is at risk of loss or harm. Ask that either this site is removed from the plan, or that the site boundaries are redrawn to exclude the ancient woodland.
Ancient woodland	10223	recommend a precautionary buffer of 50m unless it can be demonstrated that a smaller buffer would suffice: this buffer can be used for natural woodland regeneration, contributing to biodiversity net gain and/or providing accessible natural green space for residents
Biodiversity	10879	The proposed development contradicts the planning meetings of the past where assurances were made that this land would not be developed as it was part of the wildlife corridor.
Buffer	10194	The map identifies an “indicative” buffer, which appears to be in excess of 15 metres. While the policy wording does not define an extent for the buffer, the brown shading on the plan could cause confusion in setting expectations for the buffer extent.
Buffer	10194	wording of Policy SA7, which states “Development will be permitted subject to a buffer to the Trodds Copse Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Ancient Woodland” is sufficient to establish the requirement for the buffer, and therefore it is considered most appropriate for the brown shading to be

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		removed from Figure 4.17 (or at the very least, more clearly represent the 15m established on the adjacent site).
Buffer	10194	The buffer to Trodd's Copse SSSI along the north/west of the site, as currently given a visual extent in Figure 4.17, appear larger than is necessary. It should be removed, or amended to more clearly represent 15 metres, to bring it in line with the established buffer already in place on the adjacent site, - 17/01615/OUTS.
Bus service	10052	The site has good connectivity by private car but the nearest bus stop on Baddesley Road only has four buses per day each way. For older people in particular this would not be an adequate level of service.
Care Village expansion	10194	site offers a logical opportunity to extend delivery of care village accommodation that can be supported by the existing facilities being established on the adjacent site and due to open this year.
Care Village expansion	10194	it is often difficult to deliver care village accommodation on smaller sites, owing to the need for a certain level of development to support the central facilities required. The allocation of this site to enable the extension of an existing care village site by utilising the facilities already in place is relatively unique opportunity to contribute to delivery in a sustainable location
Connectivity	10194	site will function as part of Chandler's Ford, and is well connected to the services and facilities (including onwards transport hubs) available in Chandler's Ford and Eastleigh.
Environment Agency: Environmental constraints	10068	No environmental constraints identified.
Flooding	10879	There have been issues with flooding in the left corner of the meadow onto King Edward Park which would be impacted by the proposed development.
Green Spaces	10879	The proposed development contradicts the planning meetings of the past where assurances were made that this land would not be developed as it was part of the green belt.
Hampshire County Council: Minerals and Waste	10099	The site is below 3ha in area but lies almost wholly within the Minerals Safeguarding Area. Suggested additional supporting text wording: Applicants should aim to maximise the incidental extraction of mineral resources on this site, in line with the policies of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan.
Hampshire County Council: Public Right of Way	10099	There are no existing public rights of way across the site.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Hampshire County Council: Public Right of Way	10099	The site is relatively small and is described as 'extra care accommodation', so proportional impacts to the rights of way network maybe limited.
Hampshire County Council: Public Right of Way	10099	the opportunity to assess and improve accessibility to the network. Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust site Flexford Nature Reserve is opposite the site and paths can be very muddy and Ampfield FP1, BW4 and FP2 form a circular northwest of the site
Hampshire County Council: Public Right of Way	10099	It is requested that the wording is changed to say protection and enhancement "will" be required, not may be, in accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 104 of the NPPF (2023).
Hampshire County Council: Surface Water Drainage	10099	The LLFA has identified this site allocation does not have clear options to drain surface water to.
Housing to meet needs of older people	10194	Policy 7 (SA7) is the only allocation for specialist housing to contribute towards this requirement currently identified in the Draft Plan so vital it proceeds to allocation
Housing to meet needs of older people	10194	allocation of land north of King Edward Park, Ampfield / Chandler's Ford is entirely supported, and is entirely necessary to contribute towards meeting the need for older persons accommodation as identified in the SHMA
Increased quantum	10194	The quantum specified in the allocation should be increased to approximately 48 units, as informed by more detailed analysis of the site constraints and a suitable design response, undertaken since previous SHELAA and Local Plan submissions.
Infrastructure	10105	Consideration should be given to the need for accompanying improvements to infrastructure
Infrastructure - Wastewater	10047	Particular concern about allocations where wastewater from the site is anticipated to feed into treatment works which are linked to the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation.
King Edwards	10755	reference to Land at King Edwards park is misleading as it is adjacent to King Edwards Park

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
King Edwards	10194	proposed allocation of land at King Edward Park, Ampfield / Chandler's Ford is entirely supported, and delivery is necessary to contribute towards the established current and future need for specialist housing for older people
King Edwards	10194	Inspired Villages intends to deliver development on this site as soon as possible. Contractors are already on-site building out Phases 1-3, and it is logical to complete development on the land allocated by Policy 7 (SA7), which is located furthest from the access point, at the soonest opportunity. It can therefore contribute immediately to housing delivery
King Edwards name	10194	Policy SA7 identifies the site as "Land at King Edwards Park, Chandler's Ford". It is suggested that naming should be adjusted to "Land north of King Edward Park, Chandler's Ford" as site not directly associated with Park
Land at King Edward Park	11096	This site allocation features similar ecological features to the Fields Farm site, however the percentage of developable area is considered much less than the Fields Farm site due to the buffers that will need to be incorporated. However, in this instance the site is deemed appropriate and not dismissed due to the ecological buffers that should be incorporated
Land at King Edward Park	11096	Ecological buffers and the TPO's referred to on the Fields Farm site, have been identified as a perceived constraint to development, regardless of how sustainable the site is and the landscape-led design approach that the concept plan adopts. However, the proximity of SINC's, SSSI's and ancient woodlands on or adjacent to the four residential site allocations, have not prevented the Council from identifying them for development
Local gap reduction	10194	site does not contribute to the purposes of the Local Gap and has defensible boundaries and / or built development on all sides
Natural England: Ancient woodland	10140	Proposed allocation proposed directly adjacent to areas classified as ancient replaced woodland and / or ancient & semi natural woodland. Impacts should be considered in line with the NPPF paragraph 186 and standing advice.
Natural England: New Forest SAC, SPA, Ramsar	10140	Falls within 13.8km of New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar, or within the wider 15km catchment, therefore necessary to address impacts of increased recreational pressure in accordance with policy BIO2. Mitigation will be expected to satisfy interim mitigation strategy, or the joint strategic solution. Note that mitigation may be subject to the specific type / level of care facility but potential impacts and compliance with policy BIO2 should still be considered necessary at this stage.
Natural England: Nutrients	10140	Likely to discharge wastewater to Chickenhall WWtW, which discharges into the River Itchen SAC, which drains into the Solent. Allocation will need to consider nutrient neutrality for nitrogen and phosphorus.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Natural England: Trodds Copse SSSI	10140	Need to consider appropriate buffer to Trodds Copse SSSI, along with potential hydrological impacts. Trodds Copse is also designated as ancient & semi-natural woodland, so refer to Natural England & Forestry Commission's standing advice.
One site specifically for specialist housing	10729	Only one of local plan allocated sites specifically includes provision of specialist housing with 44 Class C2 extra care units proposed
Settlement Boundary	10194	The Settlement Boundary on the Policies Maps should be amended to encompass the proposed allocation and adjacent care village site; and the and Local Gap boundary should be amended to exclude the site - King Edwards
SINCs	10105	We note that one SINC and a portion of a second SINC have been included in the land proposed for housing and should be afford the necessary protection
Suggested Amendment	10105	The land shown is not at King Edwards Park and is not in Chandlers Ford
Support	10052	Welcome confirmation that Sustainable Drainage Systems required for mitigating the impact on Trodds Copse SSSI.
Under occupancy housing	10194	Policy 7 (SA7) should proceed as an allocation to maximise on the opportunity to free-up under-occupied housing in the area, by the provision of more suitable housing on this site, which can capitalise on the central facilities already being delivered on the established care village site adjacent.
Unit numbers	10194	Since its submissions to the previous round of consultation, Inspired Villages has progressed design work on this site and considers that 48 units is comfortably achievable

Proposed Employment Sites Southern Test Valley
Paragraphs 4.208 – 4.214

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Employment Sites	Para.4.210 makes reference to supply taking account of both new proposed development allocations to meet employment needs, together with the existing supply of provision in meeting overall requirements. The proposed allocations are therefore considered necessary to meet employment needs which would not be sufficiently provided for without their inclusion.
Green space	Development will need to take account of the constraints on adjacent woodland with an appropriate buffer provided, as relevant. The process and justification for the choice of sites proposed for potential allocation for development is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Site Appraisals (Appendix V) and the Site Selection Topic Paper. The scale of development requirements leads to a need for greenfield sites outside of existing settlement boundaries to be proposed for allocation.
Infrastructure - Wastewater	The Council has undertaken a Water Cycle Study which includes the assessment of w wastewater capacity to accommodate the delivery of new development, and in line with protecting the environment and water quality. This will be updated to inform the Regulation 19 stage. The Council is also engaging with local water companies including Southern Water.
Landscape Character	The process and justification for the choice of sites proposed for potential allocation for development is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Site Appraisals (Appendix V) and the Site Selection Topic Paper. The scale of development requirements leads to a need for greenfield sites outside of existing settlement boundaries to be proposed for allocation.
Redevelopment of existing employment sites	The site specific allocations together with Policy EC1 Retention of Employment Land and Strategic Employment Sites, provides a framework to consider any proposals for redevelopment. Expansion of sites beyond their existing lawful site boundary or allocation will be considered on their individual merits and justification.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
--------	---------------	---------

Employment Sites	10876	This paragraph (4.210) states that the proposed employment site allocations in the local plan exceed the employment requirement for Southern Test Valley so there should be no necessity for the employment site to be developed at Upton Lane.
Green space	11027	The proposed development will compound the impact of the motorways, and the Upton Lane proposal would destroy the green space and adjacent woodland.
Infrastructure - Wastewater	10876	The wastewater infrastructure cannot cope with the proposed development and does not have sufficient capacity for mains foul or surface water drainage.
Landscape Character	10875	The proposed employment site will destroy one of the last rural spots in the area at Upton Lane and increase the impact on residents of the other existing industrial sites as a result.
Redevelopment of existing employment sites	10129 University of Southampton Science Park	Thrust of the wording is supported but should recognise the need for both redevelopment and new development at these strategic employment sites which are within a large, successful science park, accommodating more than 100 businesses across 19 buildings. Suggested amended wording. amend para 4.213. Replace second sentence with... 'These criteria based policies support development for existing employment uses and will enable the sites to redevelop and expand'.

Policy SA8 Upton Lane
Paragraphs 4.215-4.221

Key Issue	Officer Response
Access	Access to the site from the Romsey Road is considered acceptable in highway safety terms and the additional traffic generated can be acceptably accommodated on the highway network.
Biodiversity	Development would be subject to an ecological study including of habitats and protected species. Mitigation would be provided to satisfy site designated under the Habitats Regulations. There are statutory nature conservation designations located on the larger of the two sites
Employment	The employment land requirement for Southern Test Valley is a minimum of 40.4 hectares, we have assessed whether there is sufficient existing supply of employment land to meet this need and there remains a shortfall in meeting our needs, specifically for Class B8 land (warehousing) in Southern Test Valley. However, due to our increase in housing needs, we will review our evidence on employment needs to inform the Regulation 19 stage.
Flood Risk	Consideration of flood risk would be assessed as part of an individual planning application, with development being subject to a FRA
Development in the countryside and green space	The site is in private ownership, although it is recognised that site is outside of settlement boundaries and currently designated a countryside, there is a need for development of greenfield sites in order to meet the housing and economic requirement for Test Valley borough.
Infrastructure - Education	The Council is engaging with Hampshire County Council, as education authority, to understand the needs for additional education infrastructure as a result of this development.
Infrastructure - Health	The Council has been liaising with the Integrated Care Board to understand the potential need for additional infrastructure to support this proposal. The Council will continue to engage with infrastructure providers as the preparation of the Local Plan progresses. Some health services are provided by commercial arrangement, which has an influence on the means through which the Council can seek to secure such provisions.
Infrastructure – Roads and traffic	The Council has undertaken modelling of likely traffic flows when accounting for this site and others proposed at the Regulation 18 Stage 2 and engaged with Hampshire County Council as the Highway Authority. Additional modelling will be undertaken in advance of the Regulation 19 stage. The traffic levels at peak times in particular are recognised and reflected in the modelling undertaken.
Infrastructure - Utilities	The presence of electricity pylons and other utility infrastructure will need to be taken into account in masterplanning the site, however they do not preclude the site coming forward. Regard would need to be had to guidance of the relevant infrastructure provides, including the National Grid.

Landscape	It is recognised that there is a degree of landscape sensitivity. Masterplanning for the sites, including layout and the landscape strategy must respond sensitivity to the landscape constraints identified.
Local Gap	The site is not within a Local Gap and therefore would not risk contributing to the physical or visual coalescence of settlements, the site is also surrounded by vegetation much of which shall be retained which should limit any visual impact of development
Pollution	Development will be required to meet the conditions set out in draft Local Plan 2040 policies TR2: Assessing Transport Impacts and ENV5: Pollution to avoid or mitigate pollution to an appropriate standard and to prevent any unacceptable impact
Public Transport	Development will be expected to provide enhancements to existing and provide new public transport infrastructure and enable good connectivity to bus stops.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	It is difficult to think of a proposed employment site of the scale of that proposed that has to be accessed by a country lane and via a residential area. Nursling Estate and Adanac Park can both be accessed directly from M271 J1, Upton Lane cannot be accessed directly from the M27/M271 and the chances of National Highways agreeing to new junctions are virtually zero
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	Vehicles will need to leave the motorway network and travel on the local road network through the villages of Nursling and Rownhams to access the site. The current access to Upton Lane from Romsey Road is immediately opposite residential properties on Romsey Road and the entrance of Romsey Golf Club
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	How are large HGVs required to service the proposed storage and distribution proposed for this major employment site going to be able to access the site, this is very unclear. Once on Upton Lane how will they then access the proposed employment and either side of the lane, a new major junction/roundabout?
	11036	The proposed developments would require an improvement to access.
	10930	The development will mean there is no safe access via foot or bicycles.
	11031	Opportunities in providing access to the site is limited and would cause further congestion.
	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the access point

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11057	Concerned about access to the site, noise & light pollution as well as pollution from increased traffic
	11113	According to the SHELAA ref 394, "there is an existing site entrance with direct access onto Lymer Lane, Transport strategy will need to be prepared"-this access is a single track service road bordered by private residences up to a 90 degree slope and would not be useable
	11070	Object to this proposal as the planned access is already over used and at times inaccessible
	11070	The entrance to the proposed estate bends in such a way that it is effectively a blind corner for the first 200m of the road when there are cars parked on the road
	11070	the proposed access road is unsafe for car drivers and path users as car users
	10648	The planned access at the top of Upton Lane is where children access the Mountbatten school bus and therefore an increase in traffic will make this access point dangerous
	10675	No access has been detailed for the proposed industrial estate north of Upton Lane-suggest that the access should be off the short section of the M271 as that would keep large vehicles off the Romsey Road and also Upton Lane
	10672	The proposed access to the developments either side of Upton Lane is a country lane used by horse riders, joggers, cyclists and dog walkers and there are no pavements except on the upper part of the lane-there is a weak bridge at the bottom which is not suitable for heavy vehicles and half way down the lane is a flow of water from the motorway and fields that causes serious erosion to the road surface which is particularly dangerous in freezing conditions.
	10672	Access to the proposed employment site should not be from Upton Lane-suggest reconfiguring the roundabout at the end of the M271 to accommodate a turning off to the new site therefore avoiding congestion on Romsey Road and in Upton Lane.
	10672	Access to the housing estate should not be from Upton lane-suggest access to the site from Romsey Road opposite the turning into Upton Crescent.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10949	There is insufficient accessibility via foot or cycle path in the area for local residents and therefore will not be enough for the increased local population caused by the proposed development.
	10765	The proposed site requires good communication, though there is no direct access from the site to the M27 or M271 so all vehicles will have to access the site from the existing residential areas of Nursling.
	10765	The vehicles will have to use two routes to access the site, via the Junction of M271 and A3057, and from M27 Junction 3, though these are already heavily used and congested roads at peak times.
	10765	The use of Upton Lane for the trade vehicles and HGV's that will use the lane to access the industrial estate gives no consideration to the local residents of Upton and Grove Place.
	10953	There is no access from the site to the nearby M27 and M271 motorways, meaning Upton Lane is the only current access to the site which is narrow and unsuitable for HGV vehicles.
	10953	Paragraph 4.221 proposed the need for offsite junction improvements to the proposed site yet there is no evidence to show that National Highways have been consulted as to solutions to combat already struggling traffic problems.
	11040	There is no indication as to how the heavy vehicles will access the site.
	11045	Access to the site would be via a residential area and country lane, which is dangerous for vehicles.
	11045	Access to the site would be via a residential area and country lane, which is dangerous for pedestrians as there are no footpaths or cycle lanes.
	11045	The area will become unsafe and inaccessible, affecting the mental and physical wellbeing of residents.
	11019	There are no footpaths beyond Upton Lane that residents can access.
	10876	Upton Lane is not wide enough as an access road to the proposed housing or employment site, and widening the road would involve the loss of trees.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		A more suitable access point would be to make the junction with the A3057 suitable for accessible for HGVs, especially the acute turn in from the Southampton direction.
	10877	There is a lack of footpaths and cycleways for access on the busy A3057 and the proposed development will make this dangerous for residents.
	10720	There is insufficient access to the proposed site via a country lane and residential area.
	10749	The proposed development will negatively impact the safety for vehicles and pedestrians on the A3057 due to the increase in traffic.
	11116	The access to the commercial site via Upton Lane is insufficient and access should be limited to A271 in order to ensure that commercial traffic does not access single carriageways.
	10828	How will access be achieved on Upton Lane? The road is very narrow to allow large commercial vehicles to access the area, it is totally unsuitable and the impact on existing residential properties is unacceptable
	10835	Upton Lane is a much needed main route, and the other routes are unsuitable, Lee Lane is a narrow country lane and Andes Road involves blind bends where lorries often wait
	10675	The current access from Upton Lane on to Romsey Road is difficult at times due to traffic volumes and speed -suggest a roundabout to ease congestion especially if the access is in Upton lane
	11057	Upton Lane has little in the way of pavements- hard to see where the vehicular access would be given the number of horse riders, cyclists and walkers who regularly use the lane
Access to the Countryside	10648	The proposed site is on the countryside, which is good for mental health, a place for people to ride horses, walk their dogs, etc and it would be a shame to lose it
Affordable Housing	10930	Affordable e.g. social housing should be built rather than just houses that are for sale.
Air Pollution	10670	Opposed to the proposed development in Upton because it's going to add to the air pollution in the area that is already by a motorway

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10949	The proposed development will lead to an increase in air pollution.
	10950	The proposed development will see an increase in air pollution.
	11045	The air pollution from the sites will directly and negatively impact residents.
	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the additional air pollution it would cause
	10981	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning as it will cause air pollution
	11053	The Upton Lane proposal will increase air pollution
	11044	Opposed to the Upton Lane proposal due to the adverse effects on air quality
	10806	The Upton Lane proposal is not acceptable due to potential air pollution
	10827	The increase in traffic over the years around Upton Lane must have increased air pollution
	10810	The extra traffic from the Upton Lane proposal would increase air pollution
	10835	The addition of traffic around Upton Lane would add to the air pollution which is a severe cause for concern
Air Quality	11113	The proposed development will reduce air quality
	11113	The development will result in reduced air quality levels
Alternative Sites	11040	There are many sites with sufficient facilities such as Stockbridge, and many other examples of unused land in Test Valley that would not impact upon residents as much, that should be used instead of Upton Lane for development.
Amenity	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council	Loss of amenity is inextricably linked to landscape and visual impact and to the effects of the proposed development in the context of current character of the area. We cannot see how development of the scale and extent proposed and within what is currently an area of open

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10083	countryside, could possibly be accommodated without significant adverse effects on local landscape character and consequently on residential amenity
Ancient Woodland	11053	The Upton Lane proposal includes ancient woodland which should not be destroyed
Archaeology	10765	Upton Lane is part of the historic core of Nursling and includes Grove Place - the buildings at Grove Lodge would be encircled by the proposed development. Proposed development or allocation would need to recognise the area's heritage and ensure it is conserved.
	10953	Nursling Monastery is a site of archaeological importance and an archaeological survey should be conducted prior to any development on the site. There is also a WW2 encampment in the woods adjoining the motorway.
	10864	The proposed site for development at Upton lane is in close proximity to heritage buildings such as Grove Lodge (a gatehouse and former parkland to Grove Place - a Grade 1 listed building) does not protect such historic buildings.
Biodiversity	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	Proposed allocation to the west of Upton Lane includes extensive areas of important lowland deciduous woodland - a Priority Habitat under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, 2016. These woodlands are renowned locally, we are concerned that the proposed allocation will result in the loss or damage of these woodlands and further isolation and fragmentation of these habitats
	11036	The proposed development will lead to the loss of more green space and a negative impact on wildlife.
	10926	The proposed development of B8 Units will lead to a loss of wild land which are habited by wildlife.
	10932	Residents once enjoyed the wildlife which occupied the green space before the construction of industrial units which will be worsened by further developments.
	11026	The development would threaten the wildlife in the area.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11031	The proposed development would lead to a loss of wildlife and habitats.
	11053	The Upton Lane proposal will mean a loss of habitat for wildlife
	11044	Opposed to the Upton Lane proposal due to the devastating impact on local wildlife
	11027	The proposed development will lead to the destruction of substantial areas of trees, woodland and hedgerows which would contradict the proposed policy on protecting and enhancing trees, woodland and hedgerows.
	11057	The site area has a lot of wildlife which would be adversely affected, there are areas of woodland for breeding birds, badgers, deer, foxes as well as native plants (bluebells) and trees
	11113	Opposed to development at the proposed site at Upton Lane as it is a wood providing a habitat for wildlife species including native bluebells, woodpeckers, fox, deer, bats and has a pond, horses are kept there, and the original Lodge building is nestled within it.
	11110	Upton Lane has experienced an increase in wildlife and birds (Red Kites and Buzzards) because of developments on land south of the M27 in Nursling, the two open spaces in the proposal are vitally important for this biodiversity
	11110	the density of the proposed housing is too high and increasing the hardstanding and false lawns will increase the demise of the wildlife
	10807	Object to the development of commercial and industrial use at Upton Lane because the wildlife and natural beauty has already been devastated by development at Adanac park and housing in Nursling
	10807	TVBC should support more trees and wildlife and reduce risk to habitat, local deer and bird life
	10648	The woods surrounding the proposed site is home to a lot of wildlife especially deer who will lose their home if more development occurs

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10672	The wooded area at the top of the site is a mini nature reserve with blue bells, wild life, nesting birds and pond life and is currently used as grazing land and for stabling horses- it should not be removed or disturbed by building works or cut down for access to the site as there is no suitable alternative
	10670	Opposed to the proposed development in Upton because the landscape is already becoming an industrial estate and a concrete jungle at the detriment of wild life such as bats, bees, butterflies, etc
	10708	Object to the proposal to build houses on the field opposite Upton Crescent in Nursling as this will ruin the village of Upton and be catastrophic for local wild life, deer, local migrating birds and endangered species such as toads and newts
	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because it is a contravention on the local wildlife such as deer, bats, squirrels, hedgehogs that are currently seen daily
	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because it is more important to preserve the wildlife, trees and woodland on the site
	10941	Protected species of plant including the English bluebells fall within the proposed area for development.
	10942	The proposed development will lead to greater destruction of open spaces and therefore the wildlife that inhabits them.
	10765	The site is a recorded home to breeding barn owls and bats (within farm buildings to the rear of Grove Lodge) - the proposed development must consider the site's ecological importance.
	10953	The proposed development will lead to the destruction of woodland, hedgerows and wildlife.
	10953	Policy ENV3 (Landscape Character) - significant loss of countryside and trees and consequential harm to landscape character and overall loss of residential amenity.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10953	Policy BIO1 (Conservation & Enhancement of Biodiversity & Geological Interest) - significant loss of countryside and trees and consequential harm to landscape character and overall loss of residential amenity.
	10953	Policy BIO5 (Trees and Hedgerows) - significant loss of countryside and trees and consequential harm to landscape character and overall loss of residential amenity.
	10953	Policy ENV7 (Amenity) - significant loss of countryside and trees and consequential harm to landscape character and overall loss of residential amenity.
	11045	The proposed development will lead to the destruction of wildlife and habitat.
	11047	The proposed developments will have a significant environmental impact on the wildlife in the area.
	10698	The proposed development at Upton Lane would further reduce woodland and green space, have a negative impact on wildlife and vegetation.
	10864	The visionary statement is contradicted by the proposed development, as it proposes to devastate an area including the site of a known/recorded home to breeding barn owls and bats in the farm buildings to the rear of Grove Lodge.
	10864	The proposed development disregards the natural environment and does not protect the ecological importance of the site.
	10876	The proposed development would have a drastic effect on surrounding wildlife for which the countryside and woodlands are their natural habitat.
	10877	The proposed development will destroy wildlife in the surrounding areas.
	10878	Upton Lane has no footpath and thus would need to be widened which would have to affect the rural habitat.
	10716	The fields proposed for development have a wide variety of wildlife which would be negatively impacted by the proposed development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10716	There are numerous wild flowers contained on the land proposed for development that would be negatively impacted.
	10716	The land surrounding where the access points might be for the industrial site are woodland which contain various wildlife and rare flowers which would be disrupted by the industrial units and industrial traffic.
	11005	Object to the Upton Lane proposal as the area is home to wildlife which will be destroyed
	10754	The Upton Lane proposal will severely affect the wildlife habitats
	10675	The blue bell woods on the junction of Upton Lane is in the outlined area of the industrial estate and is habited by deer and birds including Kites and Buzzards-this needs to be protected to preserve the ecology and environment
	10692	The proposed developments will have a negative impact on local wildlife and biodiversity.
Buffer to Romsey Road	11162	Justification for housing allocation appears to provide a buffer to the existing residential development on Romsey Road. No justification as to why such a buffer is needed
Character	10827	The Upton Lane proposal would have a detrimental effect on the village location as it is a semi-rural area
Community	11040	The village feel that the sense of community is diminishing with the proposed development and the industrial developments at Nursling and Rownhams.
	10716	The proposed developments will have a significant negative impact on the local environment and community.
	11027	Contention that distribution and logistics jobs are not compatible with highly skilled local jobs. Low paid jobs and multinational or national corporation ownership may lead to a spiral in prosperity and a lack of care for the local community.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Community consultation	10877	The council have mislead the public regarding the road works at A3057 and through inaccurate drawings which have been submitted for review.
Community involvement	10930	There should be consultation with local residents regarding which new businesses and what industry is going to be introduced at the industrial estate.
Community Services and Facilities	10916	The primary schools could not cope with more children and there are no doctors or dentists nearby. The draft Local Plan does not state how these challenges will be overcome
	10670	There are no facilities for young people apart from gyms
Consultation event	10675	The advertising of the meeting at the Village Hall was poor -as the proposal affects Upton Lane, Romsey Road and Upton Crescent directly-a letter should have been sent out
Countryside	10953	The vision set out in paragraphs 2.24-2.26 is meaningless and misleading when compared to the planned developments.
	11089	There will soon no longer be countryside in Test Valley and will end up as an extension of Southampton, due to increased development as Nursling is cheap land.
	11044	Opposed to the Upton Lane proposal due to the significant loss of countryside
Countryside views	10648	A planning application was made for an extension but it was denied because of blocking the view to the countryside-the same countryside is now marked for development -why is this so?
Crime	11026	Crime will increase in the area due to the lack of amenities available to new residents.
Cumulative Impact	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	Cursory assessments of the potential effects of the two allocations have been made through the SHELAA and the related Sustainability Appraisals. However, no cumulative impact assessment of the two allocations in combination has ever been made and therefore the combined effects have not been considered

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	There will be significant cumulative impacts from traffic, noise, air pollution, loss of countryside, loss of landscape character, ecology and yet in advancing these two allocations side by side, the Council has not considered these cumulative impacts
Current usage	11027	The current usage is satisfactory.
Cycle Lane	11053	There are no cycle lanes around Upton Lane
Development Area	11045	The Draft Local Plan has lied to parishioners in stating the development as 8.5 hectares when it is in fact 17.2 hectares of currently designated countryside.
Development impact	10765	Local residents feel as though Nursling is under considered due to its proximity to Southampton, and due to unauthorised development and poor enforcement by the Planning development.
Development in the Countryside	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	The two major proposals are both proposed to be located in the countryside on agricultural land off Upton Land a narrow country lane linking Romsey Road and Station Road
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	The area proposed for this major development is currently outside of the settlement boundaries within the current Adopted Local Plan, that means that the Council has effectively moved the settlement boundary to include the proposed development allocations and has therefore massively shifted the policy goalposts
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	The sustainability appraisal for the sites allocations acknowledges the poor location stating that "The site also relates poorly to the settlement boundary of Nursling and begins to sprawl development into the open countryside"
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	The land at Upton Lane is currently designated as countryside and therefore development is currently restricted by policy COM2 of the adopted Local Plan, therefore any development proposals for the land would only be considered for approval under exceptional circumstances

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	The character of the land has not changed, and the land has not changed location it must still therefore be considered outside the settlement boundary, so we need to be told what justification is there for moving the settlement boundary and what makes the proposed development acceptable in the countryside in future when it isn't currently acceptable?
Disruption during construction	11113	Opposed to development at the proposed site at Upton Lane because of the level of disruption likely to be caused to existing residents and recreational users from construction traffic, noise and ground disturbance
Drainage	10754	The removal of trees and building on Upton Lane will exacerbate drainage problems
Ecology	10916	The local woods to the north of Upton Lane provide shelter for wildlife and local flora. If that goes, it will affect the quality of the air and add more noise pollution to the area
	10665	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to ecological concerns
Effects of development	10672	If the proposal goes ahead, the current residents such as the cottage behind the existing wooded area, and the houses facing Romsey Road will lose their countryside views and will be subjected to pollution (air, noise and light), traffic congestion and more difficulty accessing Romsey Road, reduction in their property value and quality of life.
Employment allocation need	11113	It seems unnecessary to build industrial units, most likely to be used for storage and distribution when Nursling Industrial Estate is in close proximity with established road links and infrastructure.
Employment opportunities	11026	Not enough employment opportunities in local area to accommodate over 350 new residents.
Employment Provision	10844	The industrial units proposed as part of Upton Lane is wholly unacceptable as they will sit adjacent to existing and proposed residential areas
	10828	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to point a) being too wide ranging, we could end up with vehicles coming at all times and 'industrial processes' could mean pollution

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10828	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to point b), it does not specify what this could entail
	10721	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning as it will bring heavy lorries to the area, there are several empty industrial units and building more is unjustified
	10748	The industrial units as part of Upton Lane will not bring employment to the area, most will be used for storage
Employment Sites	11045	The south east parcel of land has not been designated for residential purposes. If the purpose is employment, then Southampton or Eastleigh would be better for reducing travel.
	10864	Despite multiple industrial units being built on Countryside (such as Adanac Park and Collards site, Nursling), the plan proposes further industrial development between Upton Lane and M271 on designated countryside and protected woodland.
	10875	The employment will be mostly logistics and distribution, low-skilled, low-paid labour which contradicts the objective for economy, prosperity and skills.
	10877	There would need to be considerable road network infrastructure installed in order to manage the proposed developments as there has been misuse of Paulette Lacave avenue by HGVs which would become worse with the proposal.
	11116	There is a lack of clarity pertaining to the exact use of the 'commercial' developments which makes it difficult to assess the suitability of the site. Inclusion of policies should be prevented until information is consistent.
	10716	There are high levels of empty units in the surrounding area which could be rented or purchased instead of the development of entirely new industrial units.
	10875	The assessment states that the land proposed for development regarding susceptibility for change by virtue of degraded character due to current detracting features i.e. pylons which does not mean the area should be more suitable for industrial development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10692	New employment sites should not be proposed when there are existing local industrial areas to be utilised.
Environment	10950	The proposed development contradicts the policies aimed at achieving sustainable communities and carbon neutral areas.
	11045	The proposed development will mean the loss of important ancient woodland.
Environmental constraints	Environment Agency 10068	No environmental constraints identified.
Farmland	10733	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable as the area has seen development recently all mostly using productive farmland
	10733	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable as the field marked for housing is very productive land for growing crops
	10748	The Upton Lane land should be kept growing crops not for homes
Flooding	10916	The trees in the woods help reduce the amount of surface water and aids the drainage in the area
	11113	The wooded area on the site is prone to flooding
	11110	Upton has issues with surface water runoff flooding and Upton lane and Station Road are already damaged and wont cope with additional housing if the open land that is meant to absorb the rainfall is developed
	11125	Concerned about the flooding as the field on the left as you turn in to Upton Lane absorbs rainfall but after a heavy downpour, any excess water it cannot absorb runs down the lane causing fast water flows and flooding -if the field is developed the flooding will be exacerbated
	11047	The proposed developments will have a significant environmental impact on an area already prone to flooding.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10835	Upton Lane is in a dreadful state, suffering floods and ice in the winter
Footpaths	10670	There are no footpaths beyond Upton Lane
General	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	The policy refers to a development of 8.5ha, however the combined areas of the two sites (12.6ha for west of Upton Land and 4.6ha for east of Upton Lane) is significantly greater at 17.2ha, we want to know why the draft Local Plan is describing 8.5ha of proposed development when the sites are over twice that size
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	When considered in the context of the policy framework set out in the draft Local Plan it is our view that the proposed development allocations on the west and east of Upton Lane in draft policy SA8 are contrary to many of the draft policies on the Draft Local Plan
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	We believe there is a significant disconnect between the policy wording and what is actually being proposed over the next 16 years. This is not suitable development, nor is it in accordance with the key objectives of the draft Local Plan. The impact on our community would mean more buildings, more residents, more traffic, less countryside, less available amenities.
	11113	The proposal when scrutinised will be contrary to the objectives of the Local Plan
	11110	Upton Lane is used as a shortcut and often by HGV's going over the bridge over the main Southampton to Salisbury Railway line which has a limit of 3.5t-how will this be resolved?
Green Space	10932	Residents once enjoyed the recreational benefits of the green space before the construction of industrial units which will be worsened by further developments.
	10932	Trees have been destroyed to make space for the construction of industrial units which will be worsened by further developments.
	11031	The proposed development would lead to a loss of space.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10670	Object to the development of commercial and industrial use at Upton Lane because of the destruction of the natural green wildlife area
	10941	Getting rid of the green fields and trees will not help with improving people's mental health
	10945	The development of the industrial estate will lead to a loss of green space and woodland, which will affect not only the character of the area but also the health and wellbeing of residents.
	10949	The proposed development will lead to the loss of countryside and harm to the local area as well as the mental health of existing residents.
	10950	The proposed development will lead to more commercial development and a catastrophic effect on the natural environment and habitat.
	10950	The proposed development will mean loss of local woodland, hedgerows and green spaces.
	10765	The plot area set aside for the proposed development spreads into currently identified green space.
	10953	The future generation will not have any green space or countryside to utilise if the proposed development such as the one at Upton Lane continue to occur.
	10953	The use of countryside and woodlands for employment will have a detrimental impact on residents' home.
	11047	The proposed developments will lead to an annihilation of the countryside and home environment.
	10698	The proposed developments will have a significant environmental impact to the existing fields and woods.
	10864	Further development will further destroy green space around Rownhams, which has already seen a significant decrease in green spaces due to recent developments.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10875	There has been considerable development in the local area in recent years at the expense of green spaces and countryside and the proposed 80 houses at Upton Lane are also to be developed on designated countryside under the current Local Plan.
	10720	The proposed development at Upton Lane contributes to overdevelopment in the area and would destroy the rural areas of Nursling.
	10749	The proposed development is placed on agricultural land outside the settlement boundary, which means development should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances due to policy COM2.
	10716	The proposed development at Upton Lane contradicts the principle to protect open countryside and the maintenance of open spaces.
	10716	Upton Lane is countryside and is consistently used by horseriders - it is therefore unsuitable to become a busy road as a result of the proposed development.
	10875	The area between the motorway and houses that is green space is vital to the local community and existing residents reject that they will no longer live in the countryside.
	10844	The assessment states that the land proposed for development regarding susceptibility for change by virtue of degraded character due to current detracting features i.e. pylons which does not mean the area should be more suitable for development which reduces remaining countryside.
	10667	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable due to loss of agriculture space and woodland which provides a rural environment and a haven for wildlife and flora, loss of this will have a major negative impact on quality of lives
	10664	The Upton Lane proposal should not go ahead due to the loss of green space, it should be kept for mental wellbeing
	10721	The Upton Lane proposal is destroying what green spaces are left, the environment is suffering
	10743	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the destruction of a green field site and trees which is distressing

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11027	The Upton Lane proposal is on the last green field in the area
	10692	Changing the area from a semi-rural locality to an industrialised suburb will destroy the village completely.
	10827	The proposed developments are significantly reducing the green spaces.
Green Space / Wildlife	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is eroding the green spaces which are vital to wildlife in the area
Habitats	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the risk to habitats
Active Travel	Hampshire County Council 10099	Although it is acknowledged that the primary proposed use of the site is employment use, the County Council still has concerns about access to this site via active and sustainable modes. Suggest the following criterion is added: "f. The provision of improvements to the local active travel network to ensure safe and high quality walking, cycling and wheeling connections to the site."
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Provision of cycle links to Rownhams and Nursling would be welcomed, particularly an active travel route along the eastern boundaries of both sites running parallel to the A3057 which would enhance public rights of way links. Safe access onto Coldharbour Lane would enable cycle access from Romsey using Lee Lane and the existing off-road cycleway along the A27 at Romsey.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Vehicle access to Upton Triangle is proposed off Lymer Lane, which becomes Nursling and Rownhams Footpath 501. The Footpath should be recognised and protected within a green corridor; physical and legal upgrade to give cycle access would be welcome.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	The route of Footpath 501 (future shared cycle route) should be segregated from any motorised vehicle access, as such to maintain the safe, priority public access afforded by the public rights of way.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Good shared cycle footway links compliant with LTN1.20 should be provided linking up to the Romsey road and beyond to ensure that there are routes for active travel to school.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - education	Hampshire County Council 10099	The catchment primary and secondary schools are Nursling CE Primary School & The Mountbatten School respectively.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	No additional school places are currently required to support this development. Nursling CE Primary School take a significant number of pupils from outside of Hampshire's Local Education Authority boundary, so there is potential to push back pupils to take the yield from this development.
Minerals and Waste	Hampshire County Council 10099	The site is over 3ha in area and lies wholly within the Minerals Safeguarding Area. The site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area, as defined by the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. Proposals should aim to maximise the prior extraction of mineral resources on this site, in line with the policies of the Plan.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	A Mineral Resource Assessment is required to be submitted to the Minerals Planning Authority as part of any application to develop this site.
Public Right of Way	Hampshire County Council 10099	The Upton Lane site has no direct conflict with public rights of way.
Surface Water Drainage	Hampshire County Council 10099	The LLFA has identified this site allocation does not have clear options to drain surface water to.
Health & Wellbeing	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because it is important to consider the health and wellbeing of the existing residents and the level of disturbance this will cause
Historical Environment	10672	Off the mid-section of Upton Lane is the Grade 1 listed Grove Place grounds and Elizabethan hunting lodge which is of historical importance and should remain in its rural setting -the industrial development is too close and inappropriate

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Horses	10810	The Upton Lane proposal would impact the stables and horses that use the area
Housing	11162	Objection to housing allocation. Delete allocation
	11162	Unclear what is being proposed. Inset Map 4 show the site as employment/housing. Figure 4.18 page 111 of the local plan shows the site for housing
Housing Allocation	11116	There are inconsistencies in the consultation documents as to the number of properties being proposed at the Upton Lane sites as somewhere it mentions 390 houses and elsewhere 80 residencies are mentioned. Inclusion of policies should be prevented until information is consistent.
Housing Need	10810	The need in the Upton Lane area is for first time buyers not more detached 4/5 bedroom homes
Housing next to employment	11162	New housing would be next to the proposed employment allocation so replicating the situation seeking to avoid on Romsey Road
Housing Requirement	10664	If TVBC response to Upton lane is you are dictated by parliament you should stand up for the community and say its already at capacity
Housing Type	11057	Concerned that the housing developed at Velmore Farm will be 'top end' housing encouraging new people to move into the area as opposed to social and affordable homes that are needed.
Impact Assessment	10953	The Council has not considered the cumulative impact from traffic, noise, air pollution, loss of countryside, loss of landscape character and ecology - a cumulative impact assessment should be conducted.
Incorrect Local Plan information	10950	The consultation document incorrectly states that there are 8.5 hectares of land when it is actually 12.5 hectares and the parish boundary is identified.
Infrastructure	10936	The current infrastructure in Test Valley cannot cope with another housing development.
	11026	Does not think that the planning application makes sense for an industrial site and 85 homes to be built as there is not the correct infrastructure.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10942	The infrastructure around Nursling cannot cope with the proposed development of another 80 houses and industrial estate.
	10950	There is a severe lack of infrastructure to support the proposed development.
	10765	The proposed development cannot be supported by the lack of existing services and infrastructure, as well as the damaging impact it will have on the local landscape character and amenities.
	10877	There is a lack of infrastructure in the area surrounding the proposed development and will not be able to cope with the additional pressure.
	10878	There have been no improvements as a result of other developments in the area to infrastructure and there are no provisions for infrastructure in the plans for the new developments to cope with the infrastructure.
	11027	No guarantee that the development on the south-eastern parcel will be sensitive, as the building work and the necessity for access of over 160 cars will not be sensitive.
	11044	Opposed to the Upton Lane proposal as it will have a huge impact on already overstretched local resources
	10672	There is not enough infrastructure in Romsey to support any more large scale development and would need provisions of new schools, doctor's surgeries, dentists, better bus services and increased town parking
	10899	The local infrastructure is already struggling, and this will worsen with the pressure of the proposed development.
	11019	There is not currently enough infrastructure to support the proposed development.
	10698	There is insufficient infrastructure to support additional houses and people from the proposed development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10876	The infrastructure delivery plan details for the proposed developments are absent from section 10 10.8 although it does say "associated infrastructure will be established in preparation for Reg 19".
	10806	The Upton Lane proposal is unsuitable for housing due to lack of local facilities
	10665	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to infrastructure
	10664	Local infrastructure around Upton Lane can not cope with existing residents
	10748	The infrastructure is not in place for the Upton Lane proposal
Infrastructure - Dentists	10926	The proposed additional 80 dwellings and increasing Southampton and TVBC population will put strain on the capacity of local dentists.
	10932	The proposed development will increase pressure on the local Dental surgeries which no longer accept new registrations.
	11031	The proposed development will put strain on dentists already under pressure.
	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the lack of infrastructure such as, dentists
	10981	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the lack of infrastructure which is already oversubscribed such as dentists
	11053	Additional housing will push the stretched services to breaking point such as dentists, where no provisions have been made
	11057	Dental facilities are at full capacity and the demand will increase significantly with more people
	10807	The proposal has not considered the lack of dental infrastructure as currently overstretched
	10708	Object to the proposal to build houses on the field opposite Upton Crescent in Nursling as there are currently not enough dentists in the area

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because the development will have a detrimental impact on already stretched public services such as dentists
	10947	There are not enough dentists to support the proposed development.
	10953	SHELAA 385 is incorrect in stating that Nursling has a range of facilities - Nursling has no Dental practice and nearby practices are full, meaning the Dental service is insufficient to provide for the proposed development.
	11045	The area does not have sufficient infrastructure to cope with the proposed development, as there is no dental service.
	11047	The proposed development will put additional strain on existing dentists.
	10899	The dentist surgeries are struggling and this issue will be exacerbated by the increased population from the proposed development.
	11019	There are not enough dentists in the area to support the added strain of the proposed development.
	10747	The proposed development will put additional pressure on local Dentists services.
	11116	There are no provisions to expand local dentists which are already oversubscribed and will not be able to cope with the additional pressure from the proposed development.
	10664	Local dentists around Upton Lane can not cope with existing residents
	10733	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable as dentists are already overloaded
	10754	It is not easy to find dentists in the area around Upton Lane
	10720	Local dentists are full and will not be able to cope with the added pressure from the proposed developments in Nursling and Rownhams.
Infrastructure - Energy	10864	Planning permissions have been granted on illegally destroyed woodland SINC to the north-west of SHB for two operational BESS sites.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - GPs	11036	There are insufficient GPs to accommodate a new development.
	10926	The proposed additional 80 dwellings and increasing Southampton and TVBC population will put strain on the capacity of local GP practices.
	10932	The proposed development will increase pressure on the local GP surgeries which no longer accept new registrations.
	10936	There is insufficient Doctors surgery infrastructure to accommodate the increase in population due to the proposed development.
	11026	There are not enough doctors locally to accommodate over 350 new residents.
	11031	The proposed development will put strain on doctors already under pressure.
	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the lack of infrastructure such as, doctors
	10981	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the lack of infrastructure which is already oversubscribed such as doctors
	11053	Additional housing will push the stretched services to breaking point such as doctors, where no provisions have been made
	11057	The doctors surgeries are already at full capacity and wont be able to cope
	11113	The medical services and GP surgeries are already at full capacity
	10807	The proposal has not considered the lack of GP infrastructure as currently overstretched
	10670	Doctors appointments are already difficult to get and adding extra people will exacerbate the problem

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10708	Object to the proposal to build houses on the field opposite Upton Crescent in Nursling as there are currently not enough doctors in the area
	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because the development will have a detrimental impact on already stretched public services such as doctors
	11156	Strongly disagree with the TVBC Draft Local Plan for the South Test Valley Upton sites because the new development isn't proposing a new doctors surgery
	10941	There are clear wider issues with the lack of GPS, something which should be looked at with the new development.
	10942	The village does not have a GP practice, meaning the proposed development would put strain on already limited local services.
	10945	The area has does not have enough GP service to be able to cope with the proposed development.
	10947	There are not enough Doctors surgeries to support the proposed development.
	10953	SHELAA 385 is incorrect in stating that Nursling has a range of facilities - Nursling has no GP surgery and nearby surgeries are full, meaning the GP service is insufficient to provide for the proposed development.
	11045	The area does not have sufficient infrastructure to cope with the proposed development, as there is no healthcare centre or GP practice.
	10899	The doctors surgeries are struggling and this issue will be exacerbated by the increased population from the proposed development.
	11019	The doctors infrastructure is not currently enough to support the added strain of the proposed development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11019	Development should take place elsewhere where the Doctors infrastructure is enough to cope with the new development.
	10875	There are no provisions to for already struggling local GP practices in Romsey to cope with the additional pressure from the proposed development.
	10747	The proposed development will put additional pressure on local Doctors services.
	11116	There are no provisions to expand local medical centres which are already oversubscribed, and will not be able to cope with the additional pressure from the proposed development.
	10844	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable as how will the overloaded healthcare services cope with a population increase?
	10810	There is no GP surgery around the Upton Lane proposal
	10664	Local GPs around Upton Lane can not cope with existing residents
	10835	There is no GP within walking distance around the Upton Lane proposal
	10714	GP surgeries around Upton Lane are oversubscribed and appointments are difficult to get without the addition of 80 homes
	10733	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable as doctors are already overloaded, one nearby has closed its books to new patients
	10754	It is not easy to find doctors in the area around Upton Lane
	11027	There is potential for an extra 320 residents with no provision for a doctors surgery, the existing surgeries are already unable to provide an adequate service
	10692	There are insufficient provisions for local Doctors services to support the proposed development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10720	There is limited availability for GP services and thus these services are not sufficient to support any development in Nursling and Rownhams.
Infrastructure - Healthcare	10941	There are clear wider issues with the cuts to local healthcare, something which should be looked at with the new development.
	11040	The proposed housing development will put strain on an already overloaded health service in Lordshill and Romsey, with no sign of additional facilities.
	11047	The proposed development will put additional strain on existing doctors.
Infrastructure - Hospitals	10926	The proposed additional 80 dwellings and increasing Southampton and TVBC population will put strain on the capacity of local hospitals and the UHS.
	11057	If Winchester A&E closes, there would be even more pressure on Southampton if more housing is built in Test Valley
Infrastructure - Local amenities	10941	Rownhams has lost all its local amenities in recent years,
	10942	The village only has one shop which will not be enough to cope with the population increase due to the new development.
	10945	The area has no local services to cope with the proposed development.
	10945	The area does not have adequate shops to be able to cope with the proposed development.
	10947	There are not enough facilities to support the proposed development.
	10864	The statement within the Local Plan are contradicted by the plans for proposed development as they contribute to the erosion of countryside and therefore the wellbeing and amenity of residents.
	11116	The report on the site conducted by the Council concluded that due to the lack of amenities the site is unsuitable for residential use.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - Local Services	11057	Local community facilities are non existent and not within comfortable walking distance
	10765	No consideration has been given to the impact that proposals for commercial development on the land West of Upton Lane will have on the amenity of local residents.
	10953	SHELAA 385 is incorrect in stating that Nursling has a range of facilities - Nursling has no local services, which is insufficient to provide for the proposed development.
Infrastructure - Pharmacies	10810	There is no pharmacy around the Upton Lane proposal
	10835	There is no pharmacy within walking distance around the Upton Lane proposal
Infrastructure - Power Lines	10083	The proposed allocation to the west of Upton Lane has overhead power cable bisecting it. It is not clear how proposed development could be accommodated without having an effect on the safety zone of the power lines, especially if this is to be employment related development that results in large warehouse type buildings or the stacking of containers
Infrastructure - Roads	10916	The Romsey Road is already causing traffic problems through the village and increased traffic will grind progress to a halt
	10916	The roads are already in a dire state with potholes and the increased traffic would make this worse
	10926	Due to the construction of B8 Units there will be a significant increase in HGV traffic, and the roads to Adnac Park and along Brownhill Way have already sent this increase. Consideration needs to be provided to ensure that appropriate parking facilities are arranged without significant impact to current traffic.
	10930	Insufficient road infrastructure has increased pressure because of Ashfield roundabout/Whitenap and the Hoe Lane outlet.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10932	The road networks do not have the capacity for a new development as shown by the recent developments at Hillyfields, Fen Meadow and Broadleaf.
	11044	Opposed to the Upton Lane proposal due to the lack of transport infrastructure
	10708	Object to the proposal to build houses on the field opposite Upton Crescent in Nursling as the road infrastructure can not allow for further development as the roads are already busy
	11156	Strongly disagree with the TVBC Draft Local Plan for the South Test Valley Upton sites because the new development isn't proposing updated road infrastructure
	10942	The area next to the proposed development has little accessible pavement or cycle lanes, meaning there will be greater numbers of cars on the road and therefore congestion.
	10945	The lane proposed for access to the warehousing is too small and therefore unsuitable.
	10949	The road infrastructure will not be able to cope with the 300+ vehicles with both light and heavy haulage caused by the proposed development.
	10949	The proposed development will lead to an increase in road traffic, leading to damaged roads and pedestrian access to roads much more dangerous.
	10765	The infrastructure will not cope with the proposed development as Upton Lane is a narrow country lane with no streetlights and minimal footpaths, and there is a weight restriction at the eastern end of Upton Lane which could not deal with large vehicles accessing the site.
	10765	Upton Lane is unclassified road and has no street lighting and pedestrian pavement and is designated as countryside in the Local Plan.
	11040	The road infrastructure is already overburdened and the new traffic lights on Romsey Road will not alleviate this.
	11089	Romsey Road is unsuitable for access to the proposed development sites, with many heavy vehicles getting lost and turning into a dead end on Nursling Street.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11089	The roads are unsuitable to support the proposed development as Upton Lane is too narrow and the condition of the road itself is in a poor state.
	11089	The council have not done enough to stop HGV drivers from ignoring the 3 ton restriction on the Upton Lane railway bridge and using it as a shortcut - a problem which would become more out of control with the increased traffic from the proposed developments.
	11019	There is too much already in the area with not enough supporting infrastructure or roads to support.
	10695	The recent developments have caused the roads to deteriorate and the strain of additional traffic will exacerbate this issue.
	10875	Upton Lane is not in suitable condition for heavy traffic that would utilise the industrial development, as it is a narrow lane which crosses the railway via a weak bridge at the southern end. There are no provisions to alter the unsuitable road network.
	10747	There need to be barriers installed from the Upton Lane motorway junction as far as Rownhams services to junction 3 to create less traffic in the area.
	10806	The Upton Lane proposal is unsuitable for warehouse or industrial use due to road access limitations and lack of transport infrastructure
Infrastructure - Schools	11027	Lack of public transport and reliance on private vehicles mean roads are busier. The proposed offsite junction improvements will need to result in compensation for residents for damage to health and property value.
	11036	There are insufficient school places to accommodate a new development.
	10926	The proposed additional 80 dwellings will have an impact on the primary school Nursling & Rownhams St Johns.
	10926	The proposed additional 80 dwellings will have an impact on the secondary school Mountbatten School.
	11026	Local schools are full so will not be able to accommodate over 350 new residents and their children.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11031	The proposed development will put strain on schools already under pressure.
	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the lack of infrastructure such as, schools
	10981	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the lack of infrastructure which is already oversubscribed such as schools
	11053	Additional housing will push the stretched services to breaking point such as schools, where no provisions have been made
	11057	There isn't enough school places for new children
	11113	The schools are already at full capacity
	10807	The proposal has not considered the lack of school places as currently overstretched
	10648	The two local schools Nursling Primary and Rownhams St. Johns school are already at capacity after the 2 housing estates have been built, there are no school places for residents in the proposed development
	10670	School places at Mountbatten School are already at full capacity with no room on the school bus and therefore no room for extra people
	10708	Object to the proposal to build houses on the field opposite Upton Crescent in Nursling as there are currently not enough schools in the area
	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because the development will have a detrimental impact on already stretched public services such as schools
	11156	Strongly disagree with the TVBC Draft Local Plan for the South Test Valley Upton sites because the new development isn't proposing a new school

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10941	The schools in Rownhams are already full - not enough to sustain a new development.
	10945	The primary school is oversubscribed and will not be able to cope with the proposed development.
	10945	There is no Secondary School in the area and therefore is not a reasonable location for the proposed development.
	10947	There are not enough schools to support the proposed development.
	10953	SHELAA 385 is incorrect in stating that Nursling has a range of facilities - Nursling has no secondary school and two oversubscribed primary schools, which is insufficient to provide for the proposed development.
	11045	The area does not have sufficient infrastructure to cope with the proposed development, as there are no secondary schools and both primary schools are oversubscribed.
	10899	The school infrastructure is struggling and this issue will be exacerbated by the increased population from the proposed development.
	11019	Development should take place elsewhere where the school infrastructure is enough to cope with the new development
	10875	There are no provisions for already oversubscribed local schools in Nursling and Rownhams to cope with the strain of approximately 180 additional pupils from the proposed development.
	10747	The proposed development will put additional pressure on local Schools.
	10716	There are insufficient school places for the local residents in Nursling currently and the schools will not be able to cope with the additional pressure from the proposed development.
	10844	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable as how will schools cope with an additional 160 children?
	10664	Local schools around Upton Lane can not cope with existing residents

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10714	Local schools around Upton Lane are over subscribed
	10733	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable as schools are already overloaded
	10754	It is not easy to find school places in the area around Upton Lane
	11027	There is potential for an extra 320 residents, 180 could be children with no provision for a school
	10692	There are insufficient provisions for schools to support the proposed development.
	10720	The primary and secondary schools are oversubscribed in the area and would not be able to cope with the additional pressure from the proposed development.
Infrastructure - shops	11026	There are not enough shops to accommodate over 350 new residents.
	11040	There are not enough shops to cope with the proposed development, with no sign of additional facilities.
	11045	The area does not have sufficient infrastructure to cope with the proposed development, as there is only one local shop.
	11019	Development should take place elsewhere where the Dentist infrastructure is enough to cope with the new development.
	10716	There is only one food shop in the Nursling area and thus it will not be suitable to support the increased population from the proposed development.
	10953	SHELAA 385 is incorrect in stating that Nursling has a range of facilities - Nursling only contains one small shop, which is insufficient to provide for the proposed development.
	10810	There is only one small shop around the Upton Lane proposal
	10835	There is no shop within walking distance around the Upton Lane proposal

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - Social care	10941	There are clear wider issues with the cuts to local social care, something which should be looked at with the new development.
Infrastructure - Transport	10953	Policy TR1 (Active & Sustainable Travel) - Unacceptable access, lack of appropriate and necessary transport infrastructure, significant adverse affects on local roads and existing traffic patterns and existing road users.
	10953	Policy TR2 (Assessing Transport Links) - Unacceptable access, lack of appropriate and necessary transport infrastructure, significant adverse affects on local roads and existing traffic patterns and existing road users.
Infrastructure - Utilities	10876	The appraisal for SHELAA 394 states "broadband speeds do not achieve over 10Mbps" whereas residents do not achieve in excess of 7 or 8 mbps. This is not sufficient broadband to support the proposed developments.
	10749	The drainage systems and gas supplies would be put under increased pressure by the proposed development.
	10720	The drainage infrastructure has been an after thought of other developments in the local area and thus cannot sustain under the pressure of any proposed developments in Nursling and Rownhams.
	10720	There are major flooding issues and a lack of drainage infrastructure on the roundabout and road by the golf course, which will cause more issues with increased traffic from the proposed development.
Infrastructure Assessment	10765	It is a major failing of the proposal that an assessment of the cumulative impact of a proposed development on existing infrastructure, as suggested by National Highways, has not been conducted.
Infrastructure-broadband	11113	The Broadband speed in Upton Lane is inefficient and there is no cable service
Infrastructure-public transport	11036	The proposed development does not have sufficient nearby public transport, which will lead to an increase in pollution.
	11031	There is a lack of public transport along Romsey Road.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the lack of public transport
	11053	Upton Lane is not served by public transport
	11057	Public transport stops at the lower end of Nursling and there is no street lighting along Romsey Road making night travelling unpleasant
	11057	There is no local transport to the area being considered for industrial use
	11113	The nearest bus link is 1km from the proposed sites and there is no access to rail services creating a car dependency which will contribute to traffic and reducing air quality
	10670	Opposed to the proposed development in Upton because there is no bus service in Upton
	10942	The bus service is almost non-existent and would not be able to handle the increased necessity for the public transport caused by the proposed development.
	10945	The area does not have sufficient bus services to be able to cope with the proposed development.
	10949	There is inadequate public transport in the area to be able to support the increased local population caused by the proposed development.
	10953	SHELAA 385 is incorrect in stating that Nursling has a range of facilities - Nursling has a single bus, which is insufficient public transport to provide for the proposed development. SHELAA later recognises that "the site is not well connected by public transport".
	11045	The area does not sufficient public transport to cope with the added pressure from the proposed development.
	10899	Bus times are too infrequent and non-existent at night leading to more people using cars, which will cause traffic congestion.
	10899	There are not enough bus stops within a close proximity to some residents, and no lighting on paths, meaning access to Romsey is difficult for Romsey.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11019	There is no public transport in the area to support the increased population from the proposed development.
	10876	The table on page 15 re SHELAA 385 admits "no bus route or railway station within 800m" which would not be suitable as provision for housing or employment development.
	10877	There are not enough public transport links in the area to support the proposed development.
	10878	There used to be regular buses along Romsey Road to Romsey and Southampton, though now there are now limited public transport links and not enough to cope with the additional pressure of the proposed development.
	10749	The link provided by the small diversion of the No.4 route which connected the Upton area into the region's bus network must be restored as a provision for any residential development.
	11116	The site should not be developed for residential use due to a lack of public transport in the local area.
	11116	The local public transport links are insufficient to cope with the additional pressure from the proposed development, and single carriage way bridges should be improved to support this.
	10716	The plan contradicts itself in stating that the area has a regular bus service but admits that the "site is not well connected by public transport". The site has insufficient public transport to support any proposed development.
	11005	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to the lack of public transport in the area
	10810	There are no buses in the Upton Lane area
	10835	There is no bus route within walking distance around the Upton Lane proposal
	10743	There is no public transport in the area around the Upton Lane proposal
	10754	There is a lack of public transport in the area around Upton Lane

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The site is currently remote from public transport, being around 800m north at its nearest point from Bluestar service 4 and will not deliver on a scale that will create sufficient demand to sustain a meaningful service as proposed.
Infrastructure-sewage	11113	Upton lane is not connected to the main sewerage system
	11110	Properties to the north of the M27 are not served by mains sewer provision-how will this be resolved with the additional housing?
	10675	Any new housing should make provisions for a sewage system that Southern Water can connect to- this will benefit the community as Upton lane /Lymer Villas is not on the mains sewage and the residents are being charged 4 times the regular charge by Aster
Insufficient Housing	10697	There is not enough housing proposed for the development and there should be commitment to a greater quantity of homes through higher density housing and mixed-use development.
Job creation	11113	The jobs created by industrial units at Upton lane are likely to be unskilled, low wage jobs and there is a shortage of people to take on this type of work in the area.
Landscape	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	The scale of the development, the way it proposed to be accessed and the polluting effects of the proposed development and loss of and damage to landscape features such as woodland and trees will have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of existing local residents on Upton Lane and Romsey Road in particular
	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the landscape
	10950	The proposed development will change the area from countryside to car-based suburb.
	10765	The proposed development will impact the attractive rural character of Upton Lane, used regularly by walkers and horse riders.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10765	The proposed development will completely alter the character of the area, introducing harshly urban featured such as large discordant buildings, widened roads, kerbs, street lighting and others associated with the industrial estate.
	10953	Paragraphs 5.212, 5.213 and 5.181 refer to the avoidance of the harm to landscape character and biodiversity. The proposed development directly contradicts this policy as the land allocation to the west of Upton Lane contains ancient woodland protected under the NERC Act 2016.
	11045	24/7 access by lorries and cars will significantly alter the character of the area and surrounding countryside, causing damage to the landscape features.
	11047	The proposed development will add to the issue caused by the recent three developments, that the village is now a housing estate with a loss of character and neighbourhood feel.
	10876	The proposed development would lead to a considerable loss of visual amenity and the design of the developments would not be in accordance with the surrounding countryside.
	10720	The proposed developments will significantly alter the landscape character of the area as a result of the loss of biodiversity and visual amenity.
	10754	The Upton Lane proposal will severely affect the landscape
Lee/Grove Farm	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	This land forms part of a larger promotion at Lee/Grove Farm which we regret has been ruled out in principle as not needed, and for no other clear reasons. This site and the wider promotion lie alongside a major gap in the public transport offer between Shirley and Romsey also passing Whitenap. There is unquestionably a major strategic opportunity, alongside a much more strategic development, to provide a direct frequent bus service to south Romsey from the northern edge of Southampton. This opportunity should be factored carefully into the Councils thinking as they consider the preparation of the Regulation 19 plan, and/or any review that needs to have regard to accommodating needs arising in SCC/NFDC.
	Stagecoach South and Go	The principle of development on this site is strongly supported with a view to it forming part of larger strategic allocation at Lee/Grove Farm in the relatively near term. If this site is considered sustainable

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	South Coast Limited 10243	and justifies allocation in this plan, then certainly this points to the appropriateness of looking at the Grove Farm site to meet further housing and employment needs with the latter already acknowledged at 4.211
Light Pollution	10675	Regarding the allocation at Upton Lane, will there be any considerations regarding light pollution? There has never been any street lighting in Upton and concerned that the proposed 80 new houses will be street lighted which is not in keeping with the area
	10670	Opposed to the proposed development in Upton because its going to add to the light pollution in the area that is already by a motorway
	10945	The proposed development in addition to recent developments around Nursling have significantly added to the light pollution in the area.
	10950	The proposed development will have increased effect on light pollution in the area.
	10953	The junction with Romsey Road and along Upton Lane will require lighting which will greatly change the character of the area at night. This is referenced in paragraph 5.204 but not considered for this development.
	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the additional light pollution it would cause
	10981	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning as it will cause light pollution
	11053	The Upton Lane proposal will increase light pollution
	11044	Opposed to the Upton Lane proposal due to the pollution from artificial lighting
	10835	The addition of traffic around Upton Lane would add to the light pollution which is a severe cause for concern
	10721	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to light pollution that will be created
	10754	The Upton Lane proposal will affect light pollution

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Local Gap	11031	The proposed development threatens the existence of the strategic gap which would be detrimental to the local identity of the village.
	11044	Opposed to the Upton Lane proposal due to the erosion of the village and loss of green boundaries
	11113	Opposed to development at the proposed site at Upton Lane because it will lead to the loss of a beautiful view from Southampton on the A3057 towards Romsey.
	10737	Concerned about the erosion of the local gap between North Baddesley and Romsey by the proposed industrial sites near Abbey Park Industrial site -development should go on brownfield or green field sites not in a local gap
	10765	Nursling has accommodated much of the Test Valley residential development in recent years and the open land which currently provides a local gap should be retained for this reason.
	10765	Disappointing that there is no inclusion of a Local Gap for Nursling and concerned that there will be an eventual coalescence of Nursling with Totton and Southampton, especially when other settlements vulnerable to urbanisation have been given these provisions.
	10765	<p>Consideration of a Local Gap should be given to the land south of the railway line as shown in Figure 1. This is considered an important gap marking the transition between the Nursling distribution estate to the east and the Lower Test Nature Reserve to the west.</p> <p>The Local Gap should be included in the new Local Plan and receive the same degree of protection as the other proposed Local Gaps under draft policy ENV4.</p>
	10864	There has been considerable development in the local area in recent years at the expense of important Local Gaps.
	10749	The proposed development at Upton Lane contradicts the principle to preserve the Local Gaps in the area.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10733	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable as the green gap between Southampton and Nursling has already disappeared
LP Consultation Process	11113	TVBC has not actively, timely or reasonably engaged or communicated with residents who only found out about the proposal in the Parish Newsletter
M27	10806	The Upton Lane proposal is not acceptable due to a loss of a natural break to the M27
Mental/physical wellbeing	10950	The proposed development will have a catastrophic effect on the mental and physical wellbeing of current local residents.
Misleading plans	11005	Object to the Upton Lane proposal as the plans are misleading, one section mentions 80 homes but the drawing identifies the area for employment
Motorway	10806	The Upton Lane proposal is unsuitable for housing due to the nearness of motorway
National Highways	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	We see no consultation response from National Highways in relation to the proposed allocations at Upton Lane, we do not know therefore whether it has been consulted
National Highways: Highway access	National Highways 10291	Adjacent to M27 Junction 3
Natural England: New Forest SAC, SPA, Ramsar	Natural England 10140	Falls within 13.8km of New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar, or within the wider 15km catchment, therefore necessary to address impacts of increased recreational pressure in accordance with policy BIO2. Mitigation will be expected to satisfy interim mitigation strategy, or the joint strategic solution.
Natural England: Solent SPAs	Natural England 10140	Falls within 5.6km of the Solent SPA sites, therefore necessary that address recreational impacts on the SPA sites in accordance with policy BIO2.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Need for development	11057	Is there a genuine need for this employment site given the empty units on other places like Abbey Park and Adanac
Neighbouring properties	10809	Oppose the Upton Lane proposal as our property will decline considerably and perhaps be difficult to sell
	10811	Oppose the Upton Lane proposal as it will have a detrimental effect on the value and privacy of our home as it is the only adjoining home to the site
	10721	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning as it will have a detrimental effect on the value of existing homes close by
	10754	Will the worst affected property owners be compensated from the Upton Lane proposal?
Noise Pollution	11162	Para.4.218-4.219 suggests that the allocation subject to noise survey so must be uncertainty about suitability for housing
	10930	The development will lead to an increase in 160 cars and this will lead to an increase in noise pollution.
	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the additional noise pollution it would cause
	10981	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning as it will cause noise pollution
	11053	The Upton Lane proposal will increase noise pollution
	11044	Opposed to the Upton Lane proposal due to the pollution from operational noise/vibrations
	11113	There is significant noise from the M27 and M271
	11113	The development will result in increased noise levels
	10945	The proposed development in addition to recent developments around Nursling have significantly added to the noise pollution in the area.
	10949	The proposed development will lead to an increase in noise pollution.
	10950	The proposed development will see an increase in noise pollution.
	11045	The noise pollution from the sites will directly and negatively impact residents.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11019	The increased population due to the new development means there will be far more noise pollution which will disrupt existing residents.
	11005	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to the increase in noise
	10806	The Upton Lane proposal is not acceptable due to potential noise pollution
	10827	The noise from the motorway has increased significantly in the Upton Lane area over the years
	10810	The motorway near the Upton Lane proposal already generates noise
	10835	The addition of traffic around Upton Lane would add to the noise pollution which is a severe cause for concern
	10714	The area around Upton Lane experiences noise pollution from the M27
	10721	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to noise pollution that will be created
	10743	The Upton Lane proposal is near a very noisy motorway
	10754	The Upton Lane proposal will affect noise pollution
	11027	A noise assessment should be conducted for existing residents as a residential development on the eastern site boundary may be permitted. If it proves unsuitable for new housing, neither is it suitable for existing housing.
Object	10835	The parish around Upton Lane includes the River Test SSSI, a world famous chalk stream, ancient water meadow habitat and wildlife reserve SSSI, the river runs into the Solent estuary one of 70 wetlands of International Importance in the UK and connects to the New Forest. Treating the land as what can be built on it and removing more breathing space for more inappropriate development is grossly unfair
Open Space	10932	The proposed developments will prevent residents from enjoying the open space for exercise and recreation.
	10708	Object to the proposal to build houses on the field opposite Upton Crescent in Nursling as allowing building in this location will lead to further building through to Romsey
	10765	Open space has been obliterated by intrusive and thoughtless development.
	10953	The proposed development will lead to the destruction of open space which is important to the physical and mental wellbeing of residents.
Out of character	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because the Industrial/Employment site is considered out of character with the current residential environment
	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because the proposal does not respect the local street pattern and is out of character with the local environment

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Over Development	11089	The area is becoming increasingly overdeveloped and over-industrialised and decreasingly can be considered a rural area.
	10828	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to over development in the area, it seems commercial units are dumped whenever there is some land, we will end up with no green spaces
	10825	The Upton Lane proposal will add to the area becoming over developed and industrialised, there will be no countryside left in Nursling and will become an extension of the city
	10820	The Upton Lane proposal will add to the area becoming over developed and industrialised, there will be no countryside left in Nursling and will become an extension of the city
	10665	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to over development in the area
	10714	The parish around Upton Lane is already 30% over developed against government guidelines
	10721	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning as the area has seen large developments in recent years causing damage to the area
	10743	The area of Nursling and Rownhams has had well over the amount of development for the area
	10754	The Upton Lane proposal and expansion of the village is deeply concerning, the area is already over sized
Parking	10932	Parking is an increasing issue in the area which will only get worse due to the new development.
Planning Permission/Use	10675	If the planning permission is granted for 80 new properties, are there any assurances that the planning will not be changed to industrial?
Policing	11047	Antisocial behaviour has increased on the Adanac Industrial Estate due to lack of police presence, an issue that could be caused by the increase in population due to the proposed development.
Pollution	10083	What about additional levels of noise, vibration and air pollution? Traffic already queues at peak times at the Upton Lane/Romsey Road junction, adding significantly more traffic to this junction will result in increasing tailbacks, this will result in increased air pollution.
	10083	Pollution from light, noise and vibration and disturbance and to air quality, the draft plan identifies the need for new development to avoid causing pollution. Given the modern 24hr/day 7 day/week economy, HGVs can be expected to be requiring access to the proposed employment land all through the day and night including weekends.
	10083	The impact of these lorry movements would be to totally disturb this current peaceful residential hamlet resulting in residents in Upton Lane and on Romsey Road having no respite. All additional vehicular traffic generated by development of this scale with associated junctions resulting in motor

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		traffic stacked waiting will inevitably increase local concentrations of air pollution with adverse effects for local residents
	10083	Upton Lane is a country lane with no street lighting, the use of this lane as the sole access into and out of the proposed allocations both sides of Upton Lane implies significant artificial light will be required on Upton lane itself and on the access roads from Upton Lane. This will turn an area of dark countryside into a brightly lit urbanised area, totally changing the character and quality of the area at night
	10932	Litter is becoming an increasing problem which will only worsen with more people from the proposed development who will pollute the environment.
	11113	The proposed development will increase levels of noise and light pollution
	11113	The development will result in increased light pollution levels
	10807	The community needs to be protected from additional air, light and noise pollution from increased traffic, warehousing and housing
	10765	The noise pollution from traffic and the site, the lighting from the site and the exhaust emissions from the vehicles will all greatly impact the local environment, emphasized further by the 24/7 access needed for the site.
	10765	The light, air and noise pollution caused by the site will also have detrimental impacts on the mental and physical wellbeing of local residents.
	10953	There has been no pollution impact assessment to measure the potential increased noise, air and light pollution from the proposed development.
	10953	Paragraph 5.190 identifies the need to avoid pollution, which is contradicted by the need for HGV access to the site all day and night, greatly increasing the pollution due to extra traffic.
	10953	Policy ENV5 (Pollution) - significant and unacceptable pollution from extensive artificial lighting, traffic, noise, vibration, disturbance and adverse effects on air quality.
	10953	Policy ENV6 (Lighting) - significant and unacceptable pollution from extensive artificial lighting, traffic, noise, vibration, disturbance and adverse effects on air quality.
	11047	Concern about the pollution and noise caused by the new development.
	11019	The increased use of roads due to the lack of footpaths and pedestrian access means there will be an increase in pollution.
	10695	There will be an increase in pollution due to the recent developments - any additional development will exacerbate this issue.
	10698	The increase in traffic due to the proposed development will lead a significant increase in air pollution.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10876	The larger parcel of land at Upton Lane being used as an employment site will involve hazardous materials, increasing the likelihood of unpleasant smells and threat to health.
	10877	The proposed development is another development in the area which greatly increases noise and pollution.
	10878	The proposed development would result in a particular increase in pollution.
	10747	The proposed development will lead to an increase in pollution and noise.
	10720	There will be a considerable increase in pollution caused by the volume of traffic and a larger amount of noise disturbance for residents as a result of industrial vehicles using surrounding roads.
	10749	The proposed development would have a negative impact on the rural setting as a result of considerable light pollution.
	11116	The noise pollution in the area as a result of busy surrounding roads and the increase in traffic will have a negative impact on existing and prospective residents.
	10716	There would be constant noise pollution caused by the increase of heavy vehicle traffic to a countryside area.
	10692	The proposed developments will significantly increase the pollution.
	10926	The proposed development of B8 Units will lead to an increase in light pollution.
	10926	The proposed development of B8 Units will lead to an increase in noise pollution.
	10926	The proposed development of B8 Units will lead to an increase in emission pollution.
	10930	The development will lead to an increase in 160 cars and this will lead to an increase in air pollution.
	11031	The proposed development will lead to an increase in light pollution from the potential site.
	11031	The proposed development will lead to an increase in air and noise pollution due to increased traffic from both sites.
	11044	Opposed to the Upton Lane proposal due to the pollution from traffic
	11005	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to the increase in pollution
	10665	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to pollution
	10714	The area around Upton Lane experiences pollution with a motorway close by
	10754	The access point to the Upton Lane proposal will add to congestion leading to an increase in pollution
	10754	The employment site as part of Upton Lane will bring large vehicles and pollution, the first view of the 'village' will be an industrial estate
Population density	10945	Nursling is already one of the most densely populated areas of Test Valley and cannot handle a further increase to this population.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Previous comments	11045	There has been previous development within the parish and the population density is already high - the proposed development will make this issue worse.
	10664	The local area around Upton Lane is already highly populated due to new and ongoing developments
	10765	The Old Nursling Residents Association fully endorse the comments made by Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council.
Previous Developments	10981	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning as Nursling and Rownhams have had its fair share of development in recent years
	11053	The villages of Nursling and Rownhams have been subject to large amount of new homes in last 5 years
Privacy	10742	The hedge opposite Lymer Villas must stay for privacy reasons
Property Value	10949	The proposed development will lead to a substantial drop in value in house property and will make the area less attractive.
	10953	The pollution caused by the new developments will see a decrease in property value in the area, making it harder for existing residents to sell their homes.
	10716	The properties in the area would decrease in value as a result of the proposed development.
Proposed Development	11047	Objection registered as to the development proposed at Upton Lane.
	11089	The Draft Local Plan 2040 will affect our parish with the proposed development of a new employment site of 8.5ha between the M271 (North) and Upton Lane.
	11089	The Draft Local Plan 2040 will affect our parish with the proposed development of 80 new homes between Romsey Road and Upton Lane.
	10876	The two Upton Sites should be removed from 2040 plan and the reasons for the site being refused as a site for a Tesco superstore in 1989 are still valid.
Proposed Employment Sites	10765	Objection registered as to the comprehensive major development proposed either side of Upton Lane.
	10765	The proposed sites are outside the settlement boundaries of Nursling and Rownhams and within the countryside. Concerned as to why there has been a significant shift in policy from the Local Plan,

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		which designated the land as countryside, to the Draft Local Plan which no longer gives the land countryside protection.
PROW	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the lack of cycleways and footpaths
	11005	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to the lack of footpaths and cycleways in the area
	10742	The footpath up to the main road is a right of way
PROW / Cycle Lanes	10754	There is a lack of cycle ways and footpaths in the area around Upton Lane
Public Consultation	10953	Resident would have appreciated fair opportunity for consultation on the proposed developments.
	10875	Residents of Upton Lane and Romsey Rd have not received written communication from TVBC as to the development proposals, leaving a limited amount of time for residents to make comments.
Pylons	11026	Questions what would happen to the pylons that are currently where the suggested development will take place.
	10720	Both sites proposed for development are beneath overhead power lines, causing a safety hazard for potential residents.
	11113	There are two electricity pylons on the site.
	10721	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the pylons on the site, these are a huge health risk
	10743	Who would want to live near a pylon on the Upton Lane proposal?
Pylons/Site location	11031	The proposed site for development is unsuitable due to the proximity of motorways and electricity pylons on the proposed building site.
Railway Bridge	10825	There is a weight restriction on Upton Lane bridge which HGVs ignore, how will they stop the increase in traffic from the Upton Lane development using this bridge? Station Road will bare the brunt of the traffic
	10820	There is a weight restriction on Upton Lane bridge which HGVs ignore, how will they stop the increase in traffic from the Upton Lane development using this bridge?
Recreation	11026	There are not enough places for recreation or room for places for recreation to accommodate over 350 new residents.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Rural / Urban	10809	Oppose the Upton Lane proposal as it would completely destroy the rural aspect of the area and make it urban development
rural areas	10672	Villages in the south of the Borough are under continuous threat of encroaching industrial development which will have an impact on people's quality of life as open spaces are lost and roads are congested with traffic increasing pollution.
	10672	The south of the Borough with its countryside villages such as Nursling need to be protected from further industrial development to retain their character
Scale of development	11113	Opposed to development at the proposed site at Upton Lane because Upton is a semi-rural area where development of this scale is inappropriate
	10648	There have already been 2 housing estates built in this community, why is there need for more? New Housing should be diverted to Abbotswood Estate instead
	11156	With the massive expansion of the Nursling site the industrial units are not needed as they will further shrink the size of the village.
Services and facilities	10844	TVBC has a responsibility to consider, maintain and develop existing services, living conditions and environment of its residents and tax payers and the Upton Lane proposal fails in all these respects
	10743	The proposal could be allocated to Stockbridge, they have the infrastructure such as schools, pubs and shops
Settlement Boundaries	10945	The area that has been located for development is countryside and outside of the plan area.
	10953	The land at Upton Lane is currently designated as countryside meaning development is restricted by Policy COM2 and only considered for approval under exceptional circumstances. How can the changing settlement boundaries be justified?
	10953	The proposed development allocations are in land that is currently designated as countryside and is currently outside defined settlement boundaries.
	10876	The proposed development is not suitable for the area as it does not respect the settlement boundary of Nursling and development will take over the surrounding countryside, as well as the noise pollution from the site being bound between the M27 and M271.
	10876	The site boundary includes protected woodland.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10716	The site is shown as twice the size than the mapping of 8.5ha and the plan states that the plan relates poorly to the settlement boundary of Nursling begins to sprawl development into the open countryside.
Settlement Hierarchy	10765	Nursling has been wrongly placed as a Tier 2 settlement due to its lack of facilities available to the local community, including no doctors or dental surgeries, limited sports provision, no railway station, minimal bus service, no secondary school, oversubscribed primary schools and only one small shop.
	10765	Stockbridge have a much wider range of services and facilities yet have not been allocated any sites for further residential development.
	10765	Serious consideration should be given to revise the local plan so that parishes that will struggle to maintain services with further development such as Nursling and Rownhams, North Baddesley and Valley Park do not have to take on the bulk of proposed development.
Sewage	10742	There is no main sewage in the area of Upton Lane
SINC status	10765	The land adjacent to the Nursling Electricity Sub-Station is an area of significant ecological value and does not benefit from any protection.
		The land should be given SINC status in accordance with draft policy BIO1. Attached is a detailed Ecological Survey and Assessment Report supporting the case for SINC status.
Site allocation	10672	There is a disproportionate amount of agricultural land that has been allocated for employment in the far south of the Borough changing the farmland landscape dramatically for example; Nursling Industrial estate now stretches all the way down to Redbridge village along Test Lane and Adanac Farm and Bargain Farm including Lidl's distribution depot on the south side of the M271
	10672	There are already a number of industrial estates and business parks encroaching on Nursling and there is a fear amongst residents that if this development goes ahead not only will there be an immediate effect, but this will lead to more development which will destroy the character of Nursling
	11156	Strongly disagree with the TVBC Draft Local Plan for the South Test Valley Upton sites because there are enough new homes in Nursling, Redbridge Lane, Broadleaf Park and there should be no more development in Nursling
Site location	10936	Test Valley has had enough housing development in recent years.
	11031	The scale of development the village has been through already is disproportionate to it's size.
	10708	Object to the proposal to build houses on the field opposite Upton Crescent in Nursling

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10708	Object to the proposal to build houses on the field opposite Upton Crescent in Nursling as the area is already developed
	10941	There are alternative sites within Test Valley which have less population density and more infrastructure to sustain a new development.
	10941	The strategic approach is not consistently applied across Test Valley, as the development in Tier 2 Stockbridge has respected the local character of the town and will not have a negative impact on the vitality of the centre - no allocation for new development has been made for the next 16 years.
	10942	The area of proposed development is already overpopulated. Other parts of Test Valley should be chosen to share the load of development.
Size of development	10941	The Draft Local Plan falsely claims that the proposed development set out in Policy SA8 will equate to 8.5ha, when the combined areas of the two allocated sites (12.6ha for Land West of Upton Lane and 4.6ha for Land East of Upton Lane) equates to 17.2ha.
Soil	10950	The proposed development will have increased effect on the soil quality in the area.
Extension to built form	Southampton CC 10098	Logical extension of built form given bound between M27, M271 and A3057
Sustainable travel modes to Southampton	Southampton CC 10098	Sustainable transport measures built into allocation to ensure reliable alternatives to private car. Measures could include connection to strategic cycle network (SCN3) that will link Southampton to Romsey via Nursling and improvements to frequency of bus services including future MRT
Traffic M27, A3057	Southampton CC 10098	Primary concern around increase in traffic flows into Southampton from site for work and leisure, or into site from Southampton for work. Main road into city M271 and A3057 suffer congestion at peak times
Southern Water	Southern Water 10022	SW infrastructure crosses the site which needs to be taken into account for the layout of the proposed development as an easement of 6 metres or more, depending on the pipe size and depth would be required which may affect site layout or require diversion. Easements should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting
	Southern Water 10022	Add criteria stating 'layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes' Review whether to add suggested criteria to policy wording

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
infrastructure - sewer	Southern Water 10022	SW have undertaken preliminary assessment of capacity of existing SW infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for proposal which indicated that existing local sewerage infrastructure to site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development
Infrastructure - wastewater	Southern Water 10022	Proposal for 80 dwellings on site as well as the commercial element at this site will generate a need for reinforcement of the wastewater network to provide additional capacity to serve the development. This reinforcement would be provided through New Infrastructure charge to developers
	Southern Water 10022	connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation
	Southern Water 10022	Add criteria stating 'occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of wastewater network reinforcement, in consultation with the service provider' Review whether to add suggested criteria to policy wording
Spatial Strategy	10672	The area around Nursling and Rownhams should not be protected from further industrial development and both housing and employment development should be spread out more evenly throughout the Borough
Sustainability	10765	Strong view that further concentration of development in Nursling is not a viable means of sustainable development.
Sustainability Appraisal	11161	Objection on sustainability and site selection. The site was ruled out for residential development in the site appraisal (page 620). The site is not included in the preferred pool of sites in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report ref Table 3 page 43 Preferred Pool of Sites
	Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council 10083	The allocations do not pass the test of the Councils own draft Local Plan, indeed the Councils own assessment of the proposed allocation of land east of Upton Lane for housing development in the Sustainability Appraisal concluded that is unacceptable
Traffic	11036	The proposed development will see an increase in traffic.
	10926	Romsey Road has seen an increase in traffic problems due to traffic lights, a lack of infrastructure for Oasis academy school and the new dwellings from Fen Meadow and Broadmead developments.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10926	There is insufficient infrastructure to support the current dwellings on Romsey Road and Upton Crescent and the golf course and the M271/M27 is suffering with traffic volumes.
	10930	Insufficient road infrastructure on Romsey Road since the Hillyfield development and more houses will increase traffic.
	10936	The current traffic levels could not cope with the level of population increase using the roads due to the proposed development.
	11026	Traffic will be a lot worse with 250 extra vehicles from the housing estate, and the trucks and vans from the industrial estate using Romsey Road and Upton Lane.
	10976	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the potential traffic congestion leading to accidents
	10981	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning as it is not suitable for the traffic it would generate causing congestion
	11053	Romsey Road and main roads leading to/from Romsey Road cannot carry the existing volume of traffic, additional traffic will worsen the situation
	11044	Opposed to the Upton Lane proposal due to the significant impact it will have on local roads
	11070	Traffic on this route is particularly bad at weekends and evenings and this will be exacerbated if more people from the development use the roads
	10807	The proposal has not considered the potential increase in traffic congestion
	10648	Upton lane is a very windy, narrow road which makes it very dangerous in the winter when the water runs down the road and freezes and when traffic is congested
	10672	If the proposal goes ahead, the increase in traffic and heavy vehicles will go up and down Upton Lane causing danger to pedestrians, further erosion to the road surface, pollution and potential damage to the weak bridge
	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because the employment opportunities created will be at the detriment of the residents because of the level of increased traffic
	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because the increase in traffic will result in additional emissions, pollution and noise
	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because highway access and safety will be compromised because if the increase in traffic impacting vehicle drivers/pedestrians/cyclists
	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because it is already difficult to exit Upton crescent on to Romsey road due to the current level of

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		traffic and this is the only exit route meaning increased levels of traffic will result in delays for emergency/medical care and increase stress and anxiety due to delays
	10907	Opposed to the development of 80 houses and 8.5 ha industrial/employment at land at Upton because the additional traffic will impact access routes to the M271/M27 and cause further delays on an already busy road
	11156	Strongly disagree with the TVBC Draft Local Plan for the South Test Valley Upton sites because the new development will cause more traffic chaos on the already busy Romsey Road
	11125	At peak times it is nearly impossible to get out of Upton Lane due to heavy traffic-it is a narrow lane with a 60mph speed limit which is too high and the road will be used as a rat run once this new development goes ahead
	10942	The proposed development will add to the already terrible traffic.
	10945	The traffic levels in Nursling will not be able to cope with the proposed development.
	10947	The roads can not cope with the level of traffic created by the proposed development.
	10953	Low wage employment from the development of warehouse and industrial units will mean employees have to travel from affordable housing areas, increasing the traffic on roads.
	10953	The increased current traffic of heavy-load vehicles will cause a noise and vibration disturbance.
	11040	The proposed employment and housing developments will increase traffic in Upton Lane significantly.
	11040	Automatic traffic to the industrial and residential sites will impact a huge area.
	11045	Traffic congestion from the sites will directly and negatively impact residents.
	11047	The over development in the area will create additional traffic congestion in an area already used as a shortcut from Lordshill to the M27.
	10899	Romsey already has busy traffic congestion and heavy vehicles, an issue which will be exacerbated if the proposed development goes ahead.
	11089	There would be a significant increase in traffic, which would put further strain on an already busy road at peak times with the M271 traffic.
	11019	The traffic congestion is already bad at peak times and this issue will be exacerbated by the proposed development.
	10695	There has been a considerable impact on traffic from other developments in the area, and along Romsey Road because of the unnecessary local traffic lights along Redbridge Lane. This issue will be exacerbated by the proposed development.
	10698	The proposed development would create a significant amount of traffic and heavy goods vehicles.
	10876	The developments would greatly increase traffic in the area and negatively affect Highway safety on Upton Lane.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10877	The proposed development will greatly increase traffic issues on the already busy A3057 and this could make the roads more dangerous.
	10878	The proposed development will have a significant impact on traffic and will make the surrounding roads more dangerous.
	10747	The proposed development will lead to an increase in traffic and heavy vehicles.
	10720	There are already significant traffic issues due to drainage issues and further development would exacerbate these issues.
	10749	Distribution and transport industry will be attracted to employment site being so close to the M271, meaning HGV and heavy vehicle traffic through the surrounding roads will increase and making roads unsafe.
	11116	The proposed development will cause a significant increase in traffic on the surrounding roads.
	10716	There have been consistent traffic problems in the area and these will be exacerbated by the proposed development.
	11005	Object to the Upton Lane proposal as the A3057 is already busy and the anticipated traffic congestion may result in accidents and dangerous access
	10844	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable as the area is not built to manage an additional volume of traffic
	10844	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable as Romsey Road traffic is heavy at peak times, it is common to see traffic queuing from the lights at Nursling Street/Romsey Road to the bridge over the M27, additional residential and industrial traffic will cause serious problems
	10811	Oppose the Upton Lane proposal as it is regularly used with no footpaths and the increase in traffic would create a safety risk and affect the properties close by
	10828	Object to the Upton Lane proposal as Romsey Road is extremely busy to access from Upton Crescent and is used as a diversion route when there are issues on the M27/M271, development on this site would make traffic a nightmare for all living in the area
	10825	The Upton Lane proposal would increase traffic in the area which is already a nightmare at rush hour. The roads are small, windy and in poor condition in Upton Lane and experience speeding
	10820	The Upton Lane proposal would increase traffic in the area which is already a nightmare at rush hour. The roads are small, windy and in poor condition in Upton Lane and experience speeding, there will be more rubbish and fly tipping
	10810	Romsey Road traffic is non stop at rush hour, it is impossible to cross the road, cars back up on Upton Lane and the area is a diversion route when there are issues on the M27 this occurs now without the Upton Lane development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10665	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to traffic
	10664	The road network around Upton lane such as Romsey Road are already heavily congested, further development will not help
	10835	The intersection with Romsey Road is already very busy, adding HGVs and extra traffic would be appalling, Upton Lane is a countryside location
	10714	Romsey Road is already heavy and at standstill at peak times
	10721	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to traffic that will be created
	10744	Oppose the Upton Lane proposal due to the semi-rural location used by cyclists, walkers and horse riders. An increase in cars using the lane would be considerable and dangerous.
	10733	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable due to the huge increase in traffic trying to access Romsey Road
	10743	Upton Lane cannot take more traffic, see the state of station road
	10743	It is hard to pull out of Upton Crescent, no one keeps to the 30mph speed limit on the A3057
	10748	Romsey Road keeps the traffic moving however, the traffic lights being installed will make it even worse
	10754	The access point to the Upton Lane proposal will add to congestion
	10692	The traffic along Romsey Road from the proposed development will impact the local area.]
Traffic/Noise	11027	The proposed development will create more traffic, noise, air and light pollution and will negate the enjoyment of the area and the carbon free future vision.
Traffic/Public Transport	10765	The Romsey Road is part of the only bus route in the parish and the bus route for secondary schools, and the proposed development will create even more traffic on these roads, making it dangerous for vehicular and pedestrian road users.
Trees	11044	Opposed to the Upton Lane proposal due to the significant loss of trees
Trees/View	10810	The Upton Lane proposal will severely impact our quality of life, we brought our home due to the trees and view
Trucks on Upton Lane	11125	There is a historical case of a transport company that got permission for storage on Upton Lane at the SEB site -this resulted in 40ft artic lorries parked on the pavements and mechanical noise which caused a lot of distress and since the lorries stopped coming down the lane, the cottages opposite the site have stopped shaking and there have been no further cracks -concerned that the new development will cause the same issues
Unsuitable	10981	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning as the site is inappropriate being a narrow country lane

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10744	Oppose the Upton Lane proposal as it is neither suitable or substantive enough to accommodate such plans
Upton Lane	10916	The village is already oversized
	10916	The plan includes an 'employment site'. This would lead to larger vehicles and more pollution
	10916	How would existing property holders be compensated for all the noise and inconvenience while the development takes place?
	10916	Nursling & Rownhams has been developed a few times over the past 30 years - it is time to leave it be
Upton Lane - Access	10916	Access to and from Upton Lane would be a major problem, adding to congestion and pollution
Wildlife	10828	Object to the Upton Lane proposal as development on this area will take away areas of habitat for local wildlife
	10810	The Upton Lane proposal would impact local wildlife in the area
	10667	The Upton Lane proposal should not go ahead due to the loss of wildlife which is valuable for the wellbeing of the planet, it should be kept
	10665	Object to the Upton Lane proposal due to wildlife concerns
	10714	The Upton Lane proposal will cause wildlife to disappear
	10721	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning as development will impact wildlife which should be preserved
	10744	Oppose the Upton Lane proposal as habitats will be destroyed to make way for development which is barbaric
	10733	The government is engaged in a drive to protect wildlife, how does developing valuable land and destroying ancient woodland fit with this policy?
Woodland	10765	The woodland is a Priority Habitat under the strengthened NERC Act 2006, which the council has a duty to conserve and enhance. There are also fine specimen trees, along with ancient woodland and an ancient former orchard surrounding Upton Lane and Grove Lodge. The proposed development must consider the site's ecological importance.
	10981	The Upton Lane proposal is concerning due to the damage it would have on the woodland and habitats
	10733	The Upton Lane proposal is unacceptable as the area for industrial use is woodland, homes to flora and fauna

Policy SA9 Abbey Park
Paragraphs - 4.222-4.227

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Flood Risk	Development would be subject to a FRA as necessary
Active Travel	The site is considered to be at a sustainable location, subject to the enhancement of walking and cycling connections to the wider town and town centre. Additional pedestrian and cycling links will help the development to integrate within the area and will provide active travel connections to the site, including to bus routes and bus stops on Botley Road.
Local Gap	The process and justification for the choice of sites proposed for potential allocation for development is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Site Appraisals (Appendix V) and the Site Selection Topic Paper. The scale of development requirements leads to a need for greenfield sites outside of existing settlement boundaries to be proposed for allocation, including within local gaps.
Southern Water	Master planning of the site can take appropriate account of the need for the protection and avoidance of the easement for water infrastructure.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Develop-funded uplift to bus frequencies	10243	As Bluestar service 5 lacks sufficient frequencies and peak hour journeys it must be assumed this will see develop-funded uplift. Proportionate contributions might be justifiable from this allocation according to Policy TR1 and Appendix 3 "general requirements for strategic developments".
Environmental constraints	Environment Agency 10068	No environmental constraints identified.
Flood risk	10052	Some areas have high to low surface water flood risks which need to be assessed.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Active Travel	Hampshire County Council 10099	There are currently pedestrian facilities on Premier Way, connecting the sites to Luzborough Lane and Botley Road, however there is a lack of safe pedestrian crossing facilities that would be essential for encouraging active travel to site. There is currently a lack of cycling infrastructure to provide connections to the site
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Suggest criterion c is amended as follows: "c. Access to the development via Premier Way, with the provision of improvements to walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure as identified in the Southern Test Valley Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (or subsequent equivalent document)".
Infrastructure - surface water	Hampshire County Council 10099	This site is in a Catchment Management Plan priority area where stricter drainage strategy requirements will apply.
Minerals and Waste	Hampshire County Council 10099	The site is over 3ha in area and lies wholly within the Minerals Safeguarding Area. The site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area, as defined by the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. Developers should aim to maximise the prior extraction of mineral resources on this site, in line with the policies of the Plan. A Mineral Resource Assessment is required to be submitted to the Minerals Planning Authority as part of any application to develop this site.
Land adj. to Abbey Park Ind. Est. - Open Space	Romsey Town Council 10812	There is a current undetermined planning application; whilst in the local gap its location and intent to dedicate open space would minimise harm. The dedication of open space must be part of the policy
Local Gap	Romsey & District Society Planning Committee 10279	Justification for diminishing the Local Gap by the allocation of an Employment site at Land adjacent to Abbey Park Romsey? Para 4.225 on hardly gives any justification other than the gap will be reduced!
	10269	Units nearer the M27 and M271 would be more appropriate rather than eroding the gap by expanding The Abbey Industrial Estate
Runoff	Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee 10052	Runoff to the south needs controlling, this could affect the hydrology of Luzborough Plantation.
site promotion	11147	promoted site (adjacent to Botley Road and Highwood Lane) is not reliant upon the delivery of the Abbey Park Industrial Estate allocation but once the allocation begins to deliver, it will complement

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		and strengthen the existing sustainability of the settlement and would offer further employment opportunities in the town once delivered
Southern Water	Southern Water 10022	SW infrastructure crosses the site which needs to be taken into account for the layout of the proposed development as an easement of 6 metres or more, depending on the pipe size and depth would be required which may affect site layout or require diversion. Easements should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting
Southern Water	10022	Add criteria stating 'layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes' Review whether to add suggested criteria to policy wording
Support	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The allocation is strongly supported as it is within immediate reach of Bluestar services 4 and 5 providing direct links into Romsey and a range of other communities within a competitive bus journey time.

Policy SA10 Botley Rd
Paragraphs - 4.228-4.233

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Flood Risk	Development would be subject to a FRA as necessary
Active Travel	The site is considered to be at a sustainable location, subject to the enhancement of walking and cycling connections to the wider town and town centre. Additional pedestrian and cycling links will help the development to integrate within the area and will provide active travel connections to the site, including to bus routes and bus stops on Botley Road.
Local Gap	The process and justification for the choice of sites proposed for potential allocation for development is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Site Appraisals (Appendix V) and the Site Selection Topic Paper. The scale of development requirements leads to a need for greenfield sites outside of existing settlement boundaries to be proposed for allocation, including within local gaps.
Southern Water	Master planning of the site can take appropriate account of the need for the protection and avoidance of the easement for water infrastructure.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Develop-funded uplift to bus frequencies	10243	As Bluestar service 5 lacks sufficient frequencies and peak hour journeys it must be assumed this will see develop-funded uplift. Proportionate contributions might be justifiable from this allocation according to Policy TR1 and Appendix 3 "general requirements for strategic developments".
Environment Agency: Environmental constraints	10068	No environmental constraints identified.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Flood risk	10052	Some areas have high to low surface water flood risks which need to be assessed.
Active Travel	Hampshire County Council 10099	There are currently pedestrian facilities on Premier Way, connecting the sites to Luzborough Lane and Botley Road, however there is a lack of safe pedestrian crossing facilities that would be essential for encouraging active travel to site. There is currently a lack of cycling infrastructure to provide connections to the site
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Suggest criterion c is amended as follows: "c. Access to the development via Premier Way, with the provision of improvements to walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure as identified in the Southern Test Valley Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (or subsequent equivalent document)".
Infrastructure - surface water	Hampshire County Council 10099	This site is in a Catchment Management Plan priority area where stricter drainage strategy requirements will apply.
Minerals and Waste	Hampshire County Council 10099	The site is below 3ha in area but lies wholly within the Minerals Safeguarding Area. The site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area, as defined by the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. Developers should aim to maximise the incidental extraction of mineral resources on this site, in line with the policies of the Plan.
Listed building	Historic England 10049	I suggest mentioning in the supporting text the listed buildings west of the roundabout, noting that Luzborough House is Grade II*.
Land South of Botley Road - Local Gap	Romsey Town Council 10812	There is a current undetermined planning application to which RTC has objected. The site is in the local gap between Romsey and North Baddesley and would diminish the gap as observed from the A27 at its narrowest point
	Romsey Town Council 10812	Site is unacceptable as the preservation of the gap as viewed from the A27 RTC objects to this allocation
Local Gap	Romsey Town Council 10812	Recognise the need for employment sites, object to the proposal to extend Abbey Business Park immediately south of the A27 as this will dramatically reduce the local gap, RTC object to the SA10 allocation
Runoff	Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee 10052	Runoff to the south needs controlling, this could affect the hydrology of Luzborough Plantation.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Southern Water	Southern Water 10022	SW infrastructure crosses the site which needs to be taken into account for the layout of the proposed development as an easement of 6 metres or more, depending on the pipe size and depth would be required which may affect site layout or require diversion. Easements should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting
	Southern Water 10022	Add criteria stating 'layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes' Review whether to add suggested criteria to policy wording
Support	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The allocation is strongly supported as it is within immediate reach of Bluestar services 4 and 5 providing direct links into Romsey and a range of other communities within a competitive bus journey time.
Sustainable accessibility	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Optimising sustainable accessibility depends on improved bus stops and pedestrian crossing facilities on Botley Road. The wider comprehensive masterplan for the enlarged employment area must secure direct, seamless and legible pedestrian and cycle connectivity across the site from Botley Road to the southern boundary with NA9 in particular, pursuant to policy TR1 and Appendix 3 requirements.

Policy SA11 – Test Valley Business Park
Paragraphs 4.234 – 4.240

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Biodiversity	Development would be subject to an ecological study including of habitats and protected species. Mitigation would be provided to satisfy site designated under the Habitats Regulations. The site is not itself covered by any statutory nature conservation designations
Environmental Impact - Hydrology	Development would be subject to a hydrological assessment report to confirm there would be no adverse effect on the hydrologically sensitive designations at Emer Bog SAC and Baddesley Common SSSI. This has been highlighted in the Habitats Regulations Assessment.
Environmental Impact - Pollution	Development will be required to meet the conditions set out in draft Local Plan 2040 policies TR2: Assessing Transport Impacts and ENV5: Pollution to avoid or mitigate pollution to an appropriate standard and to prevent any unacceptable impact
Minerals Safeguarding	For sites located within a minerals safeguarding area developers will be expected comply with the policies set out in the County's minerals and waste plan prior to the development of the site
Need for employment sites	The employment land requirement for Southern Test Valley is a minimum of 40.4 hectares, we have assessed whether there is sufficient existing supply of employment land to meet this need and there remains a shortfall in meeting our needs, specifically for Class B8 land (warehousing) in Southern Test Valley. However, due to the increase in housing needs, we will review our employment needs to inform the Regulation 19 stage.
Site access	Access to the site will be through the existing business park and take into consideration the protected trees on site. The additional traffic generated can be acceptably accommodated on the highway network. Development would also include a pedestrian/cycle access from Botley Road
Visual Impact	The site is not within a Local Gap and therefore would not risk contributing to the physical or visual coalescence of settlements, the site is also surrounded by vegetation which shall be retained which should limit any visual impact of development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Biodiversity	10753	The proposed development on the land at Test Valley Business Park will have a significant impact on local ecology as the immediate area is covered by SACs, SSSIs and SINC.
	10753	There are SINC.s that bound three sides of the proposed site - Lights Meadow to the North and Nutburn Meadow to the east and south. These areas should be safeguarded against development.
	10753	Emer Bog and Baddesley Common are designated as SACs, SSSIs and SINC.s and the development will have a negative impact on the ecology and biodiversity of the sites, caused by drainage systems.
Emer Bog SAC	10140 Natural England	This site is in close proximity to Emer Bog SAC and Baddesley Common SSSI and will need to consider hydrological impacts and demonstrate any changes to groundwater or surface water would not adversely affect the hydrology of these designations.
Employment sites	10025 North Baddesley Parish Council	We see no mention of the vacant employment premises in the area, nor industrial buildings yet to be built on brownfield sites. We see no need to build on greenfield site next to Draper Tools that will be visually intrusive to the village
Environmental constraints	10068 Environment Agency	No environmental constraints identified.
Facilities	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	The site is distanced from the built-up area and bus services with the nearest stop served by Bluestar service 5 about 1100m away and The Avenue shops a little further to the south served by Bluestar services 4 and 5. This makes bus use unattractive and the site is likely to be highly car-dependent as a result. We presume the allocation reflects a specific requirement for an established local business.
Green Space	10753	There are trees designated with TPOs on the western edge of the site and should be assessed as to the damage the development would cause.
Hydrology & Emer Bog	10052 Romsey & District Society: Natural Environment Committee	Proposed increase in employment land close to Emer Bog is likely to have an adverse effect on the SAC, due to hydrological effects of more built land. Therefore, it should not be allowed.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - Transport	10099 Hampshire County Council	Although the supporting text (criterion d) specifies that the site will be accessed from the existing site access this is not specified in the policy wording. Suggest that point d is amended to clarify this. This point should also be amended to include the requirement to contribute towards walking, wheeling and cycling measures, as suggested for policies SA9 and SA10.
Local gap	11083	The employment site east of Test valley Business Park breaches a local gap
Minerals and Waste	10099 Hampshire County Council	The site is below 3ha in area but lies wholly within the Minerals Safeguarding Area. The site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area, as defined by the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. Developers should aim to maximise the incidental extraction of mineral resources on this site, in line with the policies of the Plan.
Objection	10737	Object to the proposed extension of Test Valley Business Park next to Draper Tools. Draper Tools have outstanding applications to build on their existing site which have not been taken into consideration
Pollution	10753	The proposed development at TV Business Park will increase heavy vehicles and therefore noise and create an ecological imbalance in the area.
Sustainability	10243 Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	A direct lit and paved pedestrian and cycling route east to Nutburn Road would significantly improve the situation and this should be pursued if possible. However, if this is not in the promoter's control we would question the sustainability in light of national policy and vision and objectives in the plan. The site is of a non-strategic scale therefore, there may be case for retaining it on other grounds.
Test Valley Business Park	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	Landscape belt required on the north boundary of the site to prevent any visual intrusion and cause any impact on Emer Bog and Baddesley Common area
	10373 Draper Tools Ltd	Support the principle of the new Employment allocation at Test Valley Business Park (Policy SA11)
	10373 Draper Tools Ltd	Support Policy SA11 within the context of this response

Policy SA12 Kennels Farm
Paragraphs - 4.241-4.246

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Active Travel	Access to the business park will take into consideration the requirement for enhancements to walking and cycling connections to the surrounding area. Additional pedestrian and cycling links will help the development to integrate within the area and will provide active travel connections to the site.
Ancient Woodland	A buffer is proposed to the ecologically sensitive Ancient Woodland to the north of the site within the policy criteria which will seek to protect and enhance the existing habitat around the site. It is considered that there is considerable potential to enrich biodiversity in masterplanning this development, including within the required buffers.
Flood risk	Consideration of flood risk would be assessed as part of an individual planning application, with development being subject to a FRA
Infrastructure - Roads	Access to the development would be off Chilworth Road via University Parkway and Benham Road, it is considered this route and junctions would be suitable to serve the development, subject to suitable highway improvements and Hampshire County Council (HCC) agreement, based on traffic modelling evidence and liaison with HCC, who are the highway authority.
Minerals and Waste	It is noted that the site is wholly within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. A Mineral Resource Assessment would be appropriate to seek to maximise the prior extraction of mineral resources, in line with the policies of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan.
Public Right of Way	The consideration of any improvements to the local PROW would be considered as part of an individual planning application.
Public Transport	The site is considered to be at a sustainable location, there is potential to enhance the facilities and bus stop infrastructure for bus users.
Southampton Science Park	Further engagement will be undertaken between the Council, HCC and University of Southampton Science Park to ensure that the extension to the Science Park is comprehensively planned to ensure the continued delivery of a high-quality employment uses on this strategic employment site

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Ancient Woodland	10223	We object to the allocation of this site for development where ancient woodland is at risk of loss or harm. Ask that either this site is removed from the plan, or that the site boundaries are redrawn to exclude the ancient woodland.
	10223	recommend a precautionary buffer of 50m unless it can be demonstrated that a smaller buffer would suffice: this buffer can be used for natural woodland regeneration, contributing to biodiversity net gain and/or providing accessible natural green space for residents
	Natural England 10140	Proposed allocation proposed directly adjacent to areas classified as ancient, replaced woodland and / or ancient & semi natural woodland. Impacts should be considered in line with the NPPF paragraph 186 and standing advice.
Biodiversity	10397	Consider a buffer along Long Copse Ancient Woodland and SINC as an important feature, agree the woodland and motorway buffer would restrict access via Benham Road through the existing Science Park
Conjunction with Forest Park SA16	10243	The western extent is close to Rownhams Road served every half hour by Bluestar service 4 and provision of pedestrian and cycle facilities to affect this connectivity to a pair of lit bus stops would be advantageous. This would be deliverable in conjunction with proposals for Forest Park (SA16) which indicates public access to Home Wood has been agreed. It is stressed that such connectivity and facilities would directly support wider public access to Forest Park by public transport, the allocations should cross reference to this and ensure this forms part of the strategy for delivery of the proposed allocations.
Environmental constraints	Environment Agency 10068	No environmental constraints identified.
Flood Risk	10397	Proposed sequential approach will be taken to direct development to areas of lowest risk of flooding to account flood risk from all sources
	10052	This site is affected by Flood Zone 2 and surface water flooding.
Active Travel	Hampshire County Council 10099	The site is well located to connect to the existing active travel facilities on the A27, existing bus service and public rights of way network
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Suggest the following additional criterion: "f. The provision of high quality links to the existing public rights of way network and active travel infrastructure on the A27".
Kennels Farm	Hampshire County Council	The County Council as landowner supports the draft allocation of Kennels Farm and has opened discussions with the University of Southampton Science Park to ensure that the extension to the

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10099	Science Park is comprehensively planned, including the provision of a vehicular connection from Benham Road.
Minerals and Waste	Hampshire County Council 10099	The site is below 3ha in area but lies wholly within the Minerals Safeguarding Area. The site lies within the Mineral Safeguarding Area, as defined by the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. Developers should aim to maximise the incidental extraction of mineral resources on this site, in line with the policies of the Plan.
Public Right of Way	Hampshire County Council 10099	This site has an excellent opportunity to improve the potential journey-to-work routes at Lordswood Lane and the existing track through Rownhams Plantation, Home Copse and Long Copse
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Lordswood Lane' aka Chilworth Restricted Byway 3, lies east of the site and links the site to Lordswood and Southampton's residential areas including the University. It uses an existing bridge over the motorway and is open to walkers and cyclists but not motor vehicles (except any private use).
	Hampshire County Council 10099	The track through Rownhams Plantation, Home Copse and Long Copse would enable links via Rownhams Lane to North Baddesley (northwards) and Rownhams (southwards). Rownhams Lane has a tarmac offroad cycle path from North Baddesley. It is a Forestry Commission track with rights for walkers but not cyclists; there is currently no physical link to the proposed site.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	It is suggested that site policy NA10 has wording that: 'seeks the requirement to include support of active travel and public rights of way aiding the delivery of east-west routes though or in proximity to the site.'
Surface Water Drainage	Hampshire County Council 10099	The LLFA has identified this site allocation does not have clear options to drain surface water to.
Infrastructure - Roads	10397	Any development increasing employment on the Science Park would generate vehicle movements. This will require careful consideration by Hampshire Highways to complete necessary development to the A27 entrance
Highway access	National Highways 10191	Adjacent to M27 Junction 13
Policy Wording - Ancillary Production	10858	Do not object to the extension of the Science Park for research and development purposes, the 'ancillary production' definition is concerning as it could be stretched and abused towards industrial operations. Any extension needs very tight controls and wording should be reviewed with this in mind.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Public Transport	10243	The wider site benefits from the Unilink operation with U8 serving the Science Park at a stop on Enterprise Road hourly on weekdays. It links the site to the public transport interchange at the University where a number of frequent services are available. A reasonably credible choice would exist for the allocation subject to an efficient bus route extension and proper turning circle provided closer to the site. Partnership working to boost the frequency of the U8 service would naturally augment the relevance of the service.
Southampton Science Park	10397	Promote caution in relation to the development which is accepted will need to have a positive relationship with the Science Park as a whole. Development would be permitted subject to conditions which reflect current ethos and provision of employment must comprise that of research and development including associated design
	10812	It is an important positive plan to increase the high-tech employment in the south of Test Valley
Support	10243	The allocation is supported.
Support allocation but engagement needed	10129	Support proposed allocation forming an extension to the Science Park which would deliver a complementary range of employment and ancillary uses, subject to being engaged regarding the proposed nature and location of any junction improvements and the mechanism for securing improvements, given that they may be located on private science park land.
	10129	Support allocation provided the science park is involved in further discussions on how and when any development is brought forward.
Use classes	10397	Understood any development would include offices, research and development and industrial processes, must not be out of character or scope of existing requirements of the Science Park, where ancillary non-employment uses are proposed these will primarily support onsite businesses

Policy SA13 Science Park
Paragraphs - 4.247-4.251

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Conservation Area	Development would be subject to a heritage study, as set out in the policy, taking account of the nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets, this will also take into consideration proximity to conservation areas.
Southampton Science Park	University of Southampton Science Park continues to be identified as a Strategic Employment Site by the Council recognising the importance of the site for the economy of south Hampshire
Masterplan	Further engagement will be undertaken between the Council, HCC and University of Southampton Science Park to ensure that the extension to the Science Park is comprehensively planned to ensure the continued delivery of a high-quality employment uses on this strategic employment site
Infrastructure - Roads	Access to the site will be through the existing science park. Any additional traffic generated can be acceptably accommodated on the highway network subject to suitable highway improvements and Hampshire County Council (HCC) agreement, based on traffic modelling evidence and liaison with HCC, who are the highway authority.
Policy wording	The policy wording will be reviewed in advance of the Regulation 19 stage.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Comment on boundary change, map	10129	The policy boundary for the University of Southampton Science Park should be updates as it does not include the 'South of Benham Campus' extension to the science park. Update Inset Map 6 to include land south of Benham Campus to accord with Map G in the adopted plan. Map provided in representation
Comment wording - Science Park	10129	Text correctly states that developers will be expected to demonstrate that any developments and occupying firms can meet the terms of planning agreements relating to the park. Footnote 34 refers to agreements related to TVS.03448/54 and TVS.07553. However, these agreements were

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
planning agreements		superseded by a consolidated park wide agreement dated 12 January 2016. Footnote should be updated and should also refer to any future agreements or updates. Footnote 34 should be amended as follows 'Planning Agreement dated 12th January 2016 and relevant updates to this agreement or new agreements.'
Environmental constraints	Environment Agency 10068	No environmental constraints identified.
Infrastructure - Roads	Hampshire County Council 10099	Suggest that the policy requirements refer to the need for access from Benham Road to connect with Policy SA12 Kennels Farm (as follows): a) An access is provided from Benham Lane to serve the extension to the Science Park at Kennels Farm (Policy SA12).
Conservation Area	Historic England 10049	Reference is made to Chilworth Old Village. Reference should also be made to the Conservation Area as the Council has a duty to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of that area. "b) It is not visually intrusive in views from the M27 motorway, the A27, Chilworth Old Village, or Chilworth and does not detract from the setting of Chilworth Manor and garden and Childworth Old Village conservation area;"
Highway access	National Highways 10291	Adjacent to M27 Junction 13
Southampton Science Park	10812	It is an important positive plan to increase the high-tech employment in the south of Test Valley
Masterplanning	10129	The science park has grown organically over time, due to demand from occupiers. The management team has developed a masterplan to guide development and sustainable growth and environmental protection at the Park over the next 25 years. This sets out how many existing buildings will be retained and refurbished as well as identifying opportunities to redevelop older buildings, to cater for market demand, including the provision of more laboratory space.
	10129	The Masterplan for the Science Park to 2050 seeks to create a more sustainable and less car dependant, better connected science park with improved public realm. The existing science park has extensive carparks, but there is now less need for parking (since the pandemic) and this offers an opportunity to consolidate and reposition car parking towards the park periphery, freeing up existing parking areas to provide break out spaces, pedestrian and cycle links, green space and improved public realm. Potential for a mobility hub near centre of park, to include bus stops, taxi drop off, bike stores and e-scooter parking docks. This will offer sustainability and wellbeing benefits

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Support - suggest amended wording.	10129	Support and welcome allocation but amend to recognise the long term sustainable growth aspirations for the science park. Amend para 4.247, after 'circumstances,' add 'aspirations for long term sustainable growth
	10129	Thrust of Para 4.248 is supported but suggest amended wording to reflect significance of science park.

Policy SA14 Adanac Park
Paragraphs 4.252-4.256

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Active Travel	Access to the business park will take into consideration the requirement for enhancements to walking and cycling connections to the surrounding area. Additional pedestrian and cycling links will help the development to integrate within the area and will provide active travel connections to the site.
Biodiversity	Development would be subject to an ecological study including of habitats and protected species. Mitigation would be provided to satisfy site designated under the Habitats Regulations. The site is not itself covered by any statutory nature conservation designations
Design	The Council is committed to design excellence and promoting high quality sustainable design. The layout, design and form of development will be required to integrate effectively with the existing business park.
Heritage	Development would be subject to a heritage study taking account of the nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets
Infrastructure – Roads and traffic	Access to the site will be through the existing business park. Any additional traffic generated can be acceptably accommodated on the highway network subject to suitable highway improvements and Hampshire County Council (HCC) agreement, based on traffic modelling evidence and liaison with HCC, who are the highway authority.
Protection for employment uses	Adanac Park continues to be identified as a Strategic Employment Site by the Council recognising the importance of the site for the economy of south Hampshire with the ability to expand to provide high quality employment provision to allow for continued economic
Public Transport	The site is considered to be at a sustainable location.
Restricted use classes	The area around junction 3 of the M27 motorway is an important one in the context of south Hampshire in respect of the extent of the existing employment opportunities available. It has very good access to the highway network and is located close to the Port of Southampton. This criteria-based policy supports re-development for existing employment uses and will enable the site to develop.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	10932	The bridal path adjoining the Adanac development has become a trip hazard for residents using it for recreational purposes.
Biodiversity	10720	Wildlife will be negatively impacted due to the light pollution from industrial development.
	10720	Some of the area proposed for development is designated countryside and therefore a site for important nature conservation. If developed, this area contains local wildlife and nature which would be destroyed.
Environmental constraints	Environment Agency 10068	No environmental constraints identified.
Green Spaces	10720	The local area has a required 15.44ha for green spaces and the area has a deficit of 8.76ha, meaning the proposed development would increase this green space deficit even further.
Listed building	Historic England 10049	Reference should be made need to be made to Yew Tree Farmhouse (Grade II), to avoid or minimise harm to its setting.
Infrastructure	10720	There has been insufficient infrastructure developed to support the recent developments in the area and this provision seems to be an afterthought for new developments.
Infrastructure - Public Transport	10720	There is a lack of public transport in the local area which will cause employees at the industrial estate to use their own cars, increasing traffic.
Infrastructure - Roads	10720	The road infrastructure is currently insufficient in the area and there has been no consultation with locals as to how to improve the local roads.
Solent designations	Natural England 10140	Site is within close proximity to the Solent Maritime SAC and Solent and Southampton Waters SPA and Ramsar and will need to consider potential hydrological impacts, and direct impacts from any construction activities. Need to demonstrate that any changes to groundwater or surface water would not adversely affect the hydrology of the designated site. It will be necessary to manage and monitor construction activities through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).
Restriction on uses - Solent Freeport	New Forest DC 10028	Adanac Park restricts development to office/research/manufacturing (Class E(g) and exceptionally support facilities. M271 corridor strategically important in relation to Solent Freeport and future port related development in the region. Development on land within M271 corridor (particularly on western side) should consider whether need to prioritise for appropriate port and port-related uses to support function of internationally important port with associated economic benefits and reduce use of greenfield sites in more environmentally sensitive locations Amend to allow appropriate port and port related uses
Pollution	10720	The development will cause an increase in pollution due to more industrial vehicles on surrounding roads.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Bus services	Southampton CC 10098	Support improvements to frequency and hours of bus services to Adanac Park improvements to bus services
Continued engagement with businesses and travel planning	Southampton CC 10098	Continued engagement with businesses and travel planning should be key requirement
Cycle network	Southampton CC 10098	Facilities to connect strategic cycle network (SCN2) to link to Southampton Central Station should be key requirement cycle network (SCN2)
	Southampton CC 10098	Facilities to connect strategic cycle network (SCN4) to link to Southampton General Hospital should be key requirement cycle network (SCN4)
High design standard	Southampton CC 10098	Welcome intention that development must be of high design standard. This will help ensure site continues to be recognised as a premier business location on the south coast
Protect for employment uses	Southampton CC 10098	Welcome intention to continue to protect remaining undeveloped land for employment uses
Traffic	10720	The existing roads will not be able to deal with the additional traffic from the proposed developments, especially at commuter times and with more industrial vehicles.

Policy SA15 Nursling Estate
Paragraphs 4.257-4.261

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Alternative Sites	Nursling Estate continues to be identified as a Strategic Employment Site by the Council recognising the importance of the site for the economy of south Hampshire
Biodiversity	Development would be subject to an ecological study including of habitats and protected species. Mitigation would be provided to satisfy site designated under the Habitats Regulations. The site is not itself covered by any statutory nature conservation designations
Infrastructure – Roads and traffic	Access to the site will be through the existing trading estate. Any additional traffic generated can be acceptably accommodated on the highway network subject to suitable highway improvements and Hampshire County Council (HCC) agreement, based on traffic modelling evidence and liaison with HCC, who are the highway authority.
Pollution	Development will be required to meet the conditions set out in draft Local Plan 2040 policies TR2: Assessing Transport Impacts and ENV5: Pollution to avoid or mitigate pollution to an appropriate standard and to prevent any unacceptable impact
Public Transport	The site is considered to be at a sustainable location.
Restricted use classes	The area around junction 3 of the M27 motorway is an important one in the context of south Hampshire in respect of the extent of the existing employment opportunities available. It has very good access to the highway network and is located close to the Port of Southampton. This criteria-based policy supports re-development for existing employment uses and will enable the site to develop.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Air pollution	11046	The industrial area will be used 24/7 and will create an increase in air pollution.
Alternative Sites	11046	There are other areas within Test Valley that are more suited to this kind of development.
Biodiversity	11035	Other developments have depleted living, hunting and breeding grounds for birds and animals (specifically raptors) which Nursling and Rownhams are a home to.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10720	Wildlife will be negatively impacted due to the light pollution from industrial development.
	10720	Some of the area proposed for development is designated countryside and therefore a site for important nature conservation. If developed, this area contains local wildlife and nature which would be destroyed.
	11046	The proposed developments will pose a threat to habitat, nature and wildlife.
Biodiversity/Green Space	11028	The proposed developments threaten wildlife and will be ecologically damaging, as well as further encroachment to the countryside which harms local identity and the health and well-being of residents.
Community	11046	The development ensures that the parish community is eroded and enclosed by motorways and industrial buildings, having a mental and physical toll on the residents.
Community consultation	11028	Needs to be transparent and inclusive decision-making processes and further meaningful consultation with residents.
Environmental constraints	Environment Agency 10068	No environmental constraints identified.
Infrastructure	10720	There has been insufficient infrastructure developed to support the recent developments in the area and this provision seems to be an afterthought for new developments.
Infrastructure - Public Transport	10720	There is a lack of public transport in the local area which will cause employees at the industrial estate to use their own cars, increasing traffic.
	11046	There has been little improvement made to the infrastructure in Nursling to support the proposed development, for example public transport.
Infrastructure - roads	11028	The proposed development would put strain on already overburdened road infrastructure and lead to further congestion.
	10720	The road infrastructure is currently insufficient in the area and there has been no consultation with locals as to how to improve the local roads.
Light pollution	11046	The industrial area will be used 24/7 and will create an increase in light pollution.
Designations	Natural England Solent 10140	Site is within close proximity to the Solent Maritime SAC and Solent and Southampton Waters SPA and Ramsar and will need to consider potential hydrological impacts, and direct impacts from any construction activities. Need to demonstrate that any changes to groundwater or surface water would not adversely affect the hydrology of the designated site. It will be necessary to manage and monitor construction activities through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).
Restriction on uses - Solent Freeport	New Forest DC 10028	Nursling Estate restricts development to storage and distribution uses (Class B8) and ancillary processing and assembly within Class E(g). M271 corridor strategically important in relation to

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Solent Freeport and future port related development in the region. Development on land within the M271 corridor (particularly on western side) should consider whether need to prioritise for appropriate port and port-related uses to support function of internationally important port with associated economic benefits and reduce use of greenfield sites in more environmentally sensitive locations. Amend to allow appropriate port and port related uses
Noise pollution	11046	The industrial area will be used 24/7 and will create an increase in noise pollution.
Pollution	10720	The development will cause an increase in pollution due to more industrial vehicles on surrounding roads.
	11046	Heavy vehicles will be accessing the development via small roads and country lanes, resulting in increased pollution.
Site location	11028	Find alternative solutions for sustainable development that safeguard the character and environment of Nursling and Rownhams.
Traffic	10720	The existing roads will not be able to deal with the additional traffic from the proposed developments, especially at commuter times and with more industrial vehicles.
	11046	Heavy vehicles will be accessing the development via small roads and country lanes, resulting in increased traffic congestion.
Traffic/Pollution	11028	The proposed development would lead to more congestion, pollution and decreased quality of life for residents.

Policy SA16 Forest Park
Paragraphs 4.262 to 4.265

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Boundaries of proposal	The proposed boundaries of the Forest Park will be reviewed prior to the Regulation 19 stage of plan preparation taking account of feedback received and the latest position.
Access and travel	The wording of the policy in relation to appropriate access and active travel connections will be reviewed prior to the Regulation 19 stage of plan preparation
Delivery of proposal	The supporting text to this policy reflects it is an aspiration to bring forward a Forest Park as part of the green infrastructure network in South Hampshire, with delivery mechanisms continuing to be explored during the plan period. As noted in the supporting text, some parts of the Forest Park have been delivered, including Home Wood being secured as a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). Specific proposals to bring forward additional components of the Forest Park would need to be well considered, including taking account of implications on biodiversity and nature conservation interests, as well as appropriate opportunities to improve public access.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Support	10223 Woodland Trust	Support the aspiration for a Forest Park, and the potential to protect, restore and re-connect areas of ancient woodland
	10140 Natural England	Welcome inclusion of policy. Recommend further weight is given within the Local Plan to the wider aspiration for a regional park for south Hampshire to come forward within the plan period, as set out in the Green Belt / Green Infrastructure Designation Study (LUC, 2023). Justification for this proposal and recommended actions are set out in Part 2 Strategic Green Infrastructure Opportunities in South Hampshire (LUC, 2023).
	10696 New Forest National Park Authority	Supports the long standing principle of the Forest Park. The recreational provision on this site can contribute towards addressing recreational impacts on the New Forest's designated sites, as part of a wider package of mitigation packages.
	10098	Welcome allocation of wooded areas adjacent to M27 as a Forest Park.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Southampton City Council	
	10098 Southampton City Council	Welcome measures in policy to improve access whilst protecting biodiversity
	10098 Southampton City Council	Policy rightly points out it is a Green Infrastructure asset of sub-regional importance and will provide access to green space not just for Test Valley residents, but also Southampton and Eastleigh residents.
Environmental constraints	10068 Environment Agency	No environmental constraints identified.
Delivery	10812 Romsey Town Council	It is likely to be undeliverable unless the relevant landowners gain some alternative benefits. What is the proposed trade off?
Boundaries	10157 Delbury Ltd	Objection to the definition of Forest Park as it relates to land at Woodside, Chilworth
Access and travel	10099 Hampshire County Council	The location of Forest Park adjacent to the M27 and the aspiration for it to become a sub-regional facility will require access to the site to be carefully managed so that opportunities for travel by active and sustainable modes is realistic and achievable. It is suggested that the policy is amended with Guiding Principle 1 of LTP4 "Give people a choice of high-quality travel options" in mind. The County Council recommend the following policy wording is incorporated into the policy criteria: "Requirement to demonstrate that safe highway access can be achieved alongside the delivery of safe, high quality active travel connections to existing infrastructure and existing public rights of way".
	10098 Southampton City Council	Will provide opportunities for active travel. Integrating walking, wheeling and cycling routes to strategic cycle network and local paths important to ensure corridors are created e.g. Lordshill to Chilworth for employment and complement improvement to Southampton Outdoor Sport Centre
Experiences	10052 Romsey & District Society Natural Environment Committee	The proposed Forest Park will not contribute to the same sense of wilderness as can be found in locations such as the New Forest and will suffer from the effects of noise pollution.
Strategic mitigation	10098 Southampton City Council	Given ongoing need to provide strategic mitigation for recreational impacts to New Forest, Forest Park could operate as a strategic mitigation site and would welcome opportunity to work with Council and partners on this opportunity.

Policy SA17 Stockbridge Local Centre
Paragraphs 4.266 – 4.270

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Flood Risk	The designation as a local centre reflects the role of Stockbridge in serving the needs of communities in rural Test Valley in the middle of the Borough. Consideration of flood risk would be assessed as part of an individual planning application, as relevant. The aim of the policy is to manage change so that it respects the scale and function of the centre, local character and does not have a significant adverse impact on vitality and viability. .
Public Rights of Way	The designation as a local centre reflects the role of Stockbridge in serving the needs of communities in rural Test Valley in the middle of the Borough. The consideration of any improvements to the local PROW would be considered as part of an individual planning application, as relevant.
Local Centre	The designation as a local centre reflects the role of Stockbridge in serving the needs of communities in rural Test Valley in the middle of the Borough. Given the mix of uses within the local centre including residential, the policy aim to manage change so that it respects the scale and function of the centre, local character and does not have a significant adverse impact on vitality and viability. The potential loss of local shops would be covered by Policy COM2 Community Services and Facilities, as relevant.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Environment Agency: Flood risk	10068 Environment Agency	Not demonstrated that this site provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk.
	10068 Environment Agency	A site-specific flood risk assessment should demonstrate that the site will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and where possible will reduce flood risk overall.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10068 Environment Agency	Any new development within flood risk zone 3 areas will need to demonstrate that it is not flood risk zone 3b and compensatory flood storage can be provided on site. Rebuilds likely to be acceptable but should show betterment and no increased loss of floodplain storage.
Hampshire County Council: Public Right of Way	10099 Hampshire County Council	Any scheme coming forward should consider possible improvements to the Test Way and Footpath 5. This would provide benefits to active access and to tourism in the area, potentially enhancing custom.
Stockbridge Local Centre	10279 Romsey & District Society Planning Committee	The policy should include the need to retain the existing provision of shops on the ground floor of High Street properties
	11014 Stop Chilbolton Over Development	Stockbridge probably more important to Chilbolton residents than Andover; the facilities play key roles. Development of the healthcare offering would provide important benefits, reducing the need to travel to Andover or beyond

Chapter 5 - Theme Based Policies - Paragraphs 5.1-5.4

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan and theme based policies will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Ecology - biodiversity which inhabits buildings eg birds, has been overlooked and needs a policy in the plan. Existing nest sites should be protected.	
Rural economy - the plan does not support farming/agriculture	
Infrastructure – plan should be more explicit about how infrastructure will be delivered/funded	

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	11027	The development will cause the rural walk along Upton Lane to join Test Way to be unavailable.
Archaeology	11027	Satisfactory provision needs to be made for a programme of archaeological investigation at Nursling Monastery.
Ecology and Biodiversity	10067	The reference to bird boxes is welcome but the LP has overlooked biodiversity which inhabits buildings e.g. red-listed endangered bird species such as swifts, house sparrows and house martins - also overlooked by DEFRA's BNG metric calculation. These need their own clear policy according to NPPG Natural Environment 2019 p23.
	10067	Please add to the section on ecology and Biodiversity the following sentence
	10067	Please add to the section on ecology and Biodiversity that existing nest sites should be protected and retained because building-dependant species return to traditional nest sites and find it difficult to locate to a new site if they lose it.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Electric Vehicle Charging	10812	Suggested amendment There needs to be clear policy guidance on the provision of electric vehicle charging points with a requirement on developers to provide such facilities
	10812	Suggested amendment Also needs to be one or more allocations of land for public EV charging
Farming	10036	Only one reference to farming relating to water use, propose a policy is added dedicated to protecting and promoting the vital industry. We are a largely rural borough, should be incumbent to aid farmers wherever possible. Farmers are key employers in Test Valley but increasingly under threat.
	10036	Claims made on carbon impact of livestock utilise global figures, not local ones, which are much lower given local climate and agriculture. Suggest there is interaction with farming groups to put a TVBC policy in the plan in support of rural businesses and employment. Mention should be considered in the biodiversity policy.
	10204	Request TVBC consider again no mention of agriculture, farming and fishing in employment policies
Hydroelectric Power	10812	Suggested amendment Needs to be a policy encouraging renewable energy generation though the use of hydroelectric generation subject to preserving the vital ecology
Infrastructure - Hospitals	10036	No mention of hospital services, no developments should be undertaken without solid plans for increased hospital services. Reinstating A&E and extending Andover hospital is an obvious consideration. Suggest the plan states the intention to issue S106 and/or CIL agreements to mandate contributions to new facilities
Infrastructure - Utilities	10722	The new development will require sufficient electricity supplies to support the additional housing. There need to be more specific plans on how a net zero future will be achieved in the plan and how this will affect electric/gas supply to housing.
Support draft vision	11146	Support draft vision under theme based policies, which encompasses climate action targets and creating well designed new homes to support a sustainable development strategy for the future.

Chapter 5 - Climate Change

Paragraphs 5.5-5.79

Key Issue	Officer Response
The policy requirements are too vague/loose and could be improved to ensure they are met and are effective	The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan and theme based policies will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
The local plan should defer to national policy and standards and not seek to exceed these. Conflict with WMS	
General support for approach to climate change and reduction in emissions	
The policies only apply to new development,	
There is a link between climate change and health, the effects of climate change disproportionately impact those in deprived areas – policy should recognise this link	
Over reliance on mitigation	
Policies should not be overly onerous and impact viability/deliverability	
Concern over impact of development on flooding and water quality	
Concern with Whole Life Cycle requirement on deliverability	
Not the responsibility of developers/applicants to demonstrate water/wastewater capacity	

Sites for renewables should be supported, including re-use of existing sites	
--	--

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
MMO - South Marine Plan	10242	Reference is made to shoreline management plans and coastal waters in this section. It is recommended that the South Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan is also mentioned here, to show regard to these marine plans. Consider including reference to the South Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan at para 5.15
building material	Historic England 10049	A fabric first approach is appropriate for new development, but it would not be suitable for traditionally constructed buildings, which require a whole building approach (as stated in paragraph 5.56). It would be good to make this clear in the paragraph. “In reducing demand for energy for new development (including in relation to heating and cooling), a ‘fabric first’ approach should be taken...”
GI	10052	Text on green infrastructure at paragraphs 5.27 and 5.28 is to be commended and is an improvement on existing statements.
GI policies	10052	There is no mention as to how the provisions in paragraphs 5.27 and 5.28 is going to be achieved. The Council's existing policy documents on green infrastructure show a few fragmented sites that have high levels of protection but no indication as to how they are going to remain connected.
Climate Change - Insulation	10204	Request TVBC consider again no specific standards on insulation for new build houses and extensions
Climate Emergency	11077	A key way to promote sustainable travel is to align development with existing infrastructure, such as the mainline railway station at Grateley
biodiversity importance	10052	Sections of the Local Plan relating to biodiversity are of utmost importance in the reduction of climate change impacts.
	10052	The promotion of SSSIs, SINCs and LNRs and the use of wildling areas around towns and villages have been shown to have a positive effect on species diversity and health of our countryside; trees and shrubs cool the surrounding air and ground; roots hold the soil in place and through transpiration absorb water from the ground thus reducing runoff.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Ecological enhancements	10564	Policy requires additional wording as DEFRA BNG Metric does not include ecological enhancements such as bird, bat, bee bricks etc. Therefore, needs to be made clear that net gains in biodiversity also includes additional measures alongside the metric calculation.
Support	Natural England 10140	Welcome incorporation of nature-based solutions.
Urban brownfield sites	10052	Urban brownfield sites are valuable in reducing the need for the use of private cars. The NPPF does not appear to have the power to enforce the development of such sites.
Energy hierarchy	11108	Support the focus on energy hierarchy in figure 5.1.
Alternative sites	10615	The NPPF does not seem to have the ability to enforce the use of brownfield sites, specifically the Romsey Brewery Site, whereas this should be pursued instead of growing development into the countryside.
Biodiversity	10960	The plan will have a detrimental environmental impact.
	10615	Sections relating to biodiversity are of utmost importance. The promotion of SINCS and LNRs and the use of wilding areas around towns and villages has been shown to have a positive effect on species diversity and the health of your countryside.
Climate Change	10615	The wording of the document is very detailed and makes positive proposals to reduce the impact of climate change.
	10615	The term "mitigation" is used though this tends to transfer problems of pollution and emissions to another locality and a negation of responsibility.
	10114	supports the policy and welcomes the flexible approach that the emerging policy takes
	11115	Building regs are the appropriate mechanism for seeking improvements to building standards, rather than through a local plan.
	11108	Support the principles in the policy and the ambitions of the Climate Emergency Action Plan.
	10453	The LP has not addressed how climate change has changed the weather patterns with heavier and more frequent storms.
Climate Emergency	11014	Imperative that owing to the climate crisis the environment is put at the heart of the planning system so that green outcomes are prioritised. Protect nature, biodiversity and wildlife habitats which are essential to their existence.
	11014	Agree with the LP's priorities: minimising emissions, reducing vulnerability to extreme weather, making efficient use of water, building resilient infrastructure, delivering BNG; and maximising active travel and minimising unnecessary travel

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11014	LP focuses almost exclusively on new developments; says little about improving rural communities or addressing existing shortfalls. Given modest new building in the village, and the challenges of climate change, the LP must consider how all parties will mitigate the worst concerns
	11014	During prolonged winter rains, handling the confluence of high surface water drainage with comparatively low sewage outputs has no easy solution. In contrast, during prolonged dry periods, water supply occasionally fails for short periods.
	10124	More significant environmental damage is being done which is hitting tourism and our local industries
	11075	General and overarching policy CL1 is supported, in particular criteria c)
	11075	There should be stronger wording in this policy to demonstrate a presumption in favour of allowing the principle of such development that counters climate change, unless there are significant adverse impacts
	10778	Policy states development will support a net zero carbon future and address the impacts of our changing climate. Our client agrees that considering climate change is a priority and that there is need to set out a strategic approach to this
	10778	Consider the most effective way of achieving this is through nationally applied standards. In order to do this, they should defer to national policies and standards where necessary, rather than seek to duplicate or indeed exceed these
	11077	Supports all of the priorities set out in LP40 in relation to climate change but emphasises the fact that greenhouse gas emissions within Test Valley arise from a range of sources. Strategies should aim to address not just emissions from buildings but also emissions from industry and transportation
Countering Climate Change	10812	The requirements are very vague and unquantified and, therefore, may not be helpful to planning decisions Poorly worded, should be in the form "Development will only be permitted if..."
	10279	The policy is vague and imprecise. No measurements are set out but wording is vague with examples of ...minimised, maximise, adaptable to changing needs, appropriate, circular economy.
	10119	Support principle of delivering a net zero carbon future and addressing impacts of the changing climate through both mitigation and adaptation as set out in CL1.
	10279	Meaning of 'prioritising fabric first'? What body will judge the applications for the carbon compliance details and over what timescale?

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Detailed wording	10052	The wording is very detailed and makes positive proposals as to what needs to be done in a theoretical sense to reduce the impacts of climate change.
Climate Change	Eastleigh BC 10362	Support proposed approach to climate change, reducing carbon emissions
Environment	10502	Opposes the plan due to the environmental impacts that the plan poses.
Flexibility in policy	10817	Request consideration is given the availability of emerging technologies and the ability to implement at scale, relative to Policy NA8. Consideration to be given to transitional arrangements relating to planning applications already made at the point of adoption of the Plan or the phasing of standards as part of the delivery of strategic allocations.
Flooding	10615	Protection of trees and shrubs can help to prevent run-off water and decrease flood risk as the roots through transpiration absorb water from the ground.
Green Space	10615	Understands that TVBC can only work within the National Guidelines - a pity controls so ineffective in preventing outward spread of Romsey along Cupernham Lane and Jermyns Lane.
Climate change	Hampshire County Council 10099	There are many cross-cutting themes that align with Hampshire's Public Health Strategy 2023-2026 in particular those focused on healthy places and settings. It is positive to see this strategy referenced in the climate change chapter of the report.
Climate change and health	Hampshire County Council 10099	Suggest making more explicit link to climate change and health within this policy. The impacts of climate change are likely to disproportionately impact those in the most deprived areas. When thinking about planning policy it would be good to consider the co-benefits of policies that tackle both.
Mitigation	10052	The term mitigation is used but this tends to be a way of transferring problems of pollution or emissions to another locality and is a negation of responsibility. The Local Plan must have the power to set controls in place before any development proceeds.
Additional resources	Natural England 10140	Natural England has published a range of resources to help with the recommended actions, some of which are appended to the response. Natural England would be happy to advise further on this aspect of the Local Plan development.
Previous advice	Natural England 10140	Would refer back to advice in response for the Regulation 18, Stage 1 consultation for additional advice on this matter which could be further reviewed.
Net Zero future	11108	Support the delivery of a net zero carbon future and addressing the impacts of our changing climate through both mitigation and adaptation.
support	NHS 10732	support policies that promote carbon neutral development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
loose	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	Very loose and open to interpretation, better targets should be set
oil and gas	10797	not objected to in principle, the Local Plan must also take consideration of the aims and policies of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan and the NPPF, which support the ongoing supply of minerals as well as the exploration and production of new indigenous oil and gas resources
	10797	the minimisation of greenhouse gas emissions is not objected to, it is crucial that emerging planning policy does not stifle the viability/deliverability of new development from overly onerous climate change policies
Passive terminology	10052	There is great use of passive terminology which compromises the probable effectiveness of any planning controls and would provide a get out for developers.
Reuse	10760	There is now research to say it is often more carbon efficient to reuse and renovate older buildings rather than knock down and rebuild due to the high carbon production of newbuild.
Support	10817	Support the LP contributing to the transition towards net zero carbon future.
Water	10139	A specific mention of water is essential and needs to be higher on the list Suggest adding 'Development will be permitted provided that long term water quality and quantity shall not be affected either in the surface rivers or their underground sources, flood and drought events are not exacerbated, and secure plans are in place for the maintenance of these installations
Support Zero Carbon Future	Winchester City Council: 10210	Winchester City Council supports Policy CL1 which seeks the delivery of a zero carbon future
	11135	Support this policy
No risk in Grateley	Southern Water 11077	Virtually every settlement in Northern Test Valley is affected by this flood risk, except Grateley, where no flood risk is identified. Grateley is a rare exception to this, being situated in the centre of one of the largest areas of open chalk plateau in the Borough
SuDs mandatory for major development	10022	SuDs should be mandated for major developments in areas where they are viable

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Support SuDS with CIRIA guidance	Natural England 10140	Welcome requirement that development ensures flood and surface drainage are properly addressed and that Sustainable Drainage Systems are designed in accordance with CIRIA C753 SuDS Manual to be as 'natural' as possible.
Protected sites	Natural England 10140	Policy should make it clear that where a development drains to a protected site(s), an additional treatment component or other equivalent protection may be required to ensure water quality impacts are avoided.
Strengthen policy	10191	TVBC should firm up this policy and take great care to follow it to the letter when considering any suggested development for Stockbridge.
Clarify criterion	10119	<p>criterion d) sets out that development will be permitted where any residual risk can be safely managed, however, it is unclear what this relates to. Clarification should be provided to accord with NPPF (para 16).</p> <p>extra clarity on what criteria d) requires.</p> <p>extra clarity on what criteria i) requires and on what standards will apply.</p>
safeguarding SuDS	Southern Water 10022	Support policy requirement (g) that land for flood management is safeguarded from development and would add that any areas of land utilised for SuDS should also be safeguarded from future alterations or development that would impede effectiveness.
	Southern Water 10022	<p>Amend text to 'g) The proposal does not prejudice land, structures and features required for current or future flood management and/ or sustainable drainage'</p> <p>Review whether to add suggested criteria to policy wording</p>
Detail standards to follow	10119	Criteria i) sets out that sustainable drainage systems should be designed in accordance with latest policy and guidance to meet relevant standards. This is unclear details are needed of the relevant standards in order that the requirement can be met and the impact on viability considered.
clarify wording	Hampshire County Council 10099	Part j) states 'Priority is given to natural flood management and drainage approaches. Drainage approaches is a vague term and could refer unsustainable, hard engineering approaches. For clarity reasons please change 'drainage approaches' to 'Sustainable Drainage Systems'.
	10119	Criteria j) should take into account a variety of site characteristics to ensure policy is sufficiently flexible but effective. Revised wording therefore suggested.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Revise wording for Criteria j) - add 'wherever feasible.' after 'approaches'.
Natural England: Protected sites	10140	Where Sustainable Drainage Systems are proposed serving as mitigation for protected sites, development should ensure their long-term in perpetuity monitoring, maintenance / replacement, and funding.
	10119	Criteria k) should recognise that delivery and implementation arrangements might not yet be formally secured at the stage the application is submitted and the wording should be revised to enable more flexibility at this stage. Revise wording for Criteria k) add 'how' after 'and' and before 'the delivery' and add 'likely to be' after 'are' and before 'secured'.
Apply strictly	10191	Urge TVBC to ensure that this applies strictly to any developers or companies involved in potential development of the area.
Awareness of surface water management	10760	The priority needs to be for water to soak into the ground, in gardens and green areas. Driveways and concreted gardens need drainage into the soil, not the road and the drains. Separate runoff systems need to be incorporated into new developments so that waste water does not overload the sewage treatment process. This is stated in the Local Plan but it needs to raise more awareness for residents making decisions in their own gardens.
Beyond development	10760	The Council needs to encourage all measures to reduce flood water across the borough, not just in new developments.
	10760	Parts of the borough prone to flooding will need additional work to prevent damage to properties and the natural environment.
	10191	Drainage needs to be improved, as well as ongoing maintenance to the drainage system, including clearing of road side drains
De culverting	10052	Opportunities for de-culverting should be seen as a default requirement unless there are overriding reasons against it.
Design for climate change	10052	With climate change leading to more intense storms, it is going to be difficult to design for all eventualities and systems need to deal with the short term exceedance events safely.
Dutch method	10052	The 'Dutch' methods of dealing with surface water run off should be considered, where water is retained on surface and reducing the use of buried pipes. Traditional piped systems can become overwhelmed and blocked. Roads should be designed to accommodate excess surface water flows from adjacent ditches or swales caused by intense rainfall. Normally this will only be for a short duration and suitably designed will protect property with minimal inconvenience to road users.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
FRZ3	Environment Agency 10068	The Local Plan should include text specifying that development is not appropriate in areas of flood risk zone 3, unless it can be demonstrated through detailed modelling that it is not functional floodplain (flood risk zone 3b). This is important information for developers as the Environment Agency would be likely to raise an in principle objection.
FRZ3	Environment Agency 10068	It should be made clear that development (except essential infrastructure and water compatible development) is not appropriate for areas shown as flood risk zone 3, as specified within the NPPF.
Strengthen policy	Environment Agency 10068	The policy could be strengthened by incorporating suggested wording. Between criteria c) and d), add "Development shall not be sited within areas of flood risk zone 3 unless detailed analysis demonstrates that it is not functional floodplain, as defined by the PfSH Level 1 SFRA and equivalent compensatory floodplain storage volume can be provided on site."
Flooding	10960	Funding should not be spent on development and should be spent improving current infrastructure such as protection against flood risks.
	11097	Paths in the area of the Cleveland Bay pub, school, doctors and dentists regularly have deep puddles due to an insufficient draining system.
	10502	Opposes the plan due to the increased flood risk that the plan poses.
	10554	The proposed development would be on clay-based soil which will make flooding in the area worse.
Functioning in practice	10052	When runoff is being controlled, there needs to be evidence and subsequent monitoring that the outcomes are being met in practice. Although such a policy should be supported, much of the current evidence is ad hoc and needs more objective scrutiny.
covers NPPF requirements	Hampshire County Council 10099	This policy covers the basic requirements of the NPPF.
support buffers	Hampshire County Council 10099	It is noted that part I) has not come from the level 1 SFRA but we would strong support this element of the policy.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council is pleased to see that this policy encourages buffer zones to be provided along watercourses (part I).

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Increase buffers	10047	Suggested buffers in criteria l) and m) are not sufficient to ensure protection of rivers and watercourses - would recommend a minimum of 20 metres to prevent incidents of polluting run-off and protecting biodiversity.
Maintenance	10052	Welcome the mention of CIRIA design standards. Arrangements for all future maintenance will need to be in place.
National policy	10778	Policy deals with development and flood risk impact in the Borough. There is established national guidance for planning applications relating to flood risk that local policies should defer to. It is also important to acknowledge that flood risk should be considered on a site-specific basis
	11119	There is established national guidance for planning applications relating to flood risk that local policies should defer to.
Road run off	10760	It is unclear how runoff from roads will be collected separately from waste water and if it is clean enough to enter a stream or river or whether it will be diverted to a reed bed treatment or other natural treatments or an engineered facility.
site promotion land south botley road	11147	Surface water drainage within the proposed development would be handled through soakaways, SUDs and permeable surfacing to meet Environment Agency standards for runoff rates
Small streams	10052	Little mention is made of Sustainable Drainage System requirements to protect existing small streams.
management of surface water	Southern Water 10022	Add criteria under (G) to state 'surface water is not permitted to discharge to the wastewater network
	Southern Water 10022	Encourage prevention of any connection of development's surface water drainage to the foul sewer network to minimize the risk of sewer flooding and increase available capacity for foul drainage.
support approach	Southern Water 10022	support policy approach for its contribution to reducing the risk of flooding and pollution
	Southern Water 10022	SW supports intention of policy to manage flood risk, especially priority given to natural flood management and drainage approaches in SuDs design
urban creep	10022	urban creep can exacerbate capacity issues in wastewater network
Stockbridge - flooding context	10191	Stockbridge is situated on a floodplain and is historically susceptible to flooding such that much work has been done to protect it
	10191	The River Test and water meadows continue to work well by holding the water table and surplus groundwater.
	10191	Post the 2014 floods, Stockbridge has been protected by flood relief devices. The spillway is installed on the river system. The carrier here, in normal conditions, will be approx. 2 ft above the

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		level of the main river opposite. The spillway ensures that should the level of water rise it can be directed out to the main river; nothing should impede this.
	10191	The bypass sluice is 8 feet wide and consists of boards that fill the width of the sluice down to the riverbed. In emergencies, all these boards can be pulled out directing water coming from upstream to flow away onto the floodplain, lowering the level of water in the river
	10191	Should development be allowed outside the settlement boundary of Stockbridge, the land that might be considered could be these historic water meadows, which would therefore remove this flooding defence and leave Stockbridge vulnerable to floods.
	10191	Work undertaken by river keepers should not be underestimated. They protect the biodiversity and do valuable work to prevent flooding by keeping the carriers running freely and clearing ditches so that groundwater is collected and floods avoided.
	10191	Should land, other than the water meadows, be suggested for development great care and attention should be given to potential flood risk to Stockbridge which will worsen.
SuDS	10052	Suggest that the requirement for Sustainable Drainage Systems should be applied to all development.
Support	10812	Good
Support principles	11108	Support the principles in the policy as they are consistent with the NPPF and encourage enhancement of the water environment and guidance on buffers
Support prioritisation of low risk	11147	supports the strategy to direct development to areas at lowest risk of flooding, noting that this rules out multiple locations across the plan area
Undeveloped buffers	10052	Policy to ensure suitable width corridors either side of a watercourse is supported but the widths should be more than the minimum proposed.
Water quality	10047	Policy does not go far enough to achieve safeguards to the water environment, including chalk catchments. Strongly recommend the policy is amended, or a separate water quality policy is created to have more detail on the protection and enhancement of rivers new development must meet.
watercourse buffers	10114	supports the policy and welcomes the flexible wording regarding the required watercourse buffers
	10937	Basic groundwork should be implemented e.g. ditches, gulleys and farm/verge run offs. Feasibility study conducted.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Assessment methodologies	10201	That developers need to use methodologies such as Passivhaus Planning Package or CIBSE TM54 as part of assessment of compliance with policy is inconsistent with written ministerial statement 13 Dec 2023 which requires policies and by extension the assessment of performance against those policies to be based on SAP. This provides consistency in assessment frameworks for both planning policies and building regulations and ensures there is not a proliferation of assessment frameworks used that adds to complexity for both applicant and decision maker.
heritage guidance	Historic England 10049	Suggest revising the weblink to connect with our new Advice Note on the climate change adaptation of historic buildings, published for consultation in late 2023. Noting the final version of this Historic England Advice Note is not yet published (link provided)
Advice on renovations	10760	Give advice for those doing renovations, including listed buildings, which allow these buildings to become more energy efficient.
Alignment with national standards	10114	although support the initiative to promote sustainability and energy efficiency, local policies should not seek to replicate or impose higher standards than those set out in current or emerging Building Regulations
Allow sustainable techniques	10760	Via planning policy, allow new build housing to use new sustainable techniques and not be stopped by requirements to fit into the street scene of previous decades.
Amendment	10114	delete sentence All development will also need to be designed to avoid risks of overheating both now and in the future.
	10114	delete sentences New Homes All new homes (including replacement dwellings) will need to be able to demonstrate net-zero operational carbon on site by ensuring achieving: i. The predicted space heating demand of the homes will be less than 15 kWh/ m2/year; ii. The total kWh/yr of energy consumption of the buildings will be less than 35 kWh/m2/year; iii. The resultant total kWh/yr of energy consumption of the buildings on the site is balanced by the total kWh/yr of energy generation by renewables; and iv. Delivery in compliance with the submitted details. Additionally, developments incorporating 150 or more dwellings should be accompanied by a whole life carbon assessment, which indicates how both operational and embodied emissions have been reduced. Delivery in compliance with the submitted assessment will be secured.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10114	delete sentence Additionally, non-residential developments incorporating at least 5000sqm of additional floorspace should be accompanied by a whole life carbon assessment, which indicates how both operational and embodied emissions have been reduced. Delivery in compliance with the submitted assessment will be secured.
	10114	amendments to policy wording needed In order to achieve the objectives of this policy, all new developments should seek to demonstrate the lowest level of carbon emissions unless there are clear reasons that have been established through the design process that demonstrate that achieving these standards is not technically or financially practicable or produces a development that would be harmful to its setting or the character of the wider area.
Assessment method/viability	10817	Penultimate paragraph in policy CL3. The text of the policy should be amended to accord with the LETI guidance that the test relates to the building element, not non-building components. Reference should also be made the viability of achieving the objective relative to consideration of wider viability implications.
BREEAM	10114	No specific concerns with the BREEAM excellent standard but there should be greater flexibility in the policy through the amendments requested to the final paragraph.
building and energy use	10799	New Non-Residential Development' It should be made clear if this part of the policy is to apply also to 'changes of use' of sites above the given threshold
Building Regulations	10201	Disagree approach to be taken through local plan given already national approach the Future Homes Standard. Building Regulations has distinct advantage over using variety of different approach across the country
	10201	If Council go beyond current or future standards it must be done consistent with national policy and robustly assess consequences and how consistent with written ministerial statement of 13 Dec 2023.
	10201	Written ministerial statement on 13 Dec 2023 states any standard that goes beyond building regulations should be rejected at examination if local planning authority does not have well-reasoned and robustly costed rationale that ensures: development remains viable ad impact on housing supply and affordability is considered in accordance with NPPF, and additional

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		requirement is expressed at a percentage uplift of dwelling's Target Emission Rate calculated using a specified version of the Standard Assessment Procedure
	10137	It is not considered that this policy is necessary given that there is already a national approach to reduce carbon emissions, Building Regulations through the Future Homes Standard (FHS) which is due to be in effect from 2025. If the Council chooses to retain this policy, and go beyond the Building Regulations, it will need to be consistent with the written ministerial statement (WMS) published in December 2023.
Commit to reducing carbon emissions	11077	Fully committed to responding to the sustainability agenda and driving down carbon emissions in our developments. Committed to reducing the footprint of its new developments both at the point of construction, as well as along the supply chain
	11077	All of Vistry's new developments consented after 2025 will be all electric, with no gas appliances installed in new homes, and each new home will have its own dedicated charging point for electric vehicles
	11077	All of Vistry's new homes built from 2025 will be Zero Carbon Ready (with a reduction of 75-80% CO2 on new homes built and all of Vistry's new homes built from 2030 will be Net Zero Carbon for regulated energy, and then from 2035 Net Carbon Zero for both regulated and unregulated energy
	11077	Vistry already has extensive experience of building out Zero Carbon developments, including our recent partnerships scheme at Europa Way, Warwick, which uses high-performance fabrics; timber frames; air source heat pumps (ASHP); Solar PV panels; and Waste Water Heat Recovery (WWHR)
Delivery	10201	Would not disagree that proposed standards are technically feasible, but concerned as to impact of requirements on rate sites can be delivered. Given that higher than Future Homes Standard expected in 2025, will likely require higher levels of fabric efficiency which will require new skills and material which could delay delivery until become available in short to medium term as supply chains developed
	10201	Has been recognised by Future Homes Standard that to deliver higher standards will require phased transitional arrangements to enable steady build up of skills and ensure quality. As such considerations will need to be given to delivery rates of development in early years of plan period with potentially fewer homes coming forward in this period as much higher standards will take time to embed
Eastleigh BC: Support	10362	Support proposed measures to improve energy efficiency, which is subject to review in light of Government's proposals for Building Regulations through Future Homes Standard and Future Buildings Standard.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Embedded carbon	10201	Recognise need to reduce embedded carbon in development but is not evident how decision maker would determine reasonable baseline of embodied carbon and how much reduction is required.
	10201	Would level of embedded carbon then be conditioned and if certain materials are no longer available and have to be sourced from elsewhere, increasing the embodied carbon compared to original estimates, would this then require an application to be made to amend the condition. Seeking to maintain a specific level of embodied carbon from estimates in planning permission could be impossible without delaying delivery of new homes. Requirement is ineffective and should be deleted Delete requirement for embodied carbon
	10760	Housing has a large amount of carbon emitted in the production of the building material. Encourage use of materials lower in carbon which meet current regulations. Ensure these low carbon materials are covered in planning policy and can be encouraged/promoted.
Energy	10938	Support Energy Building efficiency policy.
Energy Consumption	10977	Does not specifically state whether 'total energy consumption' refers to regulated and unregulated energy
Energy Efficiency Standards	10114	The Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) 13 December 2023 states that the Government does not expect plan-makers to set local energy efficiency standards for buildings that go beyond current or planned buildings regulations. Policy CL3 would impose rigid and stringent requirements on sustainable buildings and energy use without considering technical practicability or viability. Achieving the standards identified would require substantial initial investment due to the incorporation of advanced energy-efficient technologies and materials which can significantly raise the cost of construction - impacting scheme viability
Energy standards	10760	Build to extremely high energy efficiency standards, using the Passivhaus standards or similar. The advantage of these designs are the focus on ventilation whilst preventing heat loss.
	10114	Mandating specific space and energy standards for all new homes may limit the diversity and flexibility of housing options available to residents. Not all households may prioritize achieving net zero energy status or require the same spatial configurations
Existing dwellings - energy performance	11014	While there are limits on energy use in new homes and non-residential buildings there is no parallel policy for updating existing housing stock. It is therefore not clear how planning and environmental policies will together deliver the desired outcome
	11014	Suggested addition to policy

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		LP should include a statement of, or links to, policy (and funding) for upgrading the energy efficiency of existing homes and non-residential buildings
Expensive to retrofit	10124	Relatively cheap to install when building but are expensive if residents must retrofit to comply with central government targets
fabric first supported	11147	Towerview Property Group are supportive and adopt a fabric first approach to construction of their homes which is considered more sustainable than relying on renewable energy solutions which are often more expensive, have a higher embodied energy use and may not necessarily be used efficiently by future occupiers. Committed towards the transition away from gas boilers and the fabric standard outlined in the Future Homes Standard consultation.
Feasibility	11115	Query how the feasibility of demolition or re-use will be assessed.
Future Homes Standard	10794	Support the Government's approach set out in the Future Homes Standard, with a clear roadmap as to how low carbon homes will ensure that the Government can meet its commitments to net zero by 2050. Recognise the improvements in energy efficiency should be a transition that ensures new homes continue to come forward to meet housing needs whilst still being sufficiently challenging to significantly reduce carbon emissions of new homes from 2025. Written Ministerial Statement from 13 December 2023 indicates the Government does not expect plan makers to set local energy efficiency standards that go beyond current or planned Building Regulations.
	10796	Support the need to act to reduce carbon emissions, but do not consider that this needs to be achieved through the Local Plan, given that the Future Homes Standard (FHS) is already in place nationally, providing a standard approach to be delivered through the Building Regulations process. Therefore, the inclusion of this draft policy is not justified
	10219	Support the need to act to reduce carbon emissions, but do not consider that this needs to be achieved through the Local Plan, given that the Future Homes Standard (FHS) is already in place nationally, providing a standard approach to be delivered through the Building Regulations process. Therefore, the inclusion of this draft policy is not justified
	11108	The energy, carbon and renewable generation standards proposed in the draft policy are far more than where the future Homes Standard is taking the industry
	11108	Object to the policy and suggest that the wording is revised to allow for potential change in government policy over time but that the interim current expectations are aligned to the FHS and WMS.
	10119	Support promotion of low carbon ways of living and the transition away from gas boilers and the fabric standard outlined in the Future Homes Standard consultation.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10119	<p>Not supportive of standards that exceed the FHS Part L1 2025. Concern that the CL3 requirements, including the energy, carbon and renewable generation standards proposed, are above and beyond the Future Homes Standard. The policy may therefore prevent sustainable sites from coming forward for development. The planning system should not address technical standards, which are being addressed by Government through Building Regulations, in line with the NPPF (para 159b), and to accord with the Written Ministerial Statement (Planning - Local Energy Efficiency Standards Update) 13 December 2023. The proliferation of local standards by local authority area adds costs to building new homes and complexity, and undermines economies of scale.</p> <p>CL3 should be reworded to allow for potential change in Government policy over time (and/or subject to a future local plan review) and in the interim, current expectations should be aligned to the FHS (and Written Ministerial Statement) to reflect flexibility and viability considerations.</p>
	10119	CL3 does not accord with the advice in the Written Ministerial Statement (Planning - Local Energy Efficiency Standards Update) 13 December 2023 which states that any increase on Part L that is required by local authorities should be expressed as a percentage uplift to the Target Emission Rate.
	10119	Embodied carbon, the carbon emissions generated through the production and transportation of building materials, construction processes and the maintenance of a building are currently beyond the scope of building regulations. The need for development to reduce carbon emissions is recognised and the need for development to reduce carbon emissions is supported, however, rather than placing additional requirements on the developer that are unnecessary and unjustified, the most effective way of achieving this is through strict adherence to building regulations, as they are updated.
Alignment with national standards	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council recommends that local energy efficiency standards are aligned with the national standards to be effective and sound. This is because different energy standards across plan areas could create inefficiencies within the building and development industries, and impact on the delivery of such schemes.
High environmental standards	10124	Big issue is to ensure any new builds are built to high environmental standards including solar panels, heat pumps, EV charging points, batteries, and insulation

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10124	Andover Town Council will generally object to a development without some future proofing, but we believe that any Local Plan must give clear direction. The difficulty might be that central government fails to implement the appropriate building standards
retention and reuse of buildings	Historic England 10049	encourage strengthening the support for the retention and reuse of buildings
Housing delivery	10137	Concerns raised that delivery rate of the development in the early years of the Local Plan could be put at risk since the higher standard will take time to bed in owing to, for example, the requirement for higher levels of fabric efficiency which will require new skills and materials that may not be readily available.
Infrastructure - Electricity capacity	11117	Proposals will increase demand on the electricity network and could result in capacity issues. This should be checked with electricity providers to ensure sufficient capacity.
LETI/RIBA 2030	10977	Recommend including embodied carbon/WLC targets in line with LETI/RIBA 2030 Challenge/NZC Buildings Standard, with upfront embodied carbon emissions to be offset via approved schemes
National policy	10201	National policy should be reflected in local plan and requirements included in the Sustainability Statement
Net zero	11115	Policy conflicts with the WMS on local energy efficiency standards and needs reviewing to ensure consistency with proposed national standards.
Net zero costs/viability	10137	Test Valley Local Plan Viability Assessment and CIL Review (December 2022) assumes a 5% cost uplift for achieving net zero. This uplift figure should be thoroughly tested through the examination process if this policy is to be found sound. The policy would need to be reworded so that additional requirements are expressed as a percentage uplift of a dwelling's Target Emission Rate.
NHS - Contributions	10732	support securing financial contributions where on-site carbon mitigation cannot be met
	10732	NHS property could benefit from carbon offset funds
No additional standards	10794	There is no need for additional standards through the Local Plan that vary from that required in national government guidance.
	10794	Local Plan needs to acknowledge the implications of the transition period and needs to provide flexibility in accordance with the aims of national policy. Recommend that policy CL3 reverts to the requirements set out in Building Regulations rather than kWh/m2/yr.
Offsetting	10201	Use of offsetting where any residual energy demand cannot be met by onsite renewable energy is set out in supporting text, but not included within policy itself.
Overheating	10114	overheating is addressed by Part O of the building regulations and so is not required

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		suggest delete text - 'All development will also need to be designed to avoid risks of overheating both now and in the future.'
Progress now	10760	Don't wait for the acceptance of the Local Plan 2040 to ensure those houses already planned for are close to net zero emissions. No new houses should be built that immediately need retrofit. This is essential for all buildings, not just housing. Retrofit always more costly than building to higher standards.
Renewable technologies	10760	Require the installation of renewable energy into new build such as photovoltaic in combination with heat pumps within private and public sector developments. If new technologies arise, these should be evaluated as to how they reduce carbon emissions.
Risk of out of date	10812	Principles are welcomed. Putting specific numbers risk the policy becoming out of date, would be better to say must comply with current legislations and policies in the SPD and easier to update SPDs
Role of masterplanning	11077	Would also use masterplanning to support sustainable energy. The shape and layout of the Streetway Road site in particular, with its east-west orientation, provides opportunities for solar gain through building orientation as well as active PV generation on south-facing roofs
Solar panels	10052	No mention or requirement for incorporating solar panels in housing or industrial units.
Solar panels on buildings	10052	Disappointing that no mention or requirement for incorporating solar panels in housing or industrial units.
solar PV	10114	requirement to offset energy use by provision of equivalent renewables, particularly PV, is a very challenging target. Would require a large amount of PV, with the cost and visual implications that go with this but on plots where orientation is less than ideal it is likely not to be achievable. e.g. terraces of smaller houses orientated north / south, with their limited solar gain opportunities and limited roof space may not be able to generate the required energy levels. delete this part of policy
Support	10052	Welcome proposals in this policy.
Support no embodied carbon targets	11115	Support that the policy has no targets re: embodied carbon
Sustainable development	10889	The Local Plan is in favour of sustainable development, so it should not pursue development on greenfield sites.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Sustainable housing - site specific comment on climate change mitigation - strategic allocation at Manor Farm	10119	One of the key ways to address climate change is through the identification of sustainable housing sites that are well located to key settlements and major centres, employment, services and infrastructure. Larger allocations can offer the capacity to mitigate its own development impacts and offer wider benefits. Bellway are committed to ensuring the development at Manor Farm would be energy efficient, incorporating energy generating and saving technologies where feasible and appropriate. A micro-grid approach to energy generation with battery storage is proposed to optimise the equality of renewable distribution to the proposed development and to minimise local grid capacity change, whilst also offering biodiversity net gains.
Threshold for non-residential development	11081	Generally supported, however highly challenging for non-residential development below 1,000sqm to achieve BREAAAM 'Excellent'. Such buildings are usually simple construction which reduces the scope of applicable credits and increase the risk of overdesign/overengineering for compliance sake
	11081	Consider amending the proposed threshold of 500sqm to 1,000sqm for all new non-residential development Amend threshold to 1,000sqm
Tighten wording	10812	Suggested amendment Poorly worded, should be in the form "Development will only be permitted if..." Avoid "should" but use "must"
Use Building Regulations	10120	Disagree that there is a need for local policies on this matter through the Local Plan given there is already a national approach - the Future Homes Standard - being taken forward to achieve the same goal. Delivering these provisions through Building Regulations has an advantage of providing a single approach that all developers can understand and can be rolled out at scale.
Ventilation	10760	Ventilation in new buildings will reduce the need for electric fans and air conditioning, which would add to the carbon emissions. Ventilation is essential, as well as shading and positioning of windows. Living and working in overheated buildings affects people's health.
Verification	10760	Ensure verification of energy efficiency performance on completion.
Viability	11117	Concern that the proposed standards are beyond building regs and Future Homes Standard, and this could impact on the viability and developable area of sites, with a negative impact on delivery. This requires robust viability evidence.
Viability testing	10201	Council will need to ensure costs and deliverability are fully and robustly tested

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10201	Whilst Council undertaken some costs analysis in net zero carbon study, concerned these do not reflect potential cost to the developer.
	10201	Figure 8, Ready for Zero indicates standards above Future Homes Standard for three bed end of terrace house would be 15-20% increase in costs above 2021 Building Regulations. This is significant difference to Council's Local Plan Viability Assessment which assumes 15% increase in build costs, which does not take account of cost of semi-detached and detached homes will be higher. Policy HOU5 proposes 20% of homes to be 4 bedrooms or more. Concern that impact on viability not fully assessed
	10201	Viability Assessment does not appear to include any cost in relation to delivery of carbon offsetting. Necessary for Council to include higher costs in relation to policy in viability evidence if proposed energy efficiency requirements are to be deliverable
Water Use and Management	11108	Support the detailed introduction to the issues and evolving legislative framework and localised initiatives which will ensure the LP is accessible to a wide audience
When not technically or financially viable	11081	<p>Policy should include caveat which allows an application to demonstrate requirement may not be technically or financially viable (as per draft Policy DL4)</p> <p>Add caveat which allows to demonstrate that not technically and financially viable</p>
whole life carbon assessment	10114	Whole Life Carbon (WLC) Assessment – The Partnership strongly object to this requirement
	10114	WLC calculations likely to form part of the design of future housing development but it is not currently possible to carry out a meaningful or accurate WLC calculation for a residential development. The UK Net Zero Building Standard has not yet been published which will effectively define the rules for carrying out WLC calculations. It is due to be published in 2024, but the ability to provide a WLC will depend on the content of the document, which is currently unknown.
	10114	it is possible to carry out embodied carbon calculations but the vast majority of product manufacturers do not yet have embodied carbon data available for their products, so any results have to be treated as approximate
	10114	There is a significant assessment cost and time delay attached to an embodied carbon calculation, which would increase significantly if a whole life carbon assessment is required.
	10201	If whole life carbon assessment for residential development of 150 or more dwellings, requiring a higher level of carbon reduction taken forward assessment using SAP should be sufficient with regard to operational carbon and further comment in the whole carbon assessment is unnecessary

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Support Energy Efficiency Standards	Winchester City Council 10210	Support the use of Energy Use Intensity metric to calculate space heat demand and total energy demand.
	Winchester City Council 10210	Winchester City Council is looking forward to working with TVBC in light of recent written ministerial statement on energy efficiency statement to ensure we support this key policy area.
WLC	10977	The threshold to trigger a whole life carbon (WLC) assessment should be reduced from 5000m2
Written ministerial statement	10796	If the Council chooses to go beyond current or future standards, this must be in a way that is consistent with national policy and robustly assesses its consequences, including consistency with the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) published on 13th December 2023 and ensuring a well-reasoned and robustly costed rationale is provided in support of this approach
	10219	If the Council chooses to go beyond current or future standards, this must be in a way that is consistent with national policy and robustly assesses its consequences, including consistency with the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) published on 13th December 2023 and ensuring a well-reasoned and robustly costed rationale is provided in support of this approach
	10201	<p>Approach proposed based on energy use is inconsistent with approach set out in written ministerial statement 13 Dec 2023 and as such is unsound. Government considered energy metric as proposed by Council and concluded that these do not offer any additional benefits to those taken forward by Government. Any standard above Building Regulations must be expressed as a percentage of the target emission rate</p> <p>Any standard above Building Regulations must be expressed as a percentage of the target emission rate</p>
	10120	Written Ministerial Statement on 13th December 2023 clarified the Government's commitment to this issue and the need for a consistent approach to building standards in relation to carbon emissions. A policy of this nature will not be required in the plan.
	11135	Support this policy
water and historic environment	Historic England 10049	<p>suggest adding a line or two on the links between the water environment and the historic environment.</p> <p>Amended wording: The water environment in the Borough is important for its ecological value, its influence on the character and identity of the area, as a source of drinking water, and its influence on the local economy including farming and tourism. <u>The historic environment connects to the water environment in various ways, from influencing the heritage significance of a place and how</u></p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		<u>land use has evolved over time, to impacts on heritage assets when flood events occur. The preservation of archaeological remains can be dependent on water levels.</u>
Justification	10137	The Council will need to establish a clear need for the policy, as currently worded, based on the existing sources of evidence, consultations with the local water and sewerage company, the Environment Agency and catchment partnerships, and consideration of the impact on viability and housing supply of such a requirement.
Water supply	Natural England 10140	There remains uncertainty in relation to water resources and the impacts of abstraction on protected sites in advance of a long term scheme being in place to address the existing supply demand deficit in Southern Water's Western Area.
Annual Review	10139	Fully support but would recommend that annual review is clearly built into the implementation as water issues will become increasingly difficult and building controls must keep up
Deterioration	10139	This intention should be an over-riding priority Suggest amending to read as 'It is essential that development shall on no account cause deterioration' rather than 'It is essential that development does not cause deterioration'
Consultation	10052	Suggest that both the Environment Agency and water company are consulted, as it is in the water companies' economic interest to give consent.
100 l/p/d	10817	Agree that new development should use water efficiently, however requirement seeking water consumption of no more than 100L PPPD is not achievable. The optional higher Building Regulations water use per person standard of 110 L/P/D should be used. An additional 10 LPPPD should be applied to account for changes to less water efficient fittings throughout the lifetime of the development. Natural England (see Nutrient Neutrality Generic Methodology February 2022 Step 2) take a precautionary approach and seek 120 L/P/D when factoring in water usage for nutrient impact assessments in Wiltshire.
	10796	Part G of the Building Regulations requires standards of no more than 125 litres, confirming that Councils can impose stricter targets of 110 litres. Furthermore, the WMS dated 19 December 2023 does state that in areas of serious water stress, LPAs are encouraged to work with partners to agree tighter standards
	10796	Not clear from the evidence base where the limit of 100 litres per day is derived from and where the justification is to support this lower standard. The draft policy is therefore considered unsound in its current form

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10219	Part G of the Building Regulations requires standards of no more than 125 litres, confirming that Councils can impose stricter targets of 110 litres. Furthermore, the WMS dated 19th December 2023 does state that in areas of serious water stress, LPAs are encouraged to work with partners to agree tighter standards
	10219	Not clear from the evidence base where the limit of 100 litres per day is derived from and where the justification is to support this lower standard. The draft policy is therefore considered unsound in its current form
	11077	Fully committed to introducing water efficiency measures, 'below 105 litres' (which is up to a 16% reduction on Part G of the Building Regulations) is deemed a more realistic, and viable target, particularly for customers to maintain post-occupation.
	10114	The National Framework (EA, 2020a) recommends reducing customers individual daily use to 110 litres per head per day by 2050
	10114	<p>the approach in the Local Plan should be aligned to the design standard with the Southern Water 'Water Management Plan', which looks likely to increase the target to 109 l/h/day, or alternatively align it with the National Framework target of 110 l/h/day, which also aligns with the higher standard set within Building Regulations Part G.</p> <p>a) All new homes (including replacement dwellings) are designed and built to achieve a water consumption standard of no more than 110 litres per person per day; and</p>
	10119	<p>The planning system should not include additional policies for related technical standards, as this is being dealt with through the Future Homes Standard and building regulations in line with NPPF (para 154b). It is noted that the Borough is in an area classed as seriously water stressed by the EA, which could justify the higher optional standard of 110l/person/day described in building regulations. However, the policy exceeds this at 100l/person/day and should be raised to align with Building Regulations.</p> <p>Policy should be amended to state that building regulations should be complied with (part G2 and any updates) or amended to specify 110l/person/day</p>
	11115	Policy should be kept under review in light of changes to building regs and government policy. Until that time it should be kept at the current standard of 110l/p/d
	11117	Higher water efficiency standard requirements need to be robustly evidenced

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10201	<p>Whilst recognises written ministerial statement of 13 Dec 2023 that can go standards can be tighter than 110 l/p/d, not clear why Council consider is necessary to go below, as does not appear that water scarcity is inhibiting granted planning permissions or bringing local plan forward. As such 110 l/p/d remains appropriate requirement and no justification for going below this standard</p> <p>Maintain 110 l/pd as no justification for going below this standard</p>
	10120	It is not clear why the council considers it necessary to go below the 110l/p/d that is allowed through the optional technical standards set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. The Council has outlined that the area is in water stress but it does not appear that water scarcity is inhibiting the council from granting planning permission or bringing its local plan forward. As such the 110l/p/d remains the appropriate requirement for new homes and there is no justification for going below this.
100 l/p/d - no objection	11108	Criteria (a) exceeds the current minimum 110l/person/day 'optional' requirement but on the basis that there is water stress relating to the River Anton, then W1 express no objection.
support water consumption requirements	Natural England 10140	Welcome that policy requires all new homes to be designed and built to achieve a water consumption standard of no more than 100 litres / person / day.
	Natural England 10140	The higher standards of water efficiency for homes should include external water use and re-use, in line with Southern Water's Target 100 programme.
water consumption per day	10114	The requirement goes a step beyond the levels set within Part G and would therefore require completion of Appendix A in Part G 'water efficiency calculator' to establish a specification that can achieve the performance standard. This would need to be applied for every house type across a site to demonstrate compliance
Water efficiency - beyond 100l/p/d	10047	Pleased to see requirement for new homes to meet a water efficiency standard. However, this could be taken further and would recommend that this is amended to 90 litres per person per day.
water consumption per day	10114	<p>Concern with reference to 'feasibility' which is an unrealistic bar to set as it does not take account of all relevant factors</p> <p>b) All new non-residential developments of 500sqm or more are designed and built to achieve at least one credit through the BREEAM criterion for water consumption (reference Wat 01). This needs to be satisfied unless it can be demonstrated that it is not technically practicable or financially viable.</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Water Quality	Southern Water 10022	SW support parts (c) and (d) of policy to protect water quality, along with requirement for occupation to be aligned with the necessary upgrades in cases where there are network capacity constraints
Final paragraph - for water companies not developers	10137	The final paragraph of the policy should be removed since developers or housebuilders have no control over water supply or waste water infrastructure or treatment. It is the responsibility of water companies working with local authorities and the Environment Agency, to plan for the future demand for water services relating to the development requirements proposed in Local Plan.
	10796	Do not consider that the requirements set out in the policy for applicants to demonstrate sufficient water supply and wastewater services are appropriate, given that it is the responsibility of water companies and other stakeholders to plan for future services
	10219	Do not consider that the requirements set out in the policy for applicants to demonstrate sufficient water supply and wastewater services are appropriate, given that it is the responsibility of water companies and other stakeholders to plan for future services
	10119	<p>The requirement to demonstrate that adequate water supply, surface water drainage and waste water treatment capacity will be available prior to occupation is a strategic issue that individual landowners and developers will not be able to address. This requirement is inappropriate. NPPF (para 25-27) states that local authorities should collaborate with water companies and strategic policy makers to plan for growth over the plan period and ensure adequate infrastructure, such as pipelines or reservoirs.</p> <p>Policy should be amended to remove requirement on developer/landowner to plan for wider infrastructure/capacity issues of water/drainage.</p>
	10201	<p>Final paragraph of policy is unsound. Having to show sufficient capacity is unnecessary and unlawful as attempt to get applicants to do things for which not legally responsible. It is responsibility of water companies working with local authorities and Environment Agency to plan for future demand for water services relating to development requirements proposed in local plans, not applicants</p> <p>Delete final paragraph of policy</p>
	10201	Water companies are subject to statutory duty under S37 and S94 Water Industry Act 1991. Consequently, for water company to plan for and provide sufficient supply whilst considering other obligations relating to wider environmental impacts, such as raised by Natural England. It is not for

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		developer to either anticipate or remedy them. Water supply when considering planning applications is not a land use planning matter, but to be resolved by water company in conjunction with relevant statutory agencies
	10201	If water company unable to supply water to meet expected needs of development must be disclosed in Water Resources Management Plan. If unforeseen events occur after WRMP meaning unable to provide water required, then local authority must reflect in local plan. This could represent significant barrier to delivery of local planned could mean development requirements cannot be delivered.
	10201	If water cannot be guaranteed, then development requirements in local plan cannot be delivered. Consequently, local plan is unsound. Plan cannot be made sound in relation to matters of water through policies in plan stipulating actions that applicants must taken as they cannot provide water services
	10201	Housebuilder cannot resolve problems relating to water services through policy measures or conditions. Water companies, local authorities and Environment Agency cannot ignore statutory responsibilities for planning for water by deflecting onto housebuilders. Final paragraph should be deleted as not consistent with legal framework for supply ow water and wastewater services to new development
	10120	Final paragraph of this policy is unsound. Policies in local plans relating to applicants having to show there is sufficient capacity with regard to water supply and wastewater services are unnecessary and unlawful because they are an attempt to get applicants to do things for which they are not legally responsible. Instead, it is the responsibility of water companies, under S37 and S94 of the Water Industry Act 1991, to work with local authorities and the Environment Agency, to plan for the future demand of water services relating to the development requirements proposed in local plans, not applicants.
Infrastructure - water upgrades	11117	Concerned with proposed use of conditions to restrict occupation pending delivery of off-site upgrades for water / wastewater infrastructure. Could result in delay in the delivery of sites, especially as upgrades are typically done in 5yr cycles.
	11117	Obligation is on the service provider, not the developer, to deliver water/waste water infrastructure. Use of conditions to hold up development would therefore be unreasonable.
	11117	Suggest a different approach from using conditions to instead require LPAs to take account of future planned upgrades in their decision making. Would provide more certainty and avoid delay.
100 l/p/d - no objection	10182	Support water efficiency standards

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
BREEAM	10977	Target for non-residential buildings is too easy, most developments achieve 3 credits for BREEAM Wat 01 with just standard water efficient products
Cannot be implemented	10120	The policy cannot be fully implemented as the outcome is determined by choice and the Local Plan has no jurisdiction here. Therefore, this policy is ineffective and should be removed from the Local Plan.
Existing infrastructure issues	11130	Utilities such as water and sewage are barely adequate. Abbotswood has constant disrupted water supply and for months we endured operational costs and delays with the closure of Cupernham Lane with minimum effort or priority being made by Southern Water to get the matter dealt with
Feasibility study - future water options	11014	Support pan-parish feasibility study to identify future options, based on Local Plan and sustainable drainage policy and guidance to manage rainfall. Innovative schemes needed for carbon capture and water quality to benefit residents and wildlife.
Housing figures	11079	The housing figures quoted for Test Valley will lead to further contamination of rivers in the area especially due to illegal sewage spillage due to lack of sewage facilities
Infrastructure - Wastewater	10938	Support policy suggesting reduction in water use.
	10910	The further development of housing is incompatible with the current state of Fullerton Wastewater Treatment Works, which would need upgrading so that nitrates are stripped to protect the Anton and Test rivers and wildlife habitats.
	10275	Waste water infrastructure in Andover is inadequate at present, high profile discharges due to some extent to groundwater infiltration flags the requirement for repairs/upgrades before any further housing takes place. At the very least storm tanks at Fullerton should be expanded.
Infrastructure - sewage	11079	Test valley already has development constraints because of problems of nutrients and lack of sewage infrastructure to cope with development but there are no constraints included in the LP and no sewage strategy
Water consumption	Natural England 10140	Recommend that policy encourages wise use of water in conjunction with water companies, for example by promoting the implementation of grey water recycling systems and more efficiency water appliances in new development and raising awareness of responsible water use.
	Natural England 10140	Strongly recommend that existing development adopts greater water efficiency measures to offset the likely impact new development may have on water supplies. Suitable measures would include improving fixtures and fittings, water reuse and recycling, rainwater harvesting and greywater recycling.
Water supply and CC	Natural England 10140	Borough is likely to experience hotter and drier summers, in keeping with trends across England. This has the potential to further deteriorate existing water supplies and presents greater uncertainty over the plan period.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
grey water recycling	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	Should encourage grey water recycling as part of major applications
Permission	10139	<p>Rather than leaving until prior to occupation developers should be required to do this prior to permission being granted</p> <p>Suggest amending 'prior to occupation' to 'before permission is granted...' and adding 'Provision must have been secured and costed in detail from the water companies before the development is given permission and permission shall depend on it being adequate in the long term so that...' before.</p>
Policy intro	10812	<p>Suggested amendment</p> <p>Poorly worded, should be in the form "Development will only be permitted if..." Avoid "should" but use "must"</p>
Principles supported	10812	Principles are welcomed
Projected Rainfall	10139	<p>The Water Cycle Study demonstrates the weakness of WWTWs and their inability to cope with the projected increases in rainfall</p> <p>Suggest adding 'Provision must have been secured and costed in detail from the water companies before the development is given permission and permission shall depend on it being adequate in the long term so that...' prior to the last statement in the policy 'prior to occupation....'</p>
Promoting water efficiency	10760	Residents and industries in the Test Valley need to be made aware we live in an area of low water supply and that measures to reduce the amount used per person per day are explained.
	10760	Residents need to know they are living in an area with a shortage of drinking water and adaptations encouraged such as water saving fittings and being advised on ways to save water.
Protection of rivers	10047	Encourage wording like that provided is incorporated as a new policy to have more detail on the protection and enhancement of rivers.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		<p>Strengthen policy or add new policy with wording like the following: Development that is within or adjacent to river corridors and their tributaries will be required to conserve and enhance: The natural characteristics of the river, its springs, headwaters and associated species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water sources and water quality • The river corridor's ecosystem, geodiversity and ecological connectivity • The natural functioning of the river through the seasons <p>taking into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity and geology • Natural Buffers (minimum 20m) to prevent incidents of polluting run-off and protect biodiversity; • Increased public access to the river corridor and the associated impacts of this increase; • Marginal vegetation and the ecological value of the area including its role as an ecological network; • Aquatic and riparian vegetation of the river environment. • The varying size and associated habitats within a corridor which, in order to avoid uncertainty, are defined as the habitats immediately surrounding the waterbody that contribute toward its character and ecology including but not exhaustively flood plains, water meadows, wet woodland, reedbeds, fens, mires, bankside vegetation and other smaller waterbodies within close proximity and/or sharing the same topography and geology.
Restrictive Criteria	10139	The section allowing no compliance should have very restrictive, specified criteria applied as commercial considerations should not outweigh water quality and quantity
Self Composting Toilets	10838	Southern Water are abstracting water from the aquifer and a possible solution would be to stipulate new dwellings have self-composting toilets, waste disposal and processing would need to be carefully thought through
Sewerage capacity & engagement	11115	Provision of adequate sewerage infrastructure is the responsibility of water companies, not developers. Development has a right to connect. The council should set out how it has engaged with Southern Water and EA to manage future demand.
Capacity	Southern Water 10838	Southern Water cannot cope with the current demand and it is likely the Environment Agency will object to planning applications as seen in Oxford
amend last paragraph	Southern Water 10022	Request amendment to policy to state 'prior to occupation, adequate water supply, surface water drainage, wastewater infrastructure and wastewater treatment capacity is available, or can be made available, to serve the development so as to avoid risks of adverse effects on the water

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		environment. To protect water quality, there will be a presumption against connection of surface water to the combined sewer.'
		Review whether to add suggested criteria to policy wording
	Southern Water 10022	SW encourage the addition of reference to the combined sewer network (one designed to convey both surface water and wastewater in same pipe) to increase efficacy of policy in relation to safeguarding water quality
		Review whether to add suggested criteria to policy wording
nearest point of capacity	Southern Water 10022	SW request removal of 'connected to the nearest point of capacity' as this requirement pre-dates Ofwat's changes to the new infrastructure charging mechanism, introduced in 2018.
support water consumption requirements	Southern Water 10022	SW supports parts (a) and (b) of this policy requiring higher levels of water efficiency
	Southern Water 10022	The requirement for no more than 100l/p/d aligns with Southern Water's Target 100 program which will help to protect water environment by ensuring existing sources are used as sustainably as possible
Support	10139	We support this policy in the hope legislation will be enacted to enable the higher levels of water efficiency espoused by TVBC
Support provision on technically or financially viable	11081	Support provision which allows application to demonstrate that requirement may not be technically feasible or financially viable
Targets	10977	Considering Test Valley is already a water stressed area these water targets/criteria should be stricter
Threshold for non-residential development	11081	Consider amending the proposed threshold of 500sqm to 1,000sqm for all new non-residential development Amend threshold to 1,000sqm
Wastewater	10573	The draft plan makes no mention of required increase in wastewater capacity despite all of Andover's wastewater processed at the Fullerton site being already at capacity.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10573	Will applications from Southern Water to provide sufficient water capacity be rejected as the plan already says there is sufficient infrastructure to support the additional pressure from the proposed development.
Water	10139	Test Valley should work with developers to work to standards well above those currently required to preserve the globally important and rich water heritage and quality in the borough and relieve the waster stress currently operating.
Water quality	10047	Policy does not go far enough to achieve safeguards to the water environment, including chalk catchments. Strongly recommend the policy is amended, or a separate water quality policy is created to have more detail on the protection and enhancement of rivers new development must meet.
Water stress	10052	There are already problems with water supply in Romsey, also the River Test is under water stress. Further housing can only make this worse.
Water Target	10977	Water target of <100 l/p/d is good but could be stricter, Natural England's position statement suggests new builds to achieve strict water targets of 85 l/p/d
	10197	<p>We do not believe policy CL4 is adequate and must be far stronger. It suggests that development can occur without firm requirements being in place and delivered</p> <p>Prior to occupation, adequate water supply, surface water drainage, wastewater infrastructure and waste water treatment capacity is available, <i>and proven to have sufficient capacity for development</i>, and connected to the nearest point of adequate capacity, to serve the development so as to avoid risks of adverse effects on the water environment.</p>
	11135	Support this policy
Site specific assessments	Historic England 10049	<p>Recommend adding a line to make totally clear that site specific assessment will still be required</p> <p>In balancing planning matters, considerable weight will be given to the benefits of supporting the delivery of additional renewable and low carbon energy. This however does not automatically override environmental protections for example. Site specific assessment will still be required. Additionally, as set out in the policy, significant weight would be given to community led schemes</p>
Strengthening of criterion a)	New Forest National Park Authority 10696	Criteria a) could be strengthened in relation to protected landscape and their setting and minimising adverse impacts.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Strengthen criterion c)	New Forest National Park Authority 10049	<p>“giving consideration” to significance could simply involve considering the matter, Policy CL5: renewable and low carbon energy and lead to a scheme that harms an important asset without a policy mechanism being triggered that would support effective decision-making.</p> <p>I believe a stronger steer would be better, in both policy and supporting text. In policy, I suggest adding a reference to proportionate heritage impact assessment and I propose wording for consideration.</p> <p>“c) The significance of designated and undesignated heritage assets (including their setting), considered through proportionate heritage impact assessment in accordance with policy ENV2;”</p>
Support	10760	The map showing areas suitable for wind turbines and size of turbine suitable for that location is welcome.
Approach for other technologies	10760	It is not clear how other technologies, such as energy from waste, anaerobic digestion installations and recycling plants will be guided or away from suitable or sensitive locations.
Approach to energy storage	10397	Storage systems are not a form of green energy, when considering the NPPF and PPG, that TVBC will give recognition the consideration to identify suitable areas to such technologies. Suitable areas must never include areas designated as countryside or part of the local gap.
	10083	Also concerned about one of the major spin offs from the renewable energy business that is having significant adverse effects in our countryside. Nursling and Rownhams has more BESS than any other parish in Test Valley and probably more than all the remaining parishes combined
	10083	A total of 73 battery energy storage facilities have been approved, but only 25 built, this tells us that there are already more than enough approvals to meet demand, and further batteries are not required and cannot be justified. Yet recent applications are seeking permission for a further 88 units.
Brownfield first	10052	Suggest that, where possible, renewable energy should be on existing industrial / brownfield sites rather than on farming / countryside areas.
	10036	Use of property roofs for solar panels as part of this policy should be preferable to large installations covering agricultural landscapes. Suggest using roofs is included as preferred option for renewable energy
Community energy - support	11014	Agree with the LP giving significant weight to community-led renewable and low carbon energy schemes.
Consider existing renewable sites	11075	There is little consideration for the existing sites within the Borough that currently deliver renewable and low carbon energy in the policy wording. This is likely due to the lack of detailed assessment of

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		the existing provision and potential development opportunities of those sites in The Test Valley Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study (2020)
	11075	Significant weight should be given to the benefits of utilising an established site in accordance with criteria c) paragraph 163 in the NPPF. Proposals for the repowering and life-extension of all types of for renewable and low carbon development should be included, not just 'wind energy proposals' as listed under criteria h) of policy CL5
Decommissioning of sites	11075	In terms of the de-commissioning of sites, it seems onerous to have to consider traffic implications, when it would seem obvious the traffic generation would be less if the activity or land use were to cease. The impact on local amenity would also be reduced. There is little in the policy commentary to explain why criteria g) should also comply to decommissioning
Encourage specific technologies	10760	Energy storage needs to be encouraged.
	10760	Local Plan does not show how onshore wind turbines are going to be encouraged. Although Test Valley now has many solar farms, a more rounded energy production to cover night time and rainy days - the Council needs to encourage wind turbines.
Evolving technology implications	11075	Given renewable and low carbon technology is constantly evolving at a rapid pace, the potential for amendments, revisions and extensions to existing schemes should be considered and strongly supported in policy
Feasibility assessment of renewable energy	11014	Would support TVBC or a pan-parish group undertaking a feasibility study of potential low-cost options to improve the exploitation of renewable generation in short, medium and long terms.
Food Security	10139	No mention of need to ensure food security
General - support	10397	Approve the specific action that policies in the draft Local Plan are written to facilitate the move towards carbon neutrality and join the commitment by TVBC to reduce emissions and support adaptation to the effects of climate change
	10083	Fully supports the need for greener and more renewable forms of energy both to provide a reliable energy source and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that are a major factor in climate change.
	10083	We totally support policy CL5 that seeks to control and restrict the development of facilities such as BESS
	10397	Support the provision of renewable and low carbon energy to transition to net zero. Agree national policies recognise the role of such technologies in enhancing energy security and accept the policy aims to facilitate and enable the supply of renewable and low carbon technologies and identification of suitable areas for those technologies
	10812	Principles are welcomed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Greater support for renewable sites	11075	To increase the potential to reduce emissions by 2050, further changes are required to other relevant draft local plan policies in this chapter, namely Policy CL5
	11075	Policy CL5 supports the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and storage along with the associated infrastructure. There are many sites that have been planned for the long term, not just on the basis of a 25-year licence
	11075	There should be greater support to sustain these sites, given the level of investment and potential benefit for the climate in the future in accordance with criteria a) paragraph 160 of the NPPF
	11075	Potential for re-use and re-development for other forms of renewable and low carbon energy forms should be more strongly encouraged and supported through the wording of draft policy CL5. This would result in more efficient use of land and reduce the need to look for other alternative sites for this type of provision
Grid capacity	10937	The state of the local grid means the district network operator limits the size of home installations.
	11014	District Network Operator (DNO) currently limits the size of home installations due to the old and fragile nature of the local grid.
General - support	Historic England 10049	Welcome the plan's support for renewable energy development and the inclusion of criterion c in policy CL5
heritage impact assessment	Historic England 10049	supporting text, I recommend outlining what is required in proportionate heritage impact assessment, including making clear that the setting of heritage assets has not been considered in the Council's evidence base (identifying potentially suitable areas for wind and solar development) and adding a footnote to HE guidance
impact designated heritage assets	10049	land south of Bury Hill camp Scheduled Monument, east of Abbots Ann, has been identified as potentially suitable for large-scale wind development (with a tip height of 60-100m). We infer the research has not considered potential harm to nearby designated heritage assets of such development.
Incorporating renewables	10760	The Local Plan does not state how renewable energy could be incorporated into a new development such as power from a wind turbine.
Lack of strength	10279	Giving 'consideration to'. Lack of any strength to secure the acceptable setting etc. of such projects.
Loose Wording	10139	Generally, support however, there are concerns the wording is quite 'loose' and it would be easy to satisfy the criteria given the phrase 'subject to consideration'
Passive terminology	10052	This is passive and just says that the Council will take into consideration all their policies in considering applications.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
presentation	10799	Plans on pages 144 and 145 relating to sites potentially suitable for wind energy developments are not referenced with a Figure of Plan number and are of insufficient detail to be usefully understood. The base map needs changing.
Reinstatement unnecessary	11075	The requirement for restoration and re-instatement of sites following the cease of operations in the second paragraph of the policy wording is considered to be unnecessary. The need to re-instate any lost habitats is appreciated and acknowledged as of great importance
Solar Panels	10139	Disappointed there is no mention of the opportunities provided by using rooftop solar which should be a standard requirement
	10139	Disappointed there is no mention of the opportunities provided by using rooftop solar which if promoted on agricultural and industrial buildings could reduce the likelihood of 'industrialisation' of the countryside and reduce requirement for greenfield sites
Support for supporting and ancillary development	11075	There should be greater emphasis on supporting development that is ancillary to, an expansion or re-use of existing sites that generate renewable and low carbon energy. This will maximise the potential for suitable development, and their future re-powering and life extension of existing sources of renewable and low carbon energy sources across the Borough
	10812	Suggested amendment Poorly worded, should be in the form "Development will only be permitted if..." Avoid "should" but use "must"
	11135	Support this policy
Climate Mitigation	10243	It is vital the plan-led system leads the identification of an appropriate strategy and sites to meet currently-assessed development needs into the future. Reflecting present knowledge and evidence there is an urgent need to ensure the development strategy takes an urgent view of the issues arising from climate change, in terms of mitigating both its causes and effects, than does the current plan.
	10243	The NPPF and National Transport Decarbonisation Plan have clear expectations if legally binding targets for climate mitigation by 2050 are to be met. Public transport is expected to play a radically greater role than it does today, if the aims of national and local policies are to be met.
Drainage	11135	Sustainable ground water drainage should be used for all new and redevelopments to ensure retention of ground water in locality for longer to reduce the impact of heavy rain
Climate Change	11108	Support the introduction and description of the national context as a prelude to the locally derived Climate Emergency Action Plan, adopted in 2020.support the holistic approach in paragraph 5.13

Chapter 5 - Our Communities

Paragraphs 5.80-5.109

Key Issue	Officer Response
Infrastructure – plan should be more explicit about how infrastructure challenges will be addressed and how infrastructure will be delivered/funded	The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan and theme based policies will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Education- access to Test Valley School, school grounds and buildings need investment	
Engagement-lack of engagement with bus operators	
Level crossing safety at Halterworth	
Viability- plan should include future consideration of viability through the decision-making process within Policy COM1	
Policy- not robust or effective in helping to secure a range of facilities in Test Valley	

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
BNG	10655	BNG and nitrates can affect deliverability of sites - require careful planning and mitigation measures on all sites to achieve compliance
	10655	Failure to address BNG and nitrates requirements can delay planning approvals and potentially result in sites being undeliverable if suitable mitigation measures cannot be implemented
Community Services and facilities	11108	Support the policy and its criteria is appropriate as It resists the unjustified loss of key services, local shops and public houses
	11108	The policy has overlooked the opportunity to incorporate new services and facilities either community led or delivered as part of a mixed-use development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Delivering Infrastructure	11108	Support reference to physical, green and social infrastructure and concur that all three are essential in supporting thriving sustainable communities.
	11108	No objection to the policy
	10812	Does not clearly indicate what constitutes infrastructure, in the public's mind this includes GPs, dentists, water supply and sewage systems and public transport
	10812	Policy does nothing to rectify existing infrastructure shortfalls albeit that these are probably beyond the ability of the local plan to provide
	10812	Site specific approach is needed to avoid the formulaic specification of local infrastructure, having specified the infrastructure there need to be a more rigorous approach to getting it implemented
	10036	Critics if the developer contributions system argue it is not working effectively and lacks transparency. LPAs could make better use of their powers and raise more funds, and service providers more active in securing funds. CIL is too complicated and pooling restrictions are unhelpful
	11014	Any payments for site specific mitigation (S106) and broader impact on the development of infrastructure (CIL) should be made to PCs and not TVBC. If that is not possible, then the PCs must have the overriding vote on how the money derived from their parishes is spent.
Education - Test Valley School	10727	We are a Trust that currently operates several schools within Hampshire, this includes Test Valley School at Stockbridge.
	10727	There are a number of specific issues that exist at the school an October 2022 Ofsted Report categorised the school as 'Inadequate' in all regards
	10727	The school roll has been steadily falling, such that we have a school capacity of 780, yet only have 400 pupils
	10727	Access arrangements are significantly sub-standard, there is no room for buses to enter the school premises and buses must arrive on a staggered basis. Some pupils wait 40 minutes after school. Additionally, pupils have to walk down Roman Road to catch the buses and there have been a number of near misses in the bus turning area
	10727	The school grounds do not meet the requirements of DoE Building Bulletin 103 'Area Guidelines for Mainstream Schools'. In particular, we have a shortfall of some 1.3 hectares of soft outdoor PE space.
	10727	There is a need for investment in the school buildings.
	10727	If these issues are not addressed, there is a very real danger that the school will have to close.
	10727	The provision of a safe school access with room for all buses to be accommodated within school grounds and pupils being able to leave safely and promptly at the end of the school day

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10727	Substantially improved school grounds fully meeting or exceeding Bulletin 103 requirements.
	10727	The development will provide significant funds for investment in the school estate.
	10727	Provide the catalyst to turn around the fortunes of the school, which serves a key role in the central Test Valley area
Engagement	10243	There is no indication how the Council has engaged with bus operators to examine possible viable links between the biggest settlements if a suitable development strategy were to focus opportunities on it. The NPPF expects this level of engagement with transport infrastructure providers and operators at 15 c).
Fullerton WWTW	10760	The Fullerton sewage works are not treating the wastewater adequately due to a range of problems, particularly in wet weather, with breaches having been reported where untreated water was discharged to the rivers and the sea.
Infrastructure	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council has published guidance on Planning Obligations and Developer Infrastructure Contributions as a basis for identifying necessary on-site and other infrastructure which may be sought.
School Travel Plan	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council seeks financial obligations towards education infrastructure and has indicated what increased school capacity may be necessary to support the site allocations in the chapter 4 comments. Where new or expanded, schools are required to support planned growth, the County Council will in most cases seek to ensure development proposals are supported by a commitment to fund an accredited School Travel Plan.
Havant thicket reservoir	10760	As the Local Plan relies on Havant Thicket reservoir to supply water to Andover this needs to be up and running before new developments are built.
Infrastructure	10842	Network Rail supports the inclusion of an infrastructure policy within the Plan.
	10842	there is scope for broadening out the Policy and Network Rail would request that reference be made within para d to the use of conditions to ensure required infrastructure is provided where development is dependent on this
	10074	Recommend that due consideration is given to the development of sufficient support infrastructure to ensure the increased population is able to access services and facilities.
	10197	Feel there should be far more emphasis on adequate infrastructure being in place prior to development or as a condition to development being permitted in Tiers 1-3
	10279	Romsey Future Infrastructure Workstream has reviewed provision and made 86 recommendations. Romsey Future Management Board is taking forward 31
	10768	The IDP summarises the significant number of infrastructure requirements which development will be expected to contribute towards, including components that are strategic in nature

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10768	Assessment of infrastructure capacity must consider the opportunities for development to enhance or improve conditions in line with NPPF para 83 new development may allow for upgrades to water infrastructure, broadband connection, highways, or to support services
	10374	Accepted that there are currently no borough-wide strategic infrastructure improvements. However, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2024) summarises the significant number of infrastructure requirements which development will be expected to contribute towards, including components that are strategic in nature
	10374	The precise funding gaps are not yet known at this stage and may themselves indicate that an uplift in the housing requirement is required as these improvements are likely to drive an increase in the homes needed locally
	10114	support councils aspirations
	10655	insufficient infrastructure capacity and conflicts with existing planning policies can pose significant challenges to development
	11115	There should be a joined up infrastructure policy and the council and highway authority should prepare a Infrastructure, Transport and Connectivity Plan to ensure timely delivery of funded major infrastructure
	11115	Support policy where it meets the tests of development obligations.
	11091	The Plan does not ensure that current infrastructure problems are addressed on any proposed development.
	11091	The Plan does not ensure that current infrastructure problems are addressed on any proposed development.
	10697	The UK has problems with providing appropriate energy infrastructure, infrastructure and reservoirs when developing housing.
	10779	Have infrastructure projects kept pace with the housing developments, such as essential services in light of large developments?
	10722	Where a proposed development is near a boundary, liaison with the adjacent borough should include infrastructure provisions
	10732	support approach to infrastructure delivery set out in COM1
	10732	supporting text should include examples of essential infrastructure, especially in relation to prioritisation of developer contributions where viability constraints are demonstrated
Infrastructure - Dentists	11100	The current plan does not address how it will overcome infrastructure challenges ahead of any of the proposed developments, and there needs to be a full assessment of the dentists need for any increase in housing.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10490	There is a need for housing, though there is a worrying lack of infrastructure provision surrounding children's access to dentists in the area.
	10502	There should be more provisions made in the plan to increase the number of dentists in the area to support the surge of housing and therefore residents.
Infrastructure - Doctors	11100	The current plan does not address how it will overcome infrastructure challenges ahead of any of the proposed developments, and there needs to be a full assessment of the doctors need for any increase in housing.
	10490	There is a need for housing, though there is a worrying lack of infrastructure provision surrounding children's access to doctors in the area.
	10502	There should be more provisions made in the plan to increase the number of doctors in the area to support the surge of housing and therefore residents.
Infrastructure - Education	10762	Andover developments together comprise 2,650 new dwellings. Does this overall increase generate a requirement for a new secondary school?
	11100	The current plan does not address how it will overcome infrastructure challenges ahead of any of the proposed developments, and there needs to be a full assessment of the school's need for any increase in housing.
	10490	There is a need for housing, though there have been no infrastructure provision considerations surrounding secondary schools for children leaving primary school.
Infrastructure - health	10732	new development should make a proportionate contribution to funding the healthcare needs arising from new development
	10732	residential development has significant impact on need for additional primary healthcare provision for local residents
	10732	Healthcare's strategic importance to supporting housing growth and sustainable development so should be considered forefront of priorities for infrastructure delivery
	10732	essential that health estate is supported to develop, modernise or be protected in line with integrated NHS strategies and the ability to review healthcare estate, optimise land use and deliver health services crucial
	10732	Planning policies should enable delivery of essential healthcare infrastructure and be prepared to help deliver estate transformation in consultation with NHS
	10732	Provision of healthcare services to meet needs of new residents is essential infrastructure and should be given significant weight in decision making
	10732	health infrastructure should be clearly identified as essential infrastructure

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10732	there should be an expectation that development will make provision to meet cost of health infrastructure
	10732	Infrastructure and Developer Contributions SPD should be referred to here as providing guidance on implementation of policy
	10732	importance of effective implementation mechanisms so that healthcare infrastructure is delivered alongside new development
	10732	primary healthcare services are most directly impacted by population growth associated with new development
	10732	LP should emphasize that NHS and partners will need to work with the Council in formulation of appropriate mitigation measures
	10732	important that assessment of existing healthcare infrastructure is robust and that mitigation options secured align with NHS requirements
	10732	healthcare providers should have flexibility in determining most appropriate means of meeting healthcare needs of new development
	10732	If the demand generated for healthcare services from a new development cannot be met by incremental extension or internal modification of existing facilities, then new purpose-built healthcare infrastructure will be required to provide sustainable health services
	10732	options for healthcare facilities should include financial contributions, new on-site health infrastructure, free land/ infrastructure/ property or a combination of these
	10730	new development should make a proportionate contribution to funding the healthcare needs arising from new development
	10732	residential development has significant impacts on need for additional primary healthcare provision for local residents
	10732	Healthcare's strategic importance to supporting housing growth and sustainable development so should be considered forefront of priorities for infrastructure delivery
	10732	essential that health estate is supported to develop, modernise or be protected in line with integrated NHS strategies and the ability to review healthcare estate, optimise land use and deliver health services crucial
	10732	Planning policies should enable delivery of essential healthcare infrastructure and be prepared to help deliver estate transformation in consultation with NHS
	10730	important that S106 drafting ensures funds are secured for BSW ICB (as commissioning body) with flexibility to align with BSW ICB commissioning processes and estates plans
	10730	support general approach to infrastructure delivery set out in COM1

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10730	would be useful for supporting text to include examples of essential infrastructure especially in relation to prioritisation of developer contributions where viability constraints are demonstrated
	10730	Provision of healthcare services to meet needs of new residents is essential infrastructure and should be given significant weight in decision making
	10730	health infrastructure should be clearly identified as essential infrastructure
	10730	should be expectation that development will make provision to meet cost of healthcare infrastructure necessary for development
	10730	should refer to Infrastructure and Developer Contributions SPD as providing guidance on implementation of policy
	10730	emphasise importance of effective implementation mechanisms so healthcare infrastructure is delivered alongside new development
	10730	LP should emphasize that NHS and partners will need to work with the Council in formulation of appropriate mitigation measures
	10730	healthcare providers should have flexibility in determining most appropriate means of meeting healthcare needs of new development
	10730	where new development creates demand for health services that can't be met through incremental extension or internal modification of existing buildings, new purpose built healthcare infrastructure will be required to provide sustainable services
	10730	options for healthcare facilities should include financial contributions, new on-site health infrastructure, free land/ infrastructure/ property or a combination of these
	10763	inclusion of off-site infrastructure paramount as ICB works towards consolidating estate rather than building small branches
	10763	small branches can be inefficient - highlighted in final report of the stocktake undertaken by Dr Claire Fuller on behalf of the Chief Executive of the NHS
	10763	some locations CB will seek larger solution to the impact of cumulative development
	10812	The suggestion that primary care GPs should only be about extending existing sites is perverse in an expanding town and will encourage unnecessary traffic movements because these are all in the centre of Romsey
	11014	Note the recent Hampshire Hospitals consultation on the future of Basingstoke and Winchester hospitals, little or no mention on Andover Community Hospital, better services will be necessary to address the demands from an increasingly ageing population, particularly in the local villages.
	10124	Increasing population of Andover has already led to an increasing difficulty in accessing GP and other services including dentists

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10124	Contributions to the ICB supposed to help, the reality is different as no additional services result. The provision of GPs in Andover in terms of numbers appears to be stable, but the population has steadily grown and the increase in nursing homes and sheltered housing suggest the demand is growing in terms of capacity and capability
	10124	Similar position can be applied to mental health services, in particular for young adults, where the service is failing
	10124	General feeling that the ICB was failing to take a holistic approach to health services evidenced by the Dummer hospital consultation, and that community services were taking a back seat
	11130	Inadequate doctors surgeries and the increased development in Romsey will only bear greater pressures on these precious resources
Infrastructure - Roads	10124	In new developments roads are often incomplete and reliant on SUDS which has been mismanaged resulting on HCC refusing to take them on. More needs to be done to in getting early adoption by HCC which ensures that they are completed to fit standard
	10124	Road network design is an afterthought within the estates, and organic growth is not viable from a town planning perspective as it leads to choke point and inefficient traffic flows
	11129	In Ampfield we have seen dramatic increases in traffic between our farms. We have also experienced increased incidents of fly-tipping
	11130	Transportation infrastructure is inadequate and has been for some time
Infrastructure - Sewage	10074	We are concerned there are ongoing capacity issues with the sewage systems and that necessary mitigations and solutions must be provided to meet the needs of increased housing
	10197	Development in Tier 1 must not be allowed to result in sewage discharge in chalk streams, nor should development in villages result in surface/ground water being experienced by existing homes. Nor should sewage from outside the area be brought into water treatment facilities with insufficient capacity
	10124	Three issues which can be separated out: the supply of clean water, the collection and treatment of sewage, and the drainage of surface water
	10124	TVBC needs to work with the Environment Agency and Ofwat to ensure that responsibilities are properly tied down and enforced, and that residents are not continually asked to pick up the costs
Infrastructure - Strategic Planning	10812	Consideration needs to be given to strategic planning of infrastructure, many developments happen in isolation with little thought about overall infrastructure need, especially roads
Infrastructure - Transport	11130	Limited public services such as bus routes which reduces the ability for our staff to come to work on public transport

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - Wastewater	10760	Wastewater from all new developments will need new or much improved treatment works.
Infrastructure - Water	10124	Concern that Southern Water can neither supply the amount of water for developments nor also maintain the drainage system in a fit state
	10460	Query at what stage do planners consider where extra water is coming from and include increased sewage treatment works in relation to the number of houses being built.
	10460	Needs to be a threshold when the total number of homes planned requires the provision of extra water, other than abstraction and additional sewage treatment works.
	10047	Water and drainage infrastructure frequently fails and is unable to meet existing requirements or adhere to licensed conditions.
	10047	Given lack of confidence in effective and timely investment in critical water infrastructure, the Local Plan must ensure that it does not add further burden to the acute pressures faced by the district's water environment, notably chalk catchments. The Local Plan has an opportunity to drive effective investment and safeguards through policies.
	10047	Water infrastructure already cannot cope with current pressures, which resulted in sewage pollution entering the River Test SSSI. For example, there was a significant pollution event in February 2024.
	10047	When allocating for any new sites, the Council must be confident that the water infrastructure pumping stations have capacity to handle the increased pressure.
	10760	The Water Cycle Report highlights the risks. The solutions it puts forward need to be in place before more houses are built. For both the water supply and the sewage treatment capacity for all houses and all weathers.
	10760	Development must not progress faster than the provision of water supply and sewage treatment. The sewage system is already overloaded.
	10760	There is no back up infrastructure. Should there not be an additional sewage treatment plant? Test Valley is completely reliant on Southern Water doing an excellent job.
	10760	Water companies have not been investing at the speed required to keep our rivers in good health.
	10139	A reference to waste water and domestic water supply infrastructure should be clear
Infrastructure issues	10612	Plan does not ensure current infrastructure problems addressed and new issues addressed ahead of development.
Key services	10760	Key services such as shops and schools and pharmacies need to be on or close to new developments.
Level Crossing	10842	There are several public and private level crossings within the Borough.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10842	Halterworth, a public automatic half barrier level crossing, located near Romsey is designated as having the highest collective risk rating (2). Should the Council pursue development opportunities that increases the interaction of members of the public with level crossing on the rail network, then closure or mitigation of such crossings should be an essential consideration within the new Plan. This would not block development but would need to be identified as a vital safety feature when developing site allocations or taking a decision on planning applications.
	10842	Network Rail suggest that this would take the form of inclusion of a specific Policy focused on level crossing safety and mitigations as required arising from development or inclusion of this within a relevant Policy, within the Plan.
	10842	As the experts in rail safety, Network Rail would be able to support the Council in developing an effective approach which ensures the safety of residents and other users without compromising the safe and efficient running of the railway
Object (viability)	10817	Object to the exclusion of any future consideration of viability through the decision-making process within Policy COM1. This is contrary to paragraphs 34 and 58 of the NPPF and the PPG. References to viability within paragraphs 5.98 and 5.99 in the supporting text is insufficient.
Prioritisation of infrastructure	10817	Policy COM1 should go further and identify priorities for essential and place-shaping infrastructure to help guide specific discussions at a later date on priorities within each category in the event that viability challenges existed, enabling an order of preference to be agreed.
Prioritise water environment	10760	The Local Plan delivery is dependent on the water supply and treatment. The Council must prioritise not killing the river at the expense of more development. There needs to be an understanding of the changing climate and the balance to maintain a water supply for the population of Test Valley whilst maintaining river flow.
Service Families Accommodation	10121	Service Families Accommodation is to meet a specific need with details provided about the method for calculating SFA and its characteristics
	10121	Service Families Accommodation should have a zero charge for CIL
	10121	MOD will provide community centres, childcare facilities, youth centres and publicly funded welfare facilities alongside Service Families Accommodation development
Southern Water	Southern Water 10022	Southern Water is the statutory water and wastewater undertaker for Andover.
	Southern Water 10022	The assessment reveals that existing local water supply infrastructure to the site has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Limited capacity is not a constraint to development provided planning policy and subsequent conditions ensure that occupation of the development aligns with the delivery of upgraded infrastructure.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Southern Water 10022	Southern water have limited powers to prevent connections of sewerage network, even where capacity is limited as water companies are not statutory consultees on planning applications and developers have a right to connect foul drainage with 21 days notice to the public sewer network
	Southern Water 10022	Southern water is the statutory water supplier and wastewater undertaker for Romsey
	Southern Water 10022	Southern water is the statutory water supplier and wastewater undertaker for Valley Park
	Southern Water 10022	Southern water is the statutory water supplier and wastewater undertaker for Upton
	Southern Water 10022	SW are wastewater undertaker and water supplier in TV and support this policy
	Southern Water 10022	During plan period SW may need to deliver improvements to existing, or provide new strategic infrastructure to accommodate planned growth and/ or meet stricter water quality objectives
	Southern Water 10022	SW looks to LP policies to support water company plans for infrastructure delivery at a strategic and local level
	10022	request that policy refers to support for water company plans to deliver improvements to existing, or provide new strategic infrastructure to accommodate planned growth and/ or meet stricter water quality objectives Review whether to add suggested criteria to policy wording
	Southern Water 10022	support reference in policy of the role of the infrastructure provider rather than developer to provide required upgrades
	Southern Water 10022	southern water is the statutory wastewater undertaker for Ludgershall
Infrastructure - water	Southern Water 10022	requested addition - 'Proposals by service providers for the delivery of new or improved water supply and/ or wastewater infrastructure will be supported, subject to other policies in the development plan' Review whether to add suggested criteria to policy wording
Viability	10817	Viability paramount consideration impacting strategic sites in particular. Suggest additional criteria: (e) in all cases, infrastructure will be sought where justified and viable in order to reflect the circumstances of the development and its delivery. Applicants will need to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Community Services and facilities	10027	Welcome the inclusion of policy and its premise - but it is not robust or effective in helping to secure the whole range of Test Valley's facilities.
	11108	There is an opportunity at Land east of Duck Street in Abbots Ann to bring forward complementary services and infrastructure such a splay facilities, coffee bar/pavilion/trim trails, parking and stand-alone EV charging facilities. Recommend the encouragement of new community facilities and services extending beyond shops and public houses, through an additional permissive component to the policy
	10812	Content with this policy
	10727	Increased community provision
	11014	Safeguard and improve local community facilities, including through partnership working with other organisations and entities
	11014	Younger families with childcare commitments are not well catered for; some villages have no school, playgroup or healthcare provision, and residents must travel to Andover, Wherwell or Stockbridge.
	11014	Public transport is poor to non-existent, school buses are limited and under threat of closure; their continuation will be fundamental to young families choosing to move to, or stay in, rural villages
	11014	Believe that support to these services should be a TVBC priority.
	10113	Note that some Key Facilities, such as the village shop, closed in recent years and may have contributed to the Council's assessment in 'downgrading' the assessment of Leckford
	10113	Consider the Council's proposed approach would only serve to embed issues around the vibrancy of existing villages and restrict their ability to recover and/or offer a better range of facilities for their residents in the future; the overall approach runs contrary to the Council's Vision and Objectives
	10113	While it is recognised there is value in understanding current levels of services and facilities provided in settlements, this should not be the only determinant of settlement hierarchy. Consideration should also be given to the future sustainability to ensure opportunities are identified for settlements to grow appropriately and enhance their sustainability
	11073	To meet the needs of local communities, in addition to focusing growth in the two principal settlements of the Borough, the Council should look to deliver services and facilities on smaller sites that might be adjacent to a settlement policy boundary
	11073	By allocating this site, the Council will be able to demonstrate they have identified and can support a local health and well-being need. Allocation of this site is considered to enhance the sustainability of the local community and residential environment of Romsey

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11077	To retain or create a range of services in rural settlements there needs to be growth in those settlements to ensure those local services remain viable. By focusing on growth in the larger settlements, this will result in a negative impact on those rural communities that have an acute need for vital services to be retained or created in their community
	11077	The LP40 overlooks the possibility of planning positively to deliver and reinforce such services/facilities, and to support the long-term vibrancy and viability of rural communities
	11073	Over the last few years Freedom Church has developed a partnership working model with multiple local agencies and projects to better support the needs of the local community. Whilst all of these can operate separately, it would be more beneficial in terms of working practices and the sharing of resources, knowledge and skill sets to be co-located, in one place
Criteria COM2 - need and viability	10027	<p>Suggest that the need for a facility is a better measure than commercial viability (as viability may be manipulated) and a facility which may not be viable in commercial terms could be viable under alternative models, such as through community ownership.</p> <p>Amend Policy COM2 wording: Development (including change of use of existing premises) will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that: a) following engagement with the local community and potential users of the space, that there is no longer a need for that facility for its existing use or another community use; b) there has been submission of evidence related to how the site has been marketed for a minimum of 12 months.</p>
Community Facilities	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council has an on-going need to review and, if necessary, rationalise surplus facilities as part of wider strategies to improve services, implementing a series of service-driven improvements, covering both frontline and support services. This may sometimes result in the 'necessary loss' of community facilities in County Council ownership, to reinvest proceeds of sale in local service improvements.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	it would be helpful to provide sufficient flexibility in COM2 to accommodate the unique role and function of public service providers and their need for managed change, which would bring the draft policy in line with the supporting text for existing Policy COM14: Community Services and Facilities (paragraph 5.141) (in the current adopted Local Plan).
	Hampshire County Council 10099	<p>The County Council proposed the following amendments to the draft policy wording: Development involving the loss of cultural and community facilities and places of worship will be permitted if it can be demonstrated that:...</p> <p>d) Following engagement with the local community and potential users of the space that there is no longer a need for that facility for its existing use or another community use; or</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		<p>f) The building can no longer provide suitable accommodation; org) The proposals form part of a public service provider's plan to re-provide or enhance local services, or the proposal will clearly provide sufficient community benefit to outweigh the loss of the existing facility, meeting evidence of a local need."</p> <p>Review whether to add suggested criteria to policy wording</p>
Marketing	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council's service improvement programmes have strict timeframes and budget funding, and it is helpful that the mandatory 12- month marketing exercise only applies to local shops or public houses – a 12-month delay would cause additional delay and costs which could directly impact on the delivery of the public services.
Local shops	10204	We are concerned that there is a lack of support for privately owned local shops
Retention of community facilities and services and marketing requirements	10027	It is not clear why there are different criteria applied only to local shops and pubs compared to other facilities within the policy. We contend that marketing information should also be required for other facilities and there is great merit in all criteria applying to all facilities.
Settlement Boundaries	10941	The land proposed for development should be considered outside the settlement boundary as the character of the land has not changed and it is still countryside used for agriculture.

Chapter 5 - Town Centres
Paragraphs - 5.110-5.120

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan and theme based policies will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Post pandemic retail review on shopping pattern evidence is supported	
Sequential assessment for STV offices for Southampton city centre	

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Main Town Centre Uses	Romsey Town Council 10812	Content with this policy
retail	10799	The proposed review of the evidence on shopping patterns post pandemic is supported
Sequential assessment for STV offices for Southampton city centre	Southampton CC 10098	Consider that to 'future proof' plan any office proposals in Southern Test Valley that would lead to overprovision against assessed need, or an agreed target for Borough for a particular phase of the plan, should be subject to a sequential assessment of whether there are any sites in Southampton city centre. Sequential assessment for offices above target in STV of for sites in Southampton city centre

Chapter 5 – Built Historic and Natural Environment

Paragraphs 5.121 – 5.219

Key Issue	Officer Response
Archaeology- - a field evaluation should be undertaken and attempts made to preserve the historic asset.	The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan and theme based policies will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
less than substantial harm-how will this be assessed?	
Policy effectiveness-suggested wording amendments and additions to tighten policy	
Listed Building- revising criterion to add detail on the ways in which the proposal can sympathetically respond to the significance of a Listed Building.	
Non-designated heritage assets- clarity on classification and identification	
Local gaps- inconsistent with evidence, need maintaining	
Pollution- noise, soil, light, air, soil and water	
Impact of development on landscape character	

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
archaeology	Historic England 10049	add to supporting text on: unpacking the activities referenced in criterion c, such as identifying buildings of local importance and the Council's approach to non-designated archaeological remains
Conservation Area Appraisal	Historic England 10049	recommend adding reference to management plans, noting section 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to draw up and

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
and Management Plan		publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas in their districts from time to time i.e. this is going beyond appraising character. d) preparing, adopting and where needed updating Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans; and
	Historic England 10049	add to supporting text on: outlining the current position on Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans (CAAMPs), perhaps reiterating the importance of the CAAMPs to development in Andover and Romsey in particular
heritage at risk	Historic England 10049	add to supporting text on: explaining the different approaches to heritage at risk, including both assets nationally and locally identified.
historic environment	Historic England 10049	welcome this strategic policy
	10812	Content with this policy especially non-designated heritage assets
	10113	The 'built, historic and natural environment' objective is also supported
	10113	Leckford is located alongside the River Test and within a Conservation Area and the village contains many listed buildings. These are important characteristics of the village the Estate is committed to development which would complement these assets and secure their future
	10778	Development affecting heritage assets seek to preserve and enhance the Borough's historic environment and heritage assets. As above, this should refer to national policy and legislation, rather than duplicate
	11147	supportive of policy
	11119	This policy should refer to national policy and legislation rather than duplicate.
Archaeology	10753	A desk-based assessment would be inadequate in assessing the proportionate importance of the asset - a field evaluation should be undertaken and attempts made to preserve the historic asset.
Development affecting heritage assets	10812	Content with this policy especially non-designated heritage assets
	10812	RTC believes that development should be permitted which reduced the carbon footprint of heritage assets so long as there is no substantial harm to the asset or significant aspects of their setting
Heritage Assets	10204	Chilbolton has stone age sites and would like to specifically mention the Stone Age sites on the south side of the A30 in Chilbolton Parish
	10279	Appropriate marketing' in Criterion 2 C (i) should be specified.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10778	There is established national policy and legislation that sets out that there are opportunities for development within a designated heritage asset, and also supports opportunities which preserve and enhance an asset
heritage topic paper	10799	Given that the Council's Heritage Topic Paper is 'emerging' how can it explain the Local Plan approach to heritage? Surely it is for the Local Plan to set out the approach to heritage. This might then be amplified by an emerging Heritage Topic Paper.
archaeology	Historic England 10049	suggest referring to remains rather than the study of those remains. The policy makes provision for the protection and conservation of archaeological remains."
	Historic England 10049	Archaeological remains are an integral part of heritage. Query the line "Such sites may become designated heritage assets". This could imply that responding positively to existing heritage assets increases the chances of those assets being designated, which I am not sure is what is meant. Rephrase or delete? In some cases, heritage such as archaeological remains may offer opportunities for history to be positively incorporated into the design and layout of a development and for the local community to engage with any findings.
climate change adaptation	Historic England 10049	suggest revising the weblink in footnote 69 to connect with our new advice note on the climate change adaptation of historic buildings, published for consultation in late 2023. Its final version is not yet available, so I suggest referring to the following landing page
designated and non-designated heritage assets	Historic England 10049	typo - '5' after Grade II' should be a footnote. Suggest adding designated and line about non designated heritage assets There are 38 conservation areas ⁶² within Test Valley, 2243 listed buildings (23 Grade I listed buildings ⁶³ , a further 98 Grade II* ⁶⁴ , and 2122 at Grade II ⁶⁵ and 8 registered historic parks and gardens ⁶⁵ (3 Grade II* and 5 Grade II). There are 96 Scheduled Monuments ⁶⁶ scattered throughout the Borough and ten designated heritage assets that are considered at risk ⁶⁷ . In addition to these designated heritage assets, the Borough also has a varied mix of non-designated heritage assets, which have a degree of significance for planning decision making under the provisions of the NPPF. Some non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest may be demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
harm to heritage assets	Historic England 10049	The placing of subsection Assessing harm to heritage assets feels illogical in the middle of subsections of text on different types of heritage asset. Might it be moved to the opening or end of this section?
heritage statutory duty	Historic England 10049	suggest referring to specific legislation or deleting the line on the Council's statutory duty regarding setting i.e. "In considering such proposals, the Council has a statutory duty to consider the impact of development on the setting of the heritage asset."
Landscape	11108	Support the explanatory text of the policy
landscape and non-designated heritage asset	Historic England 10049	<p>Could the sentence be tightened - presumably the entirety of the landscape should not be treated as a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The landscape of the Borough has evolved through past processes and activities, including ..."</p>
less than substantial harm	10799	Although there is reference to 'less than substantial harm' there is no description as to how this would be assessed. The focus is upon 'substantial harm' yet it is more often the case that a proposal may be considered to result in 'less than substantial harm'.
listed building	Historic England 10049	<p>object - recommend revising criterion 3 to add detail on the ways in which the proposal can sympathetically respond to the significance of a Listed Building.</p> <p>I am not sure how effective the phrase "well considered" design will be in terms of decision-making. There is also the opportunity to refer to a change in use of the Listed Building. I suggest wording for consideration</p> <p>For listed buildings Proposals to extend or alter the fabric or layout of a listed building will sympathetically preserve, enhance or better reveal any features or spaces of special architectural or historic interest. Proposals will be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate the preservation or enhancement of the significance of the asset with respect to design, construction and layout. Proposals that entail a change of use will need to demonstrate that the original use of the Listed Building is no longer viable or sustainable and that the proposed alterations are necessary to secure the long-term survival of the Listed Building."</p>
	10042	TVBC should set out objectives clearly with examples that show how the Council is keen to maintain the role of listed conservation area dwellings as an active part of the residential market as well as valuing historic building features.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10042	The policy needs to deter the 'old building' myopia from the councils reaction to listed building applications and planning precedents as part of planning law should be respected
	10042	The policy should ensure that there is no scope for planning officers to impose their personal views but represent the views of the council.
	10042	The policy wording should be reviewed to prevent the prevailing of the current situation where listed buildings are purely tourist attractions to one where they are adapted to preserve their role in the property market.
listed building and conservation area	Historic England 10049	recommend adding a reference to the Council's duty under the 1990 Act Conservation Areas are designated heritage assets. They are defined areas that have special architectural and historic interest and where extra planning controls and considerations are in place to protect the historic and architectural elements which make them special. As local planning authority, the Council has a legal duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."
Non-designated heritage assets	10170	Policy includes protection for non-designated heritage assets, however the policy does not say how a building or feature could be classified as a non-designated heritage asset.
	10170	HPC requests that text be inserted that would enable local communities to identify such assets and TVBC publish guidance as to what criteria would need to be applied
Policy wording- ENV2	10042	The principle that the objective of planning should seek to maximise net benefit from land and property use should be made clear in this policy document.
Policy wording- ENV3	10042	The current wording of this policy gives the impression of trying to please everyone, which is impossible
Policy Wording- HRA	10042	The current wording in the Habitat Regulation assessment gives the impression of trying to please everyone, which is impossible
Scheduled Monument	Historic England 10049	suggest adding lines to encourage early engagement with Historic England if a proposal is likely to constitutes works as defined by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. Most work in Scheduled Monuments will require a prior application for Scheduled Monument Consent. Historic England can advise on the need for such consent.
	Historic England 10049	the policy does not include a similar subsection on Scheduled Monuments, which feels like a significant omission. I advise adding a short paragraph on Scheduled Monuments that would complement the later lines on archaeological resources and encourage proposals to respond positively to the significance of SMs e.g. as could apply in development at Velmore Farm.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		For Scheduled Monuments Development that may affect the significance of a Scheduled Monument (including its setting) should demonstrate the steps that would be taken to avoid and minimise harm and respond positively to the asset's significance."
setting of heritage assets	Historic England 10049	recommend adding a reference to the setting of the asset(s) Proposals will need to demonstrate that any development has been sensitively located and designed (including with respect to the setting of the asset(s)), and that appropriate provision has been made for ensuring the preservation in situ and on-going management, conservation and protection of above or below ground heritage
typo	10799	Paragraph 5.160 'there' should be changed to 'their'.
	Historic England 10049	check footnote 71
Adverse effects	10052	All new development in the countryside will have an adverse effect and the plan should be honest about this.
AONB Management Plan	Basingstoke and Deane BC 10757	Support approach to protecting North Wessex Downs National Landscape (AONB) in line with AONB Management Plan.
Green Spaces	10840	Support the policies relating to trees and green infrastructure and seek assurance that the unique tree canopy in Whinwhistle Rd, home to wildlife is specifically recognised and protected by the Test Valley Local Plan 2040.
	10720	There will be a damaging loss of landscape character and residential amenity as a consequence of the proposed developments being built on top of designated countryside.
archaeology	Historic England 10049	suggest correcting a minor technicality: referring to archaeological remains rather than archaeology (the study of those remains). The historic environment of Test Valley incorporates a wide range of heritage assets, including buildings, features or groups of buildings (which may also be listed buildings ⁶¹), parks and gardens, conservation areas, historic landscapes and features, above and below ground archaeological remains, scheduled monuments and registered parks and gardens..."

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
heritage asset	Historic England 10049	<p>suggest referring to Test Valley when introducing the different types of heritage asset that are listed</p> <p>The historic environment of Test Valley incorporates a wide range of heritage assets, including buildings, features or groups of buildings (which may also be listed buildings⁶¹), parks and gardens, conservation areas, historic landscapes and features, above and below ground archaeological remains, scheduled monuments and registered parks and gardens...”</p>
heritage designation	Historic England 10049	<p>Currently the wording risks implying that Historic England designates buildings as listed buildings. I suggest tweaks that would avoid being caught up in the process of designation and advise adding a reference to the Council’s duty under the 1990 Act.</p> <p>Listed Buildings are designated identified for their special architectural and historic interest. They are designated heritage assets which have additional protection under the planning system. As local planning authority, the Council has a legal duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have “special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”.</p>
How deliver	10052	This policy and section says the right things but is silent on how this is to be achieved. As future developments are mostly identified as sites in the countryside, it is not going to be possible to do what is being said e.g. policy criteria requiring health and future needs of existing landscape features.
Importance of features	10052	Welcome recognition of the importance of views, historic and other landscape features or topography, watercourses, water meadows, distinctive skylines, trees and hedges and that many smaller, individual landscape features can combine to establish the character and identity of the area.
Landscape	10036	<p>Suggested amendment to criterion c)</p> <p>"vistas" should be inserted before "c) it does not result in the loss of, or detrimental impact ti, important local landscape vistas and features such as trees, walls, hedges, green spaces or water courses;"</p>
	10397	The parish is predominantly rural and adds to the rich variety of landscapes, topography and settlements within the Borough in close proximity to the New Forest National Park with woodland in similar nature to the park

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10397	These nationally important landscapes need to be taken account of when assessing proposals for development outside of these designated areas. Proposals that will result in an adverse impact on national landscapes or national parks taking into account any mitigation proposed must not be supported. Also imperative similar considerations be taken into account for proposals likely to impact character in Chilworth
	10170	NPPF advise local planning policies should protect and enhance valued landscapes, other authorities include policies which enable valued landscapes to be identified, TVBC do not
	10170	HPC therefore request that the Local Plan be changed to make it possible for valued landscapes to be identified and protected
	10938	Landscaping conditions that are installed before a development takes place should be identified in the permissions or section 106 agreement.
	10938	Protect landscaping policies throughout the lifespan of a development not just during construction.
Landscape Character	10812	Content with this policy
	10279	Should read more positively Require that the retention of important landscape features not be prejudiced.
	10777	In respect of landscaping, it is difficult to understand how SA scenario 1 can be ranked 1 and there are questions over whether the impacts on the AONB have been fully assessed
	11108	Support the intent of the policy but concerned about the interpretation of criteria (c) -important local landscape features would appear open to judgement but the absolute nature of 'loss' seems to jar criteria (b)
	11108	Under some circumstances the public benefits of a scheme may well justify on-site mitigation or compensatory measures, but this isn't made clear in draft policy ENV3
	11108	It seems inappropriate to cascade to material considerations given that many forms of development are likely to result in the partial loss of trees, walls, hedges and/or green spaces. Recommend omitting or revisiting Criteria (b)
	10864	The paragraph states "landscape quality and specific landscape features should be maintained and enhanced" which is contradictory as the proposed development will destroy the landscape of nearby Nursling.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10716	Several paragraphs in the plan suggest that, as a result of the proposed development, there will be a loss of amenity and therefore a significant landscape and visual impact.
Local Gaps	10864	The paragraph also refers to the importance of landscape features which protect the identity of an area, which is contradicted by the proposed development as it will destroy the identities of individual villages and absorb areas further into Southampton and Totton.
Ecological networks	Natural England 10140	Welcome clear reference to consideration of wider ecological network, taking account of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for greater landscape connectivity.
Evidence	Natural England 10140	The use of the Landscape Character Assessment and any further assessments should be suitably referred to for ensuring that none of the allocations will negatively impact the protected landscape.
NPPF	Natural England 10140	Should be guided by NPPF paragraphs 180, 182 and 183.
Protected Landscapes	Natural England 10140	Developments should avoid significant impacts on protected landscapes, including those outside the plan area. Early consideration should be given to the major development tests set out in paragraph 183 of the NPPF.
	Natural England 10140	Expect appropriate consideration to further the purposes of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape and New Forest National Park's protected landscape features, characteristics and special qualities.
	Natural England 10140	Pleased to see the commitment to conserve and enhance the landscape and setting of the New Forest National Park and North Wessex Downs National Landscape
	Natural England 10140	Welcome ensuring developments will need to be designed and located sensitively to continue to protect and enhance these high-value and high-quality landscapes and give appropriate weight to the Management Plans and adopted strategies by the relevant National Park and National Landscape.
	Natural England 10140	Please be aware of Section 245 (Protected Landscapes) of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 places a duty on relevant authorities in exercising or performing functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in a National Park or an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (National Landscape) to seek to further the statutory purpose for the area. More information appended to the comments.
Support	Natural England 10140	Welcome that referred to the Landscape Character Assessment (2018).
	Natural England 10140	Welcome that will prioritise existing landscape features via ENV3.
Duty to Regard	New Forest National Park Authority	Welcome the paragraphs outlining the protection afforded to National Parks. However, the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 strengthens the duty to regard to require authorities to seek to further the National Park purposes and not just have regard to the purposes.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10696	Suggest strengthened duty in paragraph 5.175 or 5.176 under 'Protect and enhance the landscape character to seek to further the National Park purposes and not just have regard to the purposes.
Support ENV3	New Forest National Park Authority 10696	Supports Policy ENV3, in particular the specific reference to consideration of the setting of the National Park.
landscape impact	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	Open to interpretation not adequate for National Landscape (AONB) part b) is a little watery - needs to be strengthened
	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	Open to interpretation not adequate for National Landscape (AONB) part e) very weak, needs to be strengthened
other local plan	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	Strongly advise looking at West Berkshires Draft Local Plan and The Joint Local Plan for Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire - which are landscape led and provide a more robust platform
typo	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	purpose of the AONB is to conserve AND enhance rather than OR as stated in your policy amend wording from 'or' to 'and'
Pollution	10864	The paragraph states "landscape quality and specific landscape features should be maintained and enhanced" which is contradictory as the proposed development will urbanise the skyline and lead to significant light pollution.
Protect and enhance features	10052	Agree that noted features should be protected and enhanced, as their loss (individually or cumulatively) could have a potential impact on the immediate and wider character of the landscape. This needs to be taken into account where developments outside, or changes to the settlement boundary, are proposed.
Valued Landscapes	10139	Generally, support however, we are disappointed that a mention of Valued Landscapes does not make its way into the policy wording

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10139	We believe all Valued Landscapes should be identified to gain the protection afforded by NPPF 174(a), a view which has been supported by an Inspector on appeal. We encourage all Valued Landscapes to be identified, a starting point will be areas designated as Areas of Special Landscape Quality or similar in Local Plans of the early 1990s.
Landscape protection	11135	Protection and existing landscape and mitigation of it should be stronger e.g. for lifetime development
Agriculture	10927	The land within the Abbots Ann local gap is predominantly farmland which is important for food security, so should be protected.
Andover-Enham Alamein-Smannell gap boundary	10126	Paragraph 3.1.10 of the Local Gap Assessment confirms the detail underpinning the designation of existing local gaps, including reference to no more than is necessary. There is more land included than is needed to fulfil this purpose for the Andover-Enham Alamein-Smannell gap. Therefore, request land at Smannell Lane is removed from the Local Gap.
Archaeology	10922	Abbots Ann must maintain its separation from Andover due to it's separation in character and historical and architectural importance.
	10923	Abbots Ann must maintain its separation from Andover due to it's separation in character and historical and architectural importance.
Biodiversity	10052	Thought needs to be given as to how local gaps can be better managed / improved to support biodiversity and to act as effective green corridors e.g. by perimeter tree planting and renovating existing hedgerows.
	10927	The land within the Abbots Ann local gap is predominantly farmland so should be protected for the benefit of the environment.
Consistency with evidence	10120	Conclusions for the boundaries and functions of the gaps as drawn in the emerging plan do not follow the advice within the Local Green Gaps Study evidence base document. Gaps within the emerging plan should be supported by the conclusions of the evidence base document.
Council has not taken proper account of the recommendations within evidence report in relation to this local gap	11161	Council has not taken proper account of the recommendations within evidence report in relation to this local gap - which suggests removal of areas from the gap to south of Harroway due to degradation in the function of the gap in this area over recent years. This land should be removed from the designation.
Councils landscape evidence on	11161	Concern that the Councils landscape evidence on the gaps (Stephenson Halliday Gaps Report) has not fully been taken on board for the Weyhill-Pentons Local Gap draft policy designation. The recommendation is for removal of areas of the Gap to the south of the 'Harroway' ridgeline, due to

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Gaps not fully taken on board		degradation of the function of the gap in this area, which has occurred over a number of years. More land should be removed from this Gap designation, including Homestead Farm, Weyhill Road, Andover.
Function not clear	10120	All the proposed gaps are adjacent to the settlement boundary of the highest order settlements and cover mainly areas which are not already subject to national designations adding extra levels of protection and that the function of these gaps is not necessarily clear within the policy itself.
Local Gap	10091 (2nd response)	The Enham Alamein/Smannell proposed Local Gap is unjustified by the evidence within the submission
	10058	AA PC strongly supports the designation of the Abbots Ann Local Gap
	10058	Halliday Study (2023) concludes the Abbots Ann Gap is particularly effective in separating the two settlements, noting in particular the openness of the arable landscape
	10058	Suggest the Local Plan 2040 address the question of how the strong sense of separation be maintained and reinforced
	10235	SPC recognises the TVBC commitment to the retention and protection of Local Gaps
	10235	EAPC recognises the TVBC commitment to the retention and protection of Local Gaps
	10681	Strongly in favour of the draft Local Plan maintaining the strategic gap between Andover and Abbots Ann
	10681	Many who live in the village or visit the community shop do so because of the strong rural and parish identity
	10681	Our shop could not compete with supermarkets that are not so very far away in Andover and that would no doubt advance much nearer with urban sprawl
	10083	The PC wishes to register its disappointment that yet again no Local Gaps have been proposed around the parish
	10083	A Local Gaps Study has reviewed the local gaps identified in the adopted Local Plan and policy approach, yet despite Nursling & Rownhams being immediately adjacent to the built-up areas of Southampton and Totton, no local gaps have been proposed to seek to retain the character and separation of our parish from becoming part of a wider urban sprawl
	10083	The Local Gaps Study recognises that local gaps can offer potential green infrastructure opportunities and may provide for wildlife corridors, whilst also offering health and wellbeing benefits for communities and access to green spaces and the countryside, our parish is not set to get any of these benefits
	10083	Why have no local gaps been proposed for the parish and why simultaneously is development being proposed that is recognised as reducing gaps between our settlement and those adjacent?

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10025	The expansion of Romsey is getting too close to North Baddesley. The local gap between Romsey and North Baddesley is proposed to be amended to reflect proposed sites, this will more than halve the gap by expanding Abbey Park Ind Est and we strongly object, it will make the gap nearly non-existent
	10074	Grateful that local gaps have been included, the gap ensures that coalescence with Andover is prevented and that Anna Valley and Upper Clatford retain their rural character. We continue to believe that local gaps should be afforded the necessary protections
	10105	Ampfield Meadows and the nearby mobile home parks at Wheelhouse Parks, King Edwards Park and St James' Park could be included in the settlement boundary
	10197	Strongly support policy ENV4 and the Anna Valley/Upper Clatford and Abbots Ann local gaps having strategic importance in defining the edge of Andover and in maintaining separation
	10197	Assessment study provides a rationale, and PC supports the maintenance and reinforcement and would urge TVBC to consider this further in future, we would support an extension of this gap to the south/south-east to limit coalescence between Andover and Upper Clatford in future
	10397	Local gap designations have always helped guide the direction of growth and identify areas of countryside which are strategically important in defining settlement edges and setting and in maintaining separation between them
	10397	Local gaps study recognises that our local gaps also offer potential green infrastructure opportunities and may provide for wildlife corridors, also offering health and wellbeing benefits form communities and access to green space and the countryside
	10397	Highlight the policy also recognises development on the edges of settlements will reduce physical extent of defined gaps and that development within gaps could reduce visual separation of settlements
	10397	Require TVBC to take account the individual effects of a proposal and its cumulative effects with other existing/proposed development within gaps. Accept in such cases proposals are considered on individual merits, however there must be strong reasons for a decision which would reduce visual separation of settlements
	10397	CPC goes as far as demanding that this policy is strictly adhered to and that it is in the most extenuating unavoidable circumstances would permit and form of development within local gaps
	10812	The current local gap between Romsey and North Baddesley is sacrosanct and must be preserved. In particular the gap as observed from A27 is vital to preserve as it is a key view point, RTC objects to the proposed reduction of the local gap

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10812	RTC objects to the proposal to reduce the local gap between Romsey and North Baddesley along the length of the A27, this is the narrowest part of the gap, RTC objects to the policy in respect to the Romsey-North Baddesley gap
	10812	Suggested amendment Numbers or letters should be used to label list items to aid reference
	10342	The policy proposes a local gap between North Baddesley and Chilworth. The boundary of the gap is shown in Inset Map 3. It includes Roundabouts Copse which is located immediately adjoining the village
	10342	It is clear that the contribution that Roundabouts Copse, and in particular, the area proposed for development was not considered critical by the consultants to maintaining the separation of the two settlements. The case for a further review of the proposed boundary is strengthened by the proposal for a battery storage unit which TVBC is minded to permit
	11147	in relation to the northern Test Valley area there is a particular pressure to retain Local Gap designations around settlements which play an important role in helping to define their character and in shaping the settlement pattern of the area. This is likely to influence the future distribution of development in the south of the borough.
	11147	recognise Local Gaps play an important role in preventing the coalescence of settlements in the Borough and concur they should be rightly protected
	11147	Local gaps have enabled settlements to retain their separate identity and local distinctiveness and have thus prevented the characteristics associated with urban sprawl from occurring.
	11147	the current preparation of the emerging Local Plan provides an opportunity to review whether or not the existing Gaps are still necessary and perform the function for which they were originally designated
	11108	Support the explanatory text of the policy and have no objection to the identification of local gaps where these are necessary to protect the distinct identity of historic settlements
	11108	No objection to the identification of a local gap between Andover and Abbots Ann as shown in Inset Maps 1,7 and 11
	10741	The village of Abbots Ann is an excellent example of a community with many significant attributes which are enabled by the villages location within the local countryside and its rural foundation and associated history underpins its many characteristics that depend on the local gap status. These attributes would be destroyed with the loss of a local gap by future development that ceases to separate Abbots Ann from Andover

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Local Gap - Abbotts Ann	11003	The Abbotts Ann local gap provides vital separation and plays a role in keeping the character of the rural community, it also adds security to the MOD site off Monxton Road
	11003	By allowing the Abbotts Ann local ap to remain open arable land it keeps the history and the use as a mixture of farmland brings community and commerce in a manageable and sustainable way
	11003	Any large scale on the Abbotts Ann local gap would result in a loss of character due to increased traffic and loss of community
	11003	If development was to be allowed on the Abbotts Ann local gap it would ideally suit low volume self builds
	10386	Fully support this policy and the conclusions in relation to the Abbotts Ann gap in the Stephenson Halliday report
	10802	Maintenance of the Abbotts Ann local gap is essential to prevent coalescence with Andover and preserve its village identity and sense of community
	10676	Concerned with ensuring Abbotts Ann keeps its local gap, it has a unique and distinctive character which would be lost should development blur its boundaries
	10676	I have no objection to building within Abbotts Ann where possible
	10834	Support the Abbotts Ann local gap, the village has a rich history which needs to be preserved as it is valued by residents and visitors
	10834	Support the Abbotts Ann local gap due to the diversity of wildlife through the rare chalk stream, any erosion will put this under threat
	10834	Development has previously been permitted with the Abbotts Ann local gap which has contributed to significant light pollution to the north of Little Ann which has detracted from the character
	10846	Support the Abbotts Ann local gap so the village can continue to maintain it's own identity, avoid overspill into the town and its low light pollution can remain an assets
	10846	Support the Abbotts Ann local gap due to the chalk stream tributary which must be saved from development and kept for future generations
Local Gap - Upper Clatford	10275	The Upper Clatford/Anna Valley local gap is extremely important in preserving the character and preventing urban spread, we would like to see it maintained at all costs
Local Gap boundary Chilworth	10157	<p>The proposed local gap includes Hut Wood but excludes some wooded rear gardens north of A27. The inclusion of land southeast of Woodside and south west of Carlyle House, that is privately owned, outside Hut Wood is inappropriate. Deletion of this part of Gap would not materially impact on this Gap, or the aims of the Gap under ENV4 or the delivery of the Forest Park (Policy SA16)</p> <p>Amend Local Gap boundary to exclude wooded land southeast of Woodside and southwest of Carlyle House, Chilworth, which will also be consistent with Forest Park boundary (SA16)</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Local Gap boundary should be amended further	11161	<p>Local Gap boundary should be amended further. Map provided with representation to show an alternative boundary alignment - with reduced Local Gap area to south east, to align with evidence base in Local Gap Report and Landscape Sensitivity Study. This change would retain the separation between settlements and the integrity and function of the Local Gap designation.</p> <p>Local Gap boundary should be amended further. Map provided with representation to show an alternative boundary alignment - with reduced Local Gap area to south east, to align with evidence base in Local Gap Report and Landscape Sensitivity Study</p>
Local Gap Chilworth	10157	Objection to the definition of the Local Gap as it relates to Chilworth and land at Woodside (a parcel of private wooded land should be excluded from Local Gap boundary) and should be consistent with the Forest Park boundary to north east of Chilworth.
Local Gaps	10927	The distinct characters of villages such as Abbots Ann are protected by the presence of the local gap from towns such as Andover.
	10929	The maintenance of the Local Gap between Andover and Abbott's Ann is to ensure the cultural identity of the village and the village communities.
	10933	The maintenance of the Local Gap between Andover and Abbott's Ann is to ensure the cultural identity of the village and the village communities.
	10935	The retention of a local gap between Abbots Ann and Andover is vital to maintain the separate identity of the village.
	10922	The policies and inset maps 1,7 and 11 are crucial in preventing Abbots Ann from becoming a part of Andover.
	10922	This policy and the inset maps are very important in maintaining the separation of identity and countryside between Abbots Ann and Andover.
	10923	The policies and inset maps 1,7 and 11 are crucial in preventing Abbots Ann from becoming a part of Andover.
	10923	This policy and the inset maps are very important in maintaining the separation of identity and countryside between Abbots Ann and Andover.
	10924	It is crucial that Abbots Ann maintains a separate settlement from the town of Andover.
	11119	Support that the designation of local gap does not seek to prevent development, as this would conflict with the Council's aspirations for sustainable growth where certain sites fall within the local gap.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11119	Further support that the Council will take into account the individual effects of a proposal and its cumulative effects with other existing and proposed development within the gaps.
	11020	Positive to see that there remains a policy to maintain the separateness between towns and villages.
	11043	The Local Gap is crucial in protecting the history and identity of Abbots Ann and to stop it from being absorbed into large scale developments.
	11043	All sizes of houses are urgently needed, and not everyone wishes to live in a large scale development where communities are dissolved.
	10890	The current plan shows no intention to keep local areas separate, which goes against Test Valley Policy E3 on maintaining local gaps.
	11091	Contrary to Policy E3, development at Velmore Farm would compromise the role, character and integrity of this Local Gap.
	10540	Important to maintain open space and green space between villages, towns and avoid development of the villages.
	10554	The local gap should be kept in place to preserve the separation of places in Test Valley.
Maximise biodiversity	Natural England 10140	Recommend opportunities to maximise the opportunity to maximise biodiversity in gaps are explored. This may be through the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, any site potential to generate biodiversity net gain units or nutrient credits. Any enhancements should be appropriately managed, secured and monitored.
Object	10269	Object to the deterioration of the local gaps
Overly restrictive	10120	The criteria are overly restrictive and forms an extension to Policy SS2 by adding further protection to the areas outside of settlement boundaries by designating them as Local Gaps.
Policy Wording	10858	Should refer to a local gap between Chilworth and Valley Par/Eastleigh, mentioned in 5.187 but not satisfactorily implemented within the policy wording
Romsey - North Adderbury Local Gap	11147	site on corner of Botley road and Highwood Lane does not meet the stated purposes of a Local Gap as its qualities are not significant enough to create the sense of two separate settlements physically or visually merging, nor would it individually or cumulatively with other existing or proposed development compromise the integrity of the gap. The removal of this section of the Local Gap in this location will have negligible impact
	11147	Abbey Park Industrial Estate is a proposed strategic employment allocation that would remove the land from the 'Romsey - North Adderbury' Local Gap - in very close proximity to the site. The allocation would shift the spatial distribution of Romsey eastwards and when considered in the context of the Abbey Park Industrial Estate allocation the site (adjacent to Botley road and Highwood lane) present the opportunity to provide an interconnection between the allocation's proposed employment use for future occupiers

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Romsey - North Baddesley Local Gap	11147	promoted site (adjacent to Botley road and Highwood Lane) is an ideal location for new development for the reasons set out above and development of the site represents a natural extension to Romsey that would not diminish the physical and visual separation of the Local Gap, nor would it individually or cumulatively with other existing or proposed development compromise the integrity of the Local Gap
	11147	Policy ENV4 should be amended to delete this area of the Local Gap designation. Having regard to the tests of 'soundness' set out at paragraph 35 of the NPPF we believe that the deletion of this area will ensure that the Plan is positively prepared in terms of being based on the best strategy to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements and justified
	11147	Reinforcement and management of the northern and eastern boundaries would help screen and soften views of the development, improve biodiversity and help reinforce the edge of the Local Gap
	11123	The landscape evidence concluded that the strategic importance of the Romsey - North Baddesley Gap has been eroded by development of the Abbey Park Business Park and solar farm and that its contribution to settlement identity has been weakened by development within it.
	11123	Policy ENV4 seeks to maintain the physical or visual separation of settlements. The development of land south of Highwood Lane whilst extending the build-up area boundary of Romsey would still mean that in this location it would remain west of the existing boundary of Abbey Park Business Park.
	11123	The analysis of the gap and recommendations in the evidence base are supported. The existing landscape features on Highwood Lane can be enhanced with additional boundary planting, further limiting any views of the site from the A27. The local gap boundary between Romsey and North Baddesley should be revised to exclude the land between Halterworth and Highwood Lane.
	11124	The landscape evidence concluded that the strategic importance of the Romsey - North Baddesley Gap has been eroded by development of the Abbey Park Business Park and solar farm and that its contribution to settlement identity has been weakened by development within it.
	11124	Policy ENV4 seeks to maintain the physical or visual separation of settlements. The development of land south of Highwood Lane whilst extending the build-up area boundary of Romsey would still mean that in this location it would remain west of the existing boundary of Abbey Park Business Park.
	11124	The analysis of the gap and recommendations in the evidence base are supported. The existing landscape features on Highwood Lane can be enhanced with additional boundary planting, further limiting any views of the site from the A27. The local gap boundary between Romsey and North Baddesley should be revised to exclude the land between Halterworth and Highwood Lane.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10323	The landscape evidence concluded that the strategic importance of the Romsey - North Baddesley Gap has been eroded by development of the Abbey Park Business Park and solar farm and that its contribution to settlement identity has been weakened by development within it.
	10323	Policy ENV4 seeks to maintain the physical or visual separation of settlements. The development of land south of Highwood Lane whilst extending the built-up area boundary of Romsey would still mean that in this location it would remain west of the existing boundary of Abbey Park Business Park.
	10323	The analysis of the gap and recommendations in the evidence base are supported. The existing landscape features on Highwood Lane can be enhanced with additional boundary planting, further limiting any views of the site from the A27. The local gap boundary between Romsey and North Baddesley should be revised to exclude the land between Halterworth and Highwood Lane.
	10661	In the context of the Romsey-North Baddesley gap, the development of land south of Highwood Lane whilst extending the built-up area boundary of Romsey would still mean that this location would remain west of the existing boundary of Abbey Park Industrial Estate and the proposed extension set out in the Local Plan.
	10661	The analysis of the gap and the recommendations of the Local Gap Assessment are supported. The existing landscape features on Highwood Lane can be enhanced with additional boundary planting further limiting any views of the site from the A27.
	10661	The boundary of the Romsey-North Baddesley should be redrawn to follow Highwood Lane from Stroud School to its junction with Botley Road. Amend boundary of Romsey-North Baddesley, so drawn to follow Highwood Lane from Stroud School to its junction with Botley Road.
	10120	Support the conclusions of the Local Green Gaps Study for the Romsey-North Baddesley local gap and do not believe the blanket carry over of the boundary is justified by the evidence within the supporting Local Gap Study.
	10120	The Council should amend the boundary of the Romsey-North Baddesley gap in line with the evidence if seeking to retain this policy.
Strategic Gaps	10687	Objection to the proposal to further reduce the Local Gap between Southampton, the Borough of Eastleigh and the villages of Chilworth and Valley Park.
Strongly advise a further change to	11161	Strongly advise a further change to the Gap boundary, to be consistent with landscape evidence, to exclude land at Homestead Farm, Weyhill Road from the Local Gap, to south of the Harroway. This

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
local gap boundary		will not reduce the gap between Andover and Penton Grafton or Penton Mewsey or the perceptual gap or sense of clear open separation. Change proposed to local gap boundary, and a map provided in representation for amended gap (reduced area)
Support	10052	Note policy has been externally reviewed and confirmed as being desirable and robust - this is welcome.
	10676	Support maintaining local gaps around villages in Test Valley
	10269	The current local gaps should be maintained, with no development within them, the character of the areas cannot be reversed once changed
Support approach to local gaps and evidence base	11161	Support policy approach to local gaps as a mechanism to prevent settlement coalescence across the Borough and consider the Councils evidence base to be robust.
Support for overall approach to Gaps	11161	Support for overall approach to Gaps as a mechanism to prevent coalescence across Borough.
Update wording	10120	Wording of the policy should be updated to be more flexible, for example there are very few instances where any type of development in a gap would 'not diminish the physical separation and / or visual separation'. Therefore, the wording should be focused on assessing whether the proposal would cause harm to the functionality of the gap.
Air pollution	10789	TVBC does not monitor air pollution along the A303, does not monitor NO2, PM10 or 2.5 and there is no detail in the draft plan on the annual air quality review
Biodiversity	11027	Development will result in unacceptable impact on living conditions and the natural environment as a general amenity.
Dark skies	11014	Supports continued constraints on building's external lighting to maintain the 'dark skies' policy
Footnote split	Environment Agency 10068	Footnote 78 appears to be split over two pages.
BMV Agri Land	Natural England 10140	The Local Plan should include a policy for the protection of best and most versatile agricultural land, with preference to use of areas of poorer land. Avoiding loss of such land is a priority as mitigation will not be possible on many development sites.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
BMV Agri Land	Natural England 10140	Local Plan, including identification of allocations, should be informed by an up to date evidence base on agricultural land.
BMV Agri Land	Natural England 10140	The Local Plan should recognise that development has an irreversible adverse impact on the finite national stock of best and most versatile agricultural land. Any development on such land should have a soil handling plan and sustainable soil management strategy based on detailed soil surveys.
CEMPs	Natural England 10140	Pleased to see mention of securing a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) where disturbance to designated sites may occur as a result of construction activities.
Ecological receptors	Natural England 10140	Does not recognise air pollution or water pollution in relation to specific Habitat Sites or SSSIs. Recommend a list of designated sites is included to give further clarity as to some of the ecological receptors.
Noise & birds	Natural England 10140	Regarding noise, advise percussive piling or works with heavy machinery (i.e. plant resulting in a noise level in excess of 69dbAmax, measured at the sensitive receptor) should be avoided during the bird overwintering period (i.e. October to March).
Soil protection	Natural England 10140	The Local Plan should include a policy for the protection and sustainable management of soils, so that soil disturbance is minimised and to retain as many ecosystem services as possible through careful soil management and appropriate soil re-use.
Soil protection	Natural England 10140	Development has a major and usually irreversible adverse impact on soils. Any soils of high environmental value should be considered for their role in ecological connectivity. Soil protection also relates to other policy areas.
SPA sites	Natural England 10140	Policy should seek to ensure development avoids noise and visual impacts from construction on SPA birds at the SPA sites or at identified terrestrial supporting habitat sites.
Vibration & ecology	Natural England 10140	Vibrational impacts on species should also be considered for developments close to the Test estuary or the River Test itself, particularly on migratory Atlantic salmon.
Noise pollution	10938	Any increase of noise levels is significant to the impact it has on the peaceful countryside, and it is the change of noise that most affects this and not the absolute amount of noise produced.
pollution	10049	<p>object - policy does not mention the historic environment. While most pollution cases may relate to the stated concerns, a proportion will also need to consider the impact of development on the historic environment. e.g. the impact of pollution from development at Thruxton aerodrome on the appreciation and potentially significance of designated heritage assets at Thruxton.</p> <p>Development will only be permitted where it does not result in an unacceptable impact from pollution on human health, living conditions, the natural and historic environment or general amenity, including through cumulative effects</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10812	Content with this policy
	10948	Overwhelmed sewage system, rubbish flying in from storms and people abusing the nature reserve are all leading to increase pollution of Fishlake Meadows nature reserve.
	10960	The plan will lead to an increase in pollution and therefore have a negative impact on health.
	10910	The expansion of housing and therefore the increase in traffic and agriculture leads to a significant rise in pollution (nitrates, phosphates, ammonia) and will lead to the destruction of TV chalk streams.
	10910	The strategy should include policies to raise awareness about sustainable water and sharing the burden of pollution across all parties, new and existing residents.
	10720	Pollution from lighting, traffic and operational noise will cause significant disturbance to residents.
	11027	The proposed development will do the opposite in protecting residents from the effects of pollution.
Pollution - Noise	10777	Suitable acoustic mitigation measures can be delivered to mitigate against noise impacts, and it does not appear this has been taken into consideration. Appropriate buffers to the woodland to the east can be provided. As such it is considered that there are no overriding technical constraints to the delivery of the site
River Test	10139	We regret the downplaying of the role of the River Test, its tributaries and the landscape which it has created in this list
Sewage	10052	Additional housing will put a strain on already struggling sewage systems. Whilst surface water drainage can be dealt with through SuDS, all the damaging drainage will end up at local treatment centres which are known to be discharging untreated sewage into our chalk streams on a regular basis.
Traffic	11027	The increased amount of large vehicles for the warehouse and distribution centres will have an adverse impact on health and quality of life.
Tranquillity	11135	Existing tranquillity must be noted and realisation that any increase in noise levels may be significant-the change in noise and not just the absolute additional noise is most important
	11135	Effects of local landscape on noise transmission must also be considered, especially in areas of tranquillity
Water quality	10047	Policy does not go far enough to achieve safeguards to the water environment, including chalk catchments. Strongly recommend the policy is amended, or a separate water quality policy is created to have more detail on the protection and enhancement of rivers new development must meet.
Artificial lighting	10052	Artificial lighting is often used unnecessarily.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Careful consideration	10052	Poorly chosen lighting may be wasteful of electricity as well as damaging to the environment. Careful consideration should be given to whether street lighting is necessary in new estates on the edge of towns and villages.
Dark skies	10052	Darkness is essential for biodiversity, including birds, bats and moths. Dark skies are much appreciated for the enjoyment of star-gazing.
Light pollution	11027	The 24 hour working at the proposed site will see an increase in light pollution.
Lighting	10812	Content with this policy
	10941	The use of Upton Lane as the sole access into or out of the proposed allocations implies significant artificial lighting will be required, thus turning the dark countryside into a brightly lit urbanised area, changing the character and quality of the area.
	11135	Where a site is being renovated/redeveloped the existing on site lighting should also be considered and brought up to best practice for Dark skies (BCT/ILT)
Links to BIO3	Natural England 10140	Supporting text of this policy, as a minimum, should make a clear connection to being considered in association with policy ENV3.
Support	Natural England 10140	Welcome policy to minimise impacts of artificial lighting upon skies, landscape and biodiversity.
Support	Natural England 10140	Pleased that clear reference is made to NPPF paragraph 191 for protecting the special landscape features and qualities of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape and the New Forest National Park.
Supports ENV6	New Forest National Park Authority 10696	Supports Policy ENV6 in particular the reference to National Park Authority's adopted Design Guide and impact on dark skies.
lighting	North Wessex Downs National Landscape: 10405	should encourage the upgrade of existing sources of light to meet the NWD good lighting guide
	North Wessex Downs National Landscape: 10405	should also address internal lighting as this causes significant light spill in rural areas, encourage low transmittance glass.
national landscape	North Wessex Downs National	great to include policy but for the National Landscape it needs to go a step further and encourage proposals to support the restoration and improvement of areas to enhance and or extend dark skies

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Landscape: 10405	
Pollution	10720	Pollution from lighting, traffic and operational noise will cause significant disturbance to residents.
Rural Areas	10139	Support this policy as it relates to the AONB however, strongly object as it should apply to all rural areas within the borough too
	11135	Both internal light spill and external lighting should be considered with reference to best practice such as BCT/ILT 2023 and this should apply to existing lighting when any additional/redevelopment of a site is being undertaken
Amenity	10812	Content with this policy
Amenity Noise	10121	noise levels from MOD establishments can vary according to operational needs
	10121	important to consider possible impacts on proposed development adjacent to MOD sites and the potential need for mitigation e.g. noise impacts
Biodiversity	11027	Quality of life will be affected by the removal of countryside as an amenity.
Green Spaces	10720	There will be a damaging loss of landscape character and residential amenity as a consequence of the proposed developments being built on top of designated countryside.
Landscape Character	10716	Several paragraphs in the plan suggest that, as a result of the proposed development, there will be a loss of amenity and therefore a significant landscape and visual impact.
	10716	Several paragraphs in the plan suggest that, as a result of the proposed development, there will be a loss of amenity and therefore a significant landscape and visual impact.
open space	10114	<p>concerned about the mandatory application of part c (communal open space or balconies) to flats as this could reduce density and viability. flexibility is needed as such provision may not always be appropriate or required. E.g. where balconies could result in unacceptable overlooking or where properties are in close proximity to existing or proposed Public Open Space</p> <p>c) In the case of residential dwellings, it provides for private open space in the form of private gardens, balconies or communal open space which are appropriate for the needs of residents unless such provision would result in unacceptable amenity impacts or public open space is available to meet the needs of the development.</p>
Wider water infrastructure and growth - strategic matter for Water Companies and	10119	<p>Amend wording to criteria a) to ensure policy is clear, effective and not placing an unnecessary burden on new development to provide for neighbouring amenities that are not relevant.</p> <p>Amend wording criteria a). After 'occupants and' add 'does not have an unacceptable impact on'</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
authorities rather than developers		
	11027	The development will remove privacy from neighbouring occupants.
Landscape led	10139	With the landscape of the borough being of such importance it is disappointing to see no overall policy reference to the plan being 'landscape led'
Light Pollution	11135	There should be more consideration for the effects of internal light spill on dark night skies using BCT/ILT mitigation and best practice to reduce or eliminate light spill
Safeguarding Views	10139	Disappointed there is no policy referring to safeguarding views as views are very much part of enjoyment of the landscape and development needs to avoid significant impacts on important views or landmarks.
	10139	<p>Suggest the inclusion of a policy for safeguarding views</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development proposals will only be permitted where they preserve the visual integrity, identity and scenic quality of the District by conserving and enhancing key views and views of key landmarks 2. Development proposals will be permitted that conserve and enhance the following view types and patterns <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Landmark views to and from viewpoints and tourism and recreational destinations; b) Views from publicly accessible areas which are within, to and from settlements which contribute to the viewers' enjoyment of the countryside c) Views from public rights of way, open access land and other publicly accessible areas; and 3. Development proposals will be permitted provided they conserve and enhance sequential views, and do not result in adverse cumulative impacts within views.
Historic England: built, historic environment	10049	<p>recommend being consistent in avoiding the implication that "built" is synonymous with "historic</p> <p>"...Test Valley's built, historic and natural environment is rich and varied, with parts of the Borough being of international wildlife importance, national landscape importance and important heritage value."</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Local Gap - Abbotts Ann	11064	Strongly recommend that gap between Abbotts Ann and Andover Town is maintained.

Chapter 5 - Ecology and Biodiversity
Paragraphs - 5.220-5.272

Key Issue	Officer Response
Biodiversity-LP overlooks biodiversity inhabiting buildings	The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan and theme based policies will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Chalk streams-no direct reference in policy	
Ecology-language weak and needs further work, inconsistent with NPPF	
Watercourses & Atlantic Salmon	
LNRS- clear reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) in this policy and for development	
Nutrient Neutrality-Policy to be made clearer to ensure compliance	
Recreational pressure of development on- New Forest, Salisbury Plain, Solent	
Green Infrastructure -integration into new development	

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Application	10052	Concerned that the position set out in paragraph 5.233 is not always the case. It should apply in relation to SINC's as well as SSSIs.
Biodiversity	10937	Planning policies should prioritise this.
Biodiversity enhancements	10952	UK Green Building Council has produced 'The Nature Recovery and Climate Resilience Playbook'. It includes a recommendation that Local Planning Authorities should introduce standard planning conditions and policies to deliver low cost / no regret biodiversity enhancement measures in new development as appropriate, such as bee bricks, swift boxes [and bricks] and hedgehog highways.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Biodiversity in buildings	10067	The Local Plan currently overlooks biodiversity that inhabits buildings e.g. red-listed endangered bird species such as swifts, house sparrows, and house martins. Need a clear policy - this is supported by the PPG on Natural Environment, paragraph 023 which in particular mentions swift bricks.
Biodiversity Mitigation	10938	Public maps and lists of biodiversity mitigation sites in Test Valley should be available and regularly updated. Both nutrient and biodiversity mitigation sites should be recorded by parish, so that parish councils and ecology bodies can monitor performance easier.
Bird boxes	10067	Reference to bird boxes is welcome.
	10952	Reference to bird boxes is welcome but currently insufficient to meet national policy and design code guidance and enable suitable provision for target species.
Bird nesting options	10952	The Ecology and Biodiversity section needs adding to in relation to swift bricks, artificial nest cups and existing nest sites. Recommended wording has been provided. The National Model Design Code Part 2 Guidance Notes recommend bird bricks, the PPG Natural Environment section (paragraph 023) highlights the value of swift bricks which are a universal nest brick for small birds. This addition will enable implementation of a policy recommending swift bricks, by ensuring early inclusion on the drawings for an integrated design process and reliable installation on site. Text to add: Swift bricks should be installed in all new-build developments including extensions, in accordance with best-practice guidance such as BS 42021 or CIEEM which require at least one swift brick per home on average for each development. Artificial nest cups for house martins may be proposed instead of swift bricks where recommended by an ecologist. Existing nest sites for building-dependent species such as swifts and house martins should be protected, as these endangered red-listed species which are present but declining in the Test Valley borough return annually to traditional nest sites. Mitigation should be provided if these nest sites cannot be protected.
	10952	House martins are an important species in the borough and artificial nesting cups are also included in BS 42021:2022.
Chalk streams	10460	There are about 180 chalk streams in the world, with the vast majority in Hampshire and Wiltshire. Therefore, we are the custodians of this worldwide unique environment.
	10460	Development in catchment areas of chalk streams has a triple effect, including rainwater not being able to penetrate hard surfaces, is channelled into drains which overload the system and can result in

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		discharge of untreated sewage into river systems; flash flooding so water runs off rather than sinking into the earth and into the aquifer; and additional phosphates and other chemicals getting into the watercourse, promoting adverse algae, weed and reed growth.
	10460	Development in catchment areas of chalk streams results in increased water demand, which increases the need for abstraction denuding the amount of water in the chalk streams, at the same time as discharging more sewage.
	10460	Taking account of all planned development in Test Valley and the surrounding area, the effect on the chalk stream catchment area is devastating, including through covering the catchment area in concrete and so depriving of water.
	10460	There are a range of designations and environmental protection agencies, but no strategy, awareness, or overarching organisation to protect the unique chalk stream environment that crosses county boundaries. This is resulting in the catchment area being built on in a piecemeal way. With increased abstraction without natural replenishment, the chalk streams will eventually dry up.
	10460	Need to raise awareness of the consequences of disconnected, uncoordinated, and haphazard development in this unique area with chalk streams - this relates to government, county, borough and parish council levels.
	10460	There is room for some development but there needs to be an overarching strategy and awareness in order to limit the development, especially in the feeder streams and river catchment areas, to prevent the loss of the chalk streams.
	10047	Rivers Test, Itchen and Avon are ecologically important and rare chalk streams. Chalk streams are a vital natural capital asset. Pressures from over abstraction, increased development pressure, and a legacy of modification and interventions have resulted in significant and ongoing declines in biodiversity and water quality.
	10047	While a few references to chalk streams in Chapter 5, there are no references to chalk streams within the any of the draft policies text. To reflect the importance of these watercourses and ensure the necessary protection, there should be specific chalk stream protections put into policy text.
	10047	Strongly encourage the recommendations of the Catchment Based Approach Chalk Stream Strategy are embedded within the Local Plan, including that "Planning approval must be contingent on the pre-existence of or parallel investment in more than adequate supply and treatment infrastructure with no additional burden on chalk aquifer abstraction. Developers should make water-company developer contributions to help cover the costs of addressing such impacts."
	10760	The River Anton, Pillhill Brook, Wallop Brook, and River Test are rare chalk streams and can only support wildlife if the water is not polluted by a range of sources, notably farming and sewage, and pollution from industry.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Complexities	10052	Compensation strategies do not always work. It is important to remember that biodiversity includes a range of animals and plants whose interactions are complicated.
Ecological enhancements	10564	Language too weak, especially for measures not within DEFRA BNG metric such as bird and bat boxes. Alternative wording suggested. "All development proposals must seek to include proportionate measures to conserve and enhance biodiversity. In addition to meeting the DEFRA metric, all development will be expected to include additional ecological enhancements such as integrated bird bricks/boxes, bat bricks/boxes, bee bricks, hedgehog highways, reptile refugia/hibernacula and nature friendly planting."
	10564	BS 42021:2022 should be referenced in the Local Plan. It has been endorsed by the NHBC. This includes full details on universal integrated bird bricks and details on installation.
Further work	Environment Agency 10068	As currently written, section on Ecology and Biodiversity does not go far enough and is not consistent with section 15 of the NPPF. The section of the Local Plan could be further strengthened to bring it in line with paragraph 185 of the NPPF.
Watercourses & Atlantic Salmon	Environment Agency 10068	The importance of the watercourse network within the district should be mapped and safeguarded. The River Test and River Itchen are two of only six chalk streams in the UK home to populations of Atlantic salmon. Chalk stream salmon are genetically unique and considered an irreplaceable sub-species.
	Environment Agency 10068	Data collection by the Environment Agency shows populations of Atlantic salmon are in series decline and risk of functional extinction. The Test and Itchen have bespoke targets (conservation limit) below which the populations should not be allowed to fall as the probability of further declines becomes increasingly likely. The 2023 population assessment showed the River Test met 44% of its compliance conservation target, River Itchen was 39%, with Southampton Water and the Solent important transitional environments.
	Environment Agency 10068	Atlantic salmon are listed as a Species of Principle Importance in England under S41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 and an Annex II species that is a qualifying feature for the designation of the River Itchen as a Special Area of Conservation. They are protected under the Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).
	Environment Agency 10068	Believe it is necessary and justified that a specific policy is included for protecting the district's watercourses. Suggested wording and justification is provided. Protection and Enhancement of Watercourses Protecting watercourse functions and setting:

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		<p>1. Development proposals adjacent to or containing a watercourse must demonstrate that they will not have an adverse impact on the hydrological, ecological, and geomorphological functions of the watercourse and its associated corridor. This includes ensuring no net loss of biodiversity, maintenance of natural flow regimes, and minimisation of bank erosion.</p> <p>Enhancing watercourse value:</p> <p>2. Development proposals should actively seek to enhance the biodiversity, landscape, and recreational value of the watercourse and its corridor through good design principles, such as naturalisation of banks, creation of wetland features, and provision of public access where appropriate.</p> <p>De-culverting and buffer zones:</p> <p>3. De-culverting existing watercourses will be prioritised where feasible. No new culverting will be permitted, and proposals should not prejudice future opportunities for de-culverting.</p> <p>4. Development proposals adjacent to or containing a watercourse must provide or retain a buffer zone with a minimum width of 10 metres between the top of the bank and the development. This buffer zone should be managed for long-term ecological benefit and include measures to allow for natural movement of fish where barriers exist.</p> <p>Compliance and Guidance:</p> <p>5. Proposals must demonstrate compliance with the Water Framework Directive, relevant River Basin Management Plans, and Local catchment management plans. Developers must follow guidance from the Environment Agency on flood risk management</p>
	Environment Agency 10068	<p>Justification for a new policy on protecting watercourses includes that they are irreplaceable ecological assets with unique biodiversity and ecosystem services; chalk rivers are unique habitats supporting diverse aquatic life; and only 200 chalk rivers are known globally with 85% in the UK. Maintaining continuous watercourse corridors maximises their benefit and ensures long term sustainability. Land adjacent to rivers provides an ecological buffer zone, which along with the river provides important and effective part of a network of linked habitat corridors to allow the movement of species; and is part of green infrastructure provision.</p>
Habitat types	10564	Ensure that the built environment is recognised as being a habitat type in its own right for building dependent species and those adapted to the built environment.
Habitats and species	10760	Every square meter needs to be considered. Current mown areas could be reduced to add many more trees, hedgerows and areas of habitat to encourage local species of insects, birds, mammals, and reptiles.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Insufficient proposals	10052	The suggestion that the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity could include 'things like bird and bat boxes, hedgehog highways and nature friendly planting', whilst admirable are not enough to maintain broad enough corridors and links for the movement of wildlife and would only create improvement for a limited range of species.
irreplaceable habitats	10223	<p>wording insufficiently robust as it applies to irreplaceable habitats but NPPF 186c mandates that development should not be allowed except in wholly exceptional circumstances. Suggest additional wording</p> <p>Development that is likely to result in the loss, deterioration, or harm to irreplaceable habitats, either directly or indirectly, will not be permitted except in wholly exceptional circumstances. Development that is likely to result in the loss, deterioration or harm to other habitats or species of importance to biodiversity or geological conservation interests, either directly or indirectly, will not be permitted unless...</p>
Land North of Oxlease Meadows	10446	<p>The Land North of Oxlease Meadows, also known as Horse Fields and marked on the attached map with a red box-near Romsey Barge Canal and the Fishlake Meadows SSSI should be removed from Policy BIO1 to continue being part of the SSSI as was advised by the planning inspector in the appeal of planning application 21/02715/FULLS.</p> <p>Remove site from Policy BIO1 and hashed in dark green like surrounding areas</p>
LNRS and connectivity	10052	The Local Plan cannot be prepared without the Hampshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy. One of the overriding requirements for the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, as discussed at the workshop for Test Valley, was the need for connectivity.
Local Nature Recovery Strategy	10047	<p>Aware that other Councils have included wording in their Local Plans in relation to the consideration of the ecological network and alignment with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Would recommend such wording is included in the Local Plan, with wording provided.</p> <p>Insert: Development proposals should demonstrate how they have considered the ecological network (as shown on the Policies Map) and are required to align with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Ancient woodland	Natural England 10140	Consider any impacts on ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees in line with paragraph 186 of the NPPF. The Ancient Woodland Inventory can be used to help identify ancient woodland. Standing advice has been produced by Natural England and the Forestry Commission.
LNRS	Natural England 10140	Welcome clear reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) in this policy.
LNRS	Natural England 10140	Recommend further emphasis placed on how wider ecological network of the plan area could link to the LNRS and reference to any associated mapping the Council may be using.
LNRS	Natural England 10140	The Local Plan should make clear that development proposals should demonstrate how they have considered ecological networks across the area (as shown on the policies maps) and are required to align with the emerging LNRS.
River Test SSSI	Natural England 10140	The River Test SSSI is an important natural feature within the plan area - it is recommended that it is given greater emphasis within this policy.
	Natural England 10140	This policy should give particular consideration to potential impacts on the borough's important chalk rivers via surface water drainage. This may have considerable cumulative impacts on water quality with other local factors. Some development may also result in additional phosphorus inputs with negative effects on chalk river habitats and species via eutrophication.
	Natural England 10140	Urbanisation of land within or close to the floodplain may affect water flow rates with consequential detrimental impacts on important river habitat, and / or they may exacerbate negative impacts from existing developments.
	Natural England 10140	The Local Plan should ensure urbanisation impacts on protected sites and other important habitats are properly considered, particularly when allocating sites.
SSSIs & recreational impacts	Natural England 10140	The Local Plan should consider monitoring recreational disturbance on nationally designated sites in the borough. There are several SSSIs which may be showing signs of disturbance due to increased recreational pressure - Stockbridge Downs SSSI, Trodds Copse SSSI, Broughton Down SSSI, and Baddesley Common and Emer Bog SSSI. Policy BIO1 would be the most appropriate place to reference this, embedding it as necessary policy consideration throughout the plan period.
Support	Natural England 10140	Welcome the provision of policies aimed at protecting and enhancing the natural environment, whilst maximising benefits to people and nature.
	Natural England 10140	Welcome the incorporation of this policy. Welcome the opportunity to work further with the Council on this policy.
Nature Recovery Network	10047	Nature Recovery Network mapping is about taking a strategic spatial approach to the natural environment, identifying areas of existing value, and looking at opportunities to create connections with new habitats that will benefit people and wildlife. Without such spatial mapping, it will not be

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		possible to identify where interventions are required in order to create the nature recovery network and deliver the environmental policy ambition.
	10047	Strongly recommend that the Council commits to the creation and maintenance of a functioning Nature Recovery Network through which the biodiversity of the borough can be protected and enhanced. The Nature Recovery Network is the key mechanism to deliver nature's recovery within the Local Plan, providing multiple benefits and meeting the government's 25 Year Environment Plan targets.
	10047	Strongly recommend that the Council prepare and use the Nature Recovery Network as a foundational tool for the Local Plan to identify areas within the plan area that are of special importance within the context of the Nature Recovery Network, including existing habitats that are of highest value, areas that buffer existing core habitat, and gaps within the existing network that if filled would improve ecological connectivity and reduce fragmentation.
	10047	Strongly recommend that the Council prepare and use the Nature Recovery Network to assess, identify and prioritise opportunities for ecological enhancement through the Local Plan.
	10047	Sites of core importance to the Nature Recovery Network should be protected and the Nature Recovery Strategy and Local Nature Recovery Strategies should guide where development should not take place to avoid severance of ecological connectivity within the network, or landscape corridors.
	10047	Strongly recommend that the Council prepare and use the Nature Recovery Network to inform the design of any development in such a way that makes a net contribution to the Nature Recovery Network.
	10047	Strongly recommend that the Council prepare and use the Nature Recovery Network to inform and target biodiversity net gain delivery and other nature-based solutions.
	10047	Strongly recommend that the Council prepare and use the Nature Recovery Network to send a clear market signal to developers of expectations for future planning to contribute positively and meaningfully to nature recovery.
	10047	For more information on Nature Recovery Networks, recommend reading the South East Nature Partnerships' 'Principles of Nature Recovery Networks across the South East of England' document.
Nature restoration plan	10760	Incorporate a nature and ecosystem restoration plan to reverse and restore habitats, species, and ecosystem quality and function.
Nest sites	10067	Text should be added to the Ecology and Biodiversity section in relation to existing nest sites and building dependent species, with wording recommended.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Insert: Existing nest sites should also be protected and retained, as these are not given any value by the DEFRA biodiversity net gain metric calculation. Building-dependent species return to traditional nest sites year after year, and find it difficult to locate a new site if they lose it.
Nesting cavities	10564	Closeness to nature is good for wellbeing so all new developments should provide nesting cavities for building dependent species. Universal bricks are used by 4 red listed species plus other bird species and insects - they are an invaluable boost to biodiversity in a built environment.
Nutrient Mitigation	10938	Public maps and lists of nutrient mitigation sites in Test Valley should be available and regularly updated. Both nutrient and biodiversity mitigation sites should be recorded by parish, so that parish councils and ecology bodies can monitor performance easier.
Protecting the Environment	11014	Strongly support the contention that local planning must be linked with local environment policies and believes that the links in the LP could be strengthened in certain areas.
River Anton	10047	The River Anton is greatly impacted by pressures such as phosphates and sediment. Smart River invertebrate readings showed that a site in the town centre was one of the worst for these two pressures across the headwaters.
River ecosystems	10760	The River Anton, Pillhill Brook and River Test and its tributaries are too close to collapse in the ecosystems and there is no room for mistakes.
River Test	10760	The River Test and the surrounding beautiful countryside has always been the heart of Test Valley's unique and beautiful countryside and important for the tourist industry.
Species considerations	10952	Building-dependent birds, swift bricks, and other species features are excluded from the DEFRA biodiversity net gain metric, so require their own policy.
State of rivers	10047	Of added importance is the current unacceptable state of river water quality with no rivers achieving good status and only 16% of designated rivers meeting good ecological health.
Support	11014	Strongly support the statement in this paragraph (5.225)
	11014	Strongly support the statement in this paragraph (5.229)
	10047	Welcome reference to the Nature Recovery Network and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.
	10812	Content with this policy
Swift bricks	10067	Text should be added to the Ecology and Biodiversity section in relation to swift bricks, with wording recommended.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Insert: Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species, and should be installed in all new-build developments including extensions, in accordance with best-practice guidance such as BS 42021:2022 or CIEEM. Swift bricks are a significantly better option than external boxes due to their long lifetime, no maintenance requirements, improved thermal regulation, and aesthetic integration. Artificial nest cups for house martins may be proposed instead of swift bricks where an ecologist specifically recommends it.
	10067	Other bird species which will inhabit swift bricks are also present, such as house sparrows.
	10067	Other local authorities are bringing forward Local Plan policies which support swift bricks, such as the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan which requires two swift bricks per dwelling (Regulation 19 stage, policy 88).
	10952	Swift bricks are the only type of bird box specifically mentioned as valuable to wildlife in the PPG (Natural Environment section, paragraph 023) along with bat boxes and hedgehog highways. The National Model Design Code Part 2 Guidance Notes also recommends bird bricks. Swift bricks are considered a universal nest brick suitable for a wide range of small bird species. They are significantly more beneficial than external bird boxes as they are a permanent feature of the building, have no maintenance requirements, are aesthetically integrated into the design of the building, and have improved thermal regulation with the future climate in mind. Therefore, swift bricks should be included in all developments following best practice guidance (BS 42021:2022 and from CIEEM).
	10952	Many other local authorities are including detailed swift brick requirements in their emerging Local Plans, including Tower Hamlets (follows exemplary swift brick guidance implemented by Brighton and Hove since 2020), Wiltshire Local Plan and Cotswold District Council, so enhanced levels should also be considered.
Swifts	10067	<p>Swifts are an important species in Hampshire with a substantial number of older buildings and suitable areas for foraging. RSPB swift mapper website and Hampshire Swift Survey demonstrate that they are recorded as nesting throughout the county.</p> <p>Add the following requirement 'Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species and should be installed in all new developments including extensions in accordance with best practice guidance, to provide sufficient permanent nest sites to save endangered birds'</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11059	Swifts are important as biodiversity is in crisis
	11063	<p>This small change will have a huge impact on swift populations and the wider ecology</p> <p>Add the following requirement 'Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species and should be installed in all new developments including extensions in accordance with best practice guidance, to provide sufficient permanent nest sites to save endangered birds'</p>
trees and hedgerows - support inclusion	10223	We welcome the inclusion of vi. (Irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodlands and ancient and veteran trees), vii (Trees, woodlands and hedgerows) and viii (Nature Recovery Networks)
Typo	10760	There is an error in wording regarding chalk stream rivers. A chalk stream river is a category of river, but at one point the word 'stream' has been omitted.
Verges	10760	Urge developers to plant road verges to increase biodiversity and draw down carbon and increased planting of wildflowers.
Water environment	10760	The aquifers that feed the Anton and the Test are drawn on for our water supply meaning the river flows are unnaturally low. The sewage works have been shown to be overwhelmed in wet weather when the Test is receiving water not fully treated. The indicator species that show the health of the river are in decline. Rivers are being put at risk. Issues with becoming out of balance with the nitrates and phosphates as well as discharges of sewage.
Protected species - farmland birds	Wiltshire Council: 10202	Wiltshire local plan proposed Ludgershall allocation affords potential nesting habitat for farmland birds such as skylark and meadow pipit and foraging opportunities for wintering birds
Fishlake Meadows	10944	<p>Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and the wildlife must be protected.</p> <p>It is essential that the existing settlement boundaries are maintained to protect the wildlife habitat adjacent to the Nature Reserve.</p>
	10946	<p>Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and the wildlife must be protected.</p> <p>It is essential that the existing settlement boundaries are maintained to protect the wildlife habitat adjacent to the Nature Reserve.</p>
Biodiversity	10889	The Local Plan should avoid development on sites that are rich in biodiversity.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Support- land North of Oxlease Meadows	10871	Support the exclusion of land between Cupernham Lane and Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve from development, as there have been attempts to obtain land North of Oxlease Meadows in contravention of Local Plan policy.
land North of Oxlease Meadows	10871	The land is important to protect from development as it is an access point to the countryside and supports the wellbeing and diversity of wildlife and the land as a human amenity and more development adjacent to the barge canal should be resisted.
Landscape character	10720	There will be a damaging loss of landscape character and residential amenity as a consequence of the proposed developments being built on top of designated countryside.
biodiversity	10938	Biodiversity policies are good but should be carried through to on the ground enforcement.
Swift Bricks	10917	New homes in the proposed development should be installed with swift bricks so that swifts or house sparrows are able to breed. Paragraph 5.228 should contain the following requirement: "Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species and should be installed in all new developments including extensions in accordance with best-practice guidance, to provide sufficient permanent nest sites to save these endangered birds."
	10919	New homes in the proposed development should be installed with swift bricks so that swifts or house sparrows are able to breed. Paragraph 5.228 should contain the following requirement: "Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species and should be installed in all new developments including extensions in accordance with best-practice guidance, to provide sufficient permanent nest sites to save these endangered birds."
Support	11135	Support this policy
Nutrient Neutrality	Basingstoke and Deane BC 10757	Support collaborative working with other local authorities in Solent Region on seeking to avoid and mitigate impacts of nutrients from new development, upon the Test, Itchen and sensitive environment of the Solent.
Development mitigation	10047	Encourage that the meeting of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) calculations is the minimum and does not fully mitigate potential impacts to all sites of ecological importance. Development in close proximity to nature reserves increase the footfall which third parties will have to bear the costs of.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10364	Land at Fairbournes Farm has already been promoted to the Council as land suitable for removal from farming and to be used for either nitrate mitigation, Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space or Biodiversity Net Gain or a combination of these uses
Full assessment	10047	When assessing the ecological impact of new developments, the Council must go beyond the draft policy and undergo a complete appraisal on impacts of both designated and non-designated wildlife sites (e.g. local nature reserves) and provide sufficient mitigation measures.
Emer Bog SAC	Natural England 10140	The Council may wish to incorporate the guidance note on hydrology of Emer Bog SAC within its Local Plan policies or produce updated guidance (such as an Supplementary Planning Document) at a later date.
Emer Bog SAC	Natural England 10140	An important consideration for Emer Bog SAC should be Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) where hydrological assessments demonstrate that there could be a hydrological link from a given site to the SAC. Sufficient detail should be provided so that surface drainage can be properly addressed and that SuDS are designed in line with CIRIA C753 SuDS Manual.
Functionally linked land - Mottisfont	Natural England 10140	Policy BIO2 recognises that Mottisfont Bats SAC has a 7.5km zone of influence wherein developments could potentially impact foraging habitats for protected bats inhabiting the SAC. Developments must consider site-specific measures in order to mitigate impacts. Where direct or indirect impacts on suitable roosting, foraging and commuting habitats are considered likely, such impacts must be fully assessed, avoided and where required appropriately mitigated. This should be in accordance with the relevant best practice guidelines. Mitigation must be secured for the duration of the development's effects.
	Natural England 10140	Exterior lighting affecting roosting, foraging, and / or commuting habitats for bats will need to conform to the latest best practice guidelines outlined by the Bat Conservation Trust and the Institute of Lighting Professionals (currently Guidance Note 08/18) due to the proximity to the Mottisfont Bats SAC.
	Natural England 10140	Recommend that potential impacts are avoided (e.g. through scheme design, such as sensitive lighting strategy). Where this is not possible, measures for mitigating impacts on protected species and habitats, and include biodiversity compensation measures for any residual biodiversity losses that cannot be fully mitigated on site. This might include the provision of off-site replacement habitat, or an agreed financial contribution to biodiversity enhancements elsewhere calculated using a biodiversity compensation framework.
	Natural England 10140	Proposed measures to enhance habitat corridors for bats via hedgerow planting are welcome, although any mitigation measures should be informed by additional survey efforts. Further mitigation

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		measures, if required, could include planting or restoring native hedgerows, planting native trees, the creation of wildlife ponds and the provision of further foraging opportunities for bats.
	Natural England 10140	Consideration should be given to any lighting proposed on site during construction and operational phases of development, which outlines how light spill will be prevented in the unlit bat buffers and other areas sensitive to light pollution. This should be agreed by the Council's ecologist.
More detail - further information needed	Natural England 10140	Policy requires considerable further work to act as a core overarching policy for all such designated sites.
	Natural England 10140	Further information is necessary to provide the correct level of detail and direction through this policy, across the multiple impact pathways, for new development to comply with.
Nutrient neutrality - detailed advice	Natural England 10140	Onsite sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) can result in reductions to a development's nutrient burden, provided they are designed in line with the relevant CIRIA C753 SuDS Manual and management is secured for the lifetime of the development. Wetland proposals can provide multiple benefits - in order to generate nutrient credits they should be designed in line with the Wetland Framework.
	Natural England 10140	Where developments are within a nutrient neutrality catchment but discharge to wastewater outside the catchment, advise that a nutrient budget calculation is not required for the surface water element as long as the sustainable drainage scheme (as defined in CIRIA guidance) forms part of the development for schemes below the EIA threshold.
Nutrient neutrality - HRA	Natural England 10140	The Local Plan includes new housing development and has inevitable wastewater implications. These implications and all other matters capable of having significant effects on designated sites in the Solent must be addressed in the ways required by Section 63 of the Habitat Regulations.
	Natural England 10140	Strongly recommend that the Council include a nutrient management plan or similar strategy to offset the delivery of increased nutrients from the Local Plan development to achieve nutrient neutrality.
Nutrient neutrality - overnight accommodation	Natural England 10140	Welcome that policy will require new development involving a net increase in overnight accommodation to address in-combination effects on the Solent designated sites, River Itchen SAC, and River Avon SAC via eutrophication from nutrients in wastewater.
Nutrient neutrality - resources	Natural England 10140	Natural England has written advise on calculating nutrient budgets and potential mitigation solutions and will continue to work with all affected local planning authorities to help address this issue.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Nutrient neutrality - River Avon	Natural England 10140	A small area falls within the catchment of the River Avon SAC. While the Local Plan does not allocate development within this catchment, the supporting text under policy BIO2 should outline the necessary mitigation that will be required for relevant proposals.
Nutrient neutrality - secure mitigation	Natural England 10140	For nutrient neutrality mitigation, where strategic schemes are relied upon it is advised that the credits are secured / reserved to ensure there is adequate supply available for the Local Plan growth. This has not currently been demonstrated. Bespoke solutions at neighbourhood plan level or development level can also come forward.
Nutrient neutrality - strengthen policy	Natural England 10140	Policy could make scope of requirement for nutrient neutrality explicit i.e. including all development proposing an increase in overnight accommodation.
Nutrient neutrality - terminology	Natural England 10140	The term 'nutrient' or 'nitrogen' should be used when discussing eutrophication of the marine Solent designated sites ('nitrates' is a component of total nitrogen). For eutrophication of riverine systems, 'phosphorus' should be used, not 'phosphates'.
Nutrients	1 Natural England 10140	All site allocations that propose an increase in overnight accommodation must comply with emerging policy BIO2 in achieving nutrient neutrality. Policy BIO2 needs to be clear on this to ensure compliance.
Recreational pressure - New Forest	Natural England 10140	Would expect further details of the current interim approach for mitigating recreational impacts on the New Forest designations to be demonstrated, in advance of a joint strategic approach, to ensure that development and housing allocations have the correct policy direction for securing necessary mitigation. This could include overarching principles mitigation that are unlikely to change upon adoption of a longer-term strategy.
	Natural England 10140	A substantial area falls within the 13.8km zone of influence within which new overnight accommodation (including residential and hotel / touristic development) is likely to have a significant effect on the New Forest designated sites.
	Natural England 10140	BIO2 does not include any information on the wider 15km catchment of the New Forest designated sites, whereby larger developments should consider impacts from increased recreational pressure.
	Natural England 10140	Recommend the Council works with the New Forest National Park Authority and the other partner authorities to develop a strategic approach to addressing recreational impacts from new development on the New Forest designated sites. Mitigation for the New Forest designated sites should include in-borough measures such as SANG provision as well as measures at the designated sites to address residual impacts e.g. via contributions to a suitable scheme such as the New Forest National Park's Habitat Mitigation Scheme. Natural England would be happy to provide further advice to the Council on this aspect.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Natural England 10140	There is insufficient information under policy BIO2 to provide clarity on what mitigation measure are expects for development that falls within the zones of influence for the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar. Policy requires further information on mitigation parameters to be able to act as an overarching policy for the New Forest designated sites.
Recreational pressure - Salisbury Plain	Natural England 10140	Recognise that Wiltshire Council have established a 6.4km zone of influence for Salisbury Plain SPA, whereby recreation pressure from increased housing development is assessed and may require mitigation. The supporting information under policy BIO2 does not highlight this 6.4km zone and does not provide details on what mitigation measures are expected and how it will be secured.
	Natural England 10140	There is insufficient information under policy BIO2 to provide the necessary clarity for any housing allocations and windfall development to know when mitigation for increased recreational pressures on Salisbury Plain SPA is necessary, and how to comply with these requirements.
Recreational pressure - Solent	Natural England 10140	Parts of the plan area like within 5.6km of the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, and as the Local Plan will result in a net increase in dwellings it will be required to address its impacts on the SPA from recreational pressure. Recommend the Local Plan includes a policy to cover the strategic solution.
	Natural England 10140	Insufficient information under policy BIO2 to provide clarity on what mitigation is expected for residential development that falls within 5.6km of the Solent SPA sites. The policy does not include any information to set out how contributions are calculated or secured, nor does the policy correctly specify the 5.6km zone of influence whereby any gain in residential development must comply.
River Itchen SAC	Natural England 10140	Developments that drain to Chickenhall WwTW will require mitigation for phosphorus.
Solent and Southampton Water SPA	Natural England 10140	Part of the Solent and Southampton Water SPA lies within Test Valley. It also is part of the Solent Wader and Brent Goose Strategy network of sites. Advise that any development coming forward likely to impact on this site duly considers this designated site.
SuDS	Natural England 10140	Best practice sustainable drainage systems should be installed in line with the requirements in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753).
Joint working on New Forest Recreational Disturbance	New Forest DC 10028	Welcome the cooperative working that has taken place to date on a coordinated strategic approach to mitigation for recreational impacts on New Forest and look forward to further joint working on this strategic matter.
Mitigation for New Forest Recreational Disturbance	New Forest DC 10028	Support the provisions made in Policy BIO2 which require development that is likely to have a significant recreational impact, either alone or in combination, on New Forest international nature conservation designations to clearly demonstrate that any potential adverse effects on integrity are fully mitigated

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
New Forest mitigation	10052	The proposal for mitigation packages for recreational impacts to the New Forest must take into account why people go there.
Supports BIO2	New Forest National Park Authority 10696	Supports Policy BIO2 in particular the requirement for an potential adverse recreational impacts on New Forest International Nature Conservation Designations to be fully mitigated. This includes a need for the Borough Council to ensure appropriate mitigation is provided within the Borough (e.g. through new greenspace provision) as part of overall package of mitigation.
Nutrients - in catchment mitigation	10052	Mitigation for excess nutrient levels should be limited to the same catchment as that affected. New housing and tourist accommodation in the Test Valley catchment should therefore be mitigated by changes within the catchment.
Provision of mitigation	10047	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust is well positioned to deliver biodiversity net gain and mitigation for nitrates, prioritising significant value added. Would be pleased to discuss these in more detail.
SANG & SINC/SSSIs	10052	The provision of SANG must not result in the use of, and damage to, areas designated as SINC or SSSI and should take into account that, for example, people will travel further to go somewhere wilder, such as the New Forest.
Stacking	10047	While positive to see the inclusion of nutrient neutrality, would recommend that the policy goes further and gives a strong preference for nitrate mitigation schemes that will deliver wider environmental benefits, especially for biodiversity. The opportunities for creation and improvement of habitats as part of mitigation strategies should be identified through the forthcoming Local Nature Recovery Strategy and Nature Recovery Network.
Support	10812	Content with this policy
Solent SPA/SAC	Wiltshire Council 10202	Working with Council on cross boundary matters concerning Solent Internationally Protected Sites and established working relationships in place for protected sites
Alignment with legislation and national policy	10201	Policy relates to all development of 1 or more dwellings, whereas legislation set out a number of exemptions including de minimis development of less than 25sqm. Recommend policy amended to be consistent with legislation or simply refer to development requirements by Environment Act to provide 10% BNG Amend to reflect exemptions consistent with Environment Act
	10120	The policy should be amended to be consistent with the legislation or simply refer to development requirement by the Environment Act to provide a 10% BNG to avoid unnecessary confusion and delays.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Approach to brownfield sites	10223	Encourage considering development of a local metric for more urban/brownfield sites, e.g. London Urban Greening Factor, as these sites may have a low level of biodiversity so a percentage increase may not in practice deliver significant enhancements
Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy	10120	The policy refers to the mitigation hierarchy instead of the biodiversity hierarchy. The Planning Practice Guidance set out the distinction. Therefore point i) should be corrected to avoid confusion.
	10201	Council refers to mitigation hierarchy instead of biodiversity hierarchy. Paragraph 74-008 states two are distinct with mitigation hierarchy relating to refusal of development where significant harm to biodiversity as a result of development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or compensated whereas BNG hierarchy sets out the priority actions with regard to delivery of net gain Amend Bullet point i) to Biodiversity Hierarchy
	10201	Council should amend bullet point i) to 'Biodiversity Hierarchy' to ensure consistency with Environment Act and avoid confusion for decision makers
BNG for developments	10397	Very aware of the Environment Act 2021 which introduces 10% mandatory requirement for BNG in conjunction with certain development, it is the achievement of measurable gains for biodiversity through new development that occurs when a development leaves biodiversity in a better state than before development
Connectivity	10052	Connectivity of habitats should be maintained as this is important for allowing the movement of species between sites.
Flexibility & Viability	10201	Given 10% BNG non-negotiable statutory requirement, need to ensure other policies are sufficiently flexible to ensure development is not made unviable by policies in local plan and this flexibility is clearly signalled to decision makers
Higher BNG requirement	10223	Support setting a greater than 10% target for net gain where appropriate. A more ambitious target in Local Plan increases the chances that an average net gain of at least 10% will be delivered across the Plan area as some sites may not be able to deliver net gain within the District or that initiatives intended to deliver such gain may fall short in practice. Examples of other LPs provided
	10564	Local Plan should be more ambitious. Many aiming for between 15% and 30%. Given Local Plans stand for many years they should be future-proofed and 10% net gain is too low a starting point.
	10052	Net gain should be a minimum, not an upper limit. Irreplaceable habitats must never be lost.
	10047	Recommend reviewing Kent County Council's viability assessment for the potential effect of a 15% or 20% biodiversity net gain target, as this did not material affect viability in the majority of instances when delivered on site or offsite. The biggest cost in most cases is to get to mandatory net gain.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Generally, the biodiversity net gain costs are low when compared to other policy costs, in no cases are they likely to be what renders development unviable.
	10047	Encourage the Council to set a target beyond the 10% minimum biodiversity net gain, instead aiming for at least 20% biodiversity net gain.
heritage considerations	Historic England 10049	Newly created or altered habitats will sit within a historical landscape and may have both positive and negative impacts on setting as well as physical and chemical conditions of heritage assets. Consequently, heritage needs to be considered in the context of both BNG and tree planting (links provided)
interconnection of natural and historic environment	Historic England 10049	Effective decision-making benefits from considering the natural and historic environment in an integrated way e.g. taking into account archaeological considerations in sites better known or indeed designated for their natural beauty. We recommend adding relevant text on the way in which the natural and historic environments are inter-connected.
Measurable	10052	Net gain should be a measurable effect and not just a token measure.
Council approach	Natural England 10140	The Council should have appropriate measures and practices in place for agreeing BNG assessments, recording and monitoring any on-site or off-site BNG, and any strategic sites whereby BNG credits will be sold.
Guidance	Natural England 10140	Please refer to Natural England's advice on embedding biodiversity net gain in your plan and further information on achieving net gains (appended to response).
Management & Maintenance	Natural England 10140	Clear reference should be made to the requirement of development proposals to submit a costed 30-year management and maintenance plan detailing how the BNG values will be kept and achieved over the full time period.
Strategies	Natural England 10140	While the LNRS is being prepared, need to specify which alternative strategy landowners and developers should refer to when planning for biodiversity net gain. This could include the draft LNRS, existing biodiversity action plans, local plans and neighbourhood plans.
Support LNRS reference	1 Natural England 10140	Welcome the reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, with emphasis on considering the wider ecological network for connecting net gains.
Nature Recovery	11014	Welcome the Local Nature Recovery Strategy being developed by HCC, outlining the contribution to the single national Nature Recovery Network of improved joined-up, wildlife rich places which will benefit people and wildlife
encourage higher BNG	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	10% basic level should encourage higher in National Landscape 15% is an achievable and realistic target.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Support	11014	Support the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain required for all new developments, particularly for larger developments
	10047	Welcome reference to the Nature Recovery Network and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy in the supporting text.
	10812	Content with this policy
Viability testing	10201	Viability Assessment used 2019 Defra Impact Assessment as basis for costings. These are very general figures used to assess overall impact of national policy based on past examples. These cannot account for that some schemes will face much higher costs than expected and as such impact on viability will be more significant. Until baseline biodiversity is measured impossible to know what these costs are
Open Space	10875	The proposed development will impact access to open space and will cause the destruction of local nature assets.
Off-site mitigation	11135	A public register/mapping of sites used for 'off-site' mitigation should be kept to ensure local groups and ecology groups are able to monitor the efficiency of 'off-site' mitigation
Biodiversity & climate change	10047	Green infrastructure should support biodiversity, and the mitigation and adaptation for the climate crisis.
Building with Nature	10047	Recommend that all proposals for green infrastructure will be expected to be designed with the Building with Nature Standards, or an equivalent standard set by the Council.
Criterion to be met for planning permission	10139	<p>Support point a) however, we believe the wording can be strengthened to make this a criterion to be met for planning permission to be given</p> <p>Development proposals will only be permitted where they demonstrate that they:</p> <p>a) Maintain or enhance the integrity, quality, connectivity and multi-functionality of the existing blue and green infrastructure network and individual sites;</p> <p>b) Provide new green, and where appropriate, blue infrastructure, or improvements to existing green and blue assets and linkages, which are integrated into the development design, which meets the needs of communities both within and beyond the site's boundaries.</p> <p>2. Blue and Green infrastructure proposals must be designed to;</p> <p>a) Strengthen connectivity and resilience of ecological networks;</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		<p>b) Incorporate measures that are appropriate to the type and context of the development proposal as part of an overall landscape design;</p> <p>c) Maximise opportunities to mitigate, adapt and improve resilience to climate change;</p> <p>d) Maximise opportunities for cycling and walking, including multi-user routes and, where possible, facilitate circular routes; and e) Support health and wellbeing.</p> <p>3. Development proposals that may harm the existing Blue or Green Infrastructure network must incorporate measures that sufficiently mitigate or offset their effects.</p> <p>4. Where appropriate, the Authority will seek to secure, via planning condition or legal agreement, provision for the future management and/or maintenance of Blue / Green Infrastructure.</p>
Green and blue spaces	10139	Green and blue spaces is hinted but this could be stronger, we believe integration in new developments brings a multitude of benefits
Benefits to health	Hampshire County Council 10099	Active travel, physical activity and time spent in nature are all linked to good physical and mental health.
Green Infrastructure provision	Hampshire County Council 10099	In considering green infrastructure and how it integrates into new development, regard should be had to its extent, quality, the level of connection to the network, and the functions it is delivering. Where possible, nature-based solutions should be utilised and prioritised, including in relation to water management (also relevant to policy CL2).
High quality GI principles	10047	Would like to see the Local Plan adapt the green infrastructure policy to set high quality green infrastructure principles across the built footprint of new and existing areas. This would increase the sustainability of developments, boost climate resilience and public wellbeing, increase value, support a resilient economy and desire to live in the area.
GI Framework	Historic England 10049	Natural England's GI Framework principles document and the subsection on heritage features and the historic environment in the Framework's Planning and Design Guide may be particularly useful
LNRS and connectivity	10052	One of the overriding requirements for the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, as discussed at the workshop for Test Valley, was the need for connectivity.
	10052	It is important to enable the movement of species between suitable sites. Links must not be severed since mixing of genetic populations is essential to species survival.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Additional detail for applications	Natural England 10140	In developing the green infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan could consider requiring planning applications to clearly set out their contribution to and enhancement of the green infrastructure network, including benefits for access to nature, wildlife, climate change and other strategies. Also, management and long term maintenance requirements must be considered from the outset.
existing GI resources	Natural England 10140	In developing the green infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan could ensure existing green infrastructure resources are strongly protected.
Expand policy	Natural England 10140	Recommend the policy is expanded to support maximum benefits from green infrastructure provision and to meet the Council's vision and aspirations set out within the draft Local Plan and the strategic priorities of the Green Space Strategy 2021-31.
GI for allocations	Natural England 10140	All allocated site policies should make clear demonstration for enhancing ecological connectivity and considering how green infrastructure can be a tool in facilitating this.
GI Framework	Natural England 10140	In developing the green infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan could seek to cover the five main topics of the Green Infrastructure Framework standards in locally specific targets / policies where these are not already included; retain existing targets / policies which set standards that are greater than this.
	Natural England 10140	Natural England has produced the Green Infrastructure Framework - Principles and Standards for England. It helps local planning authorities meet the requirements in the NPPF on green infrastructure. It is not mandatory but the use of this Framework and accompanying standards is supported by the Partnership for South Hampshire Spatial Position Statement.
	Natural England 10140	Recommend that as a minimum, local plans set out policies to reflect the headline Green Infrastructure Framework Standards. This includes Green Infrastructure Strategy Standards, Accessible Greenspace Standards, Urban Nature Recovery Standard, Urban Greening Factor, and Urban Tree Canopy Cover.
	Natural England 10140	Further evidence may be required. The Green Infrastructure Framework guidance helps local authorities integrate considerations into local plans, including the Process Journey for Local Authorities and the Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide.
Green Space Strategy priorities	Natural England 10140	In developing the green infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan could consider ensuring the Local Plan is supporting strategic priorities of the Green Space Strategy by requiring appropriate on-site provision of green infrastructure and off-site contributions.
Green transport options	Natural England 10140	Recommend that green infrastructure also considers the provision of green transport options in the borough. Options for low carbon travel options (e.g. walking routes and cycling infrastructure) are incorporated into project proposals. Natural England's Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide contains further advice on integrating green infrastructure into travel networks.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Integration with other policies	Natural England 10140	In developing the green infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan could consider continuing to integrate green infrastructure across policy areas.
Limited detail	Natural England 10140	There is limited detail and clarity around what good green infrastructure provision looks like for Test Valley Borough Council in this policy.
other GI tools	Natural England 10140	In developing the green infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan could consider the requirement to utilise other tools to aid good design of multifunctional green infrastructure, such as the Building with Nature Standard.
Policies	Natural England 10140	Green infrastructure should be incorporated into the Local Plan as a strategic policy area, supported by appropriate detailed policies and proposals to ensure effective provision and delivery.
Urban greening factor	Natural England 10140	In developing the green infrastructure requirements in the Local Plan could utilise the urban greening factor, particularly on brownfield, town centre, employment and higher density development sites.
Nature Recovery Network	10047	Strongly recommend that the Council prepare and use the Nature Recovery Network to inform the use of building standards that promote biodiverse developments within the Local Plan (e.g. Building with Nature) to ensure that development targets action to most effectively contribute to restoring nature.
Overall framework	10052	Individual planning applications take account of SINCs and other designated protected sites that are immediately impacted by the proposal but there is no overall framework for them to be judged against.
Policy intro	10812	Suggested amendment Poorly worded, should be in the form "Development will only be permitted if..."
Recreational impacts	10047	Recommend that this policy should consider recreational impacts and disturbance on both designated and non-designated wildlife sites, which is currently missing from the policy wording.
Romsey Waterways	10052	The Romsey Waterways Strategy should form part of the policies for blue infrastructure connections.
Support	10047	Welcome reference to the Nature Recovery Network and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy in the supporting text.
	10139	Generally support
Untidiness	10052	It is important that connections are properly managed in a sustainable way, allowing a measure of 'untidiness' which benefits the small mammals and insects for example.
	10840	Support the policies relating to trees and green infrastructure and seek assurance that the unique tree canopy in Whinwhistle Rd, home to wildlife is specifically recognised and protected by the Test Valley Local Plan 2040.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
ancient woodland	10223	<p>guidance on buffer zones for ancient woodland is given in footnote 125 within Appendix 3 but recommend elevating it to be more integrated with policy</p> <p>b) it avoids the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland, ancient semi-natural woodland, and ancient or veteran trees), unless there are wholly exceptional reasons; and applies suitable buffers if located within 50m of ancient woodland. (or add to paragraph 5.269)</p>
Biodiversity	10937	Planning policies should prioritise this.
Existing trees	10760	Ensure existing trees are properly protected, in order to store carbon, support nature, aid flood protection and deliver mental health benefits while spending time in nature.
	10760	Existing hedgerows and trees, as well as being protected, should have a buffer space of the natural environment around them when incorporated into a new development.
trees and hedgerows	Historic England 10049	Newly created or altered habitats will sit within a historical landscape and may have both positive and negative impacts on setting as well as physical and chemical conditions of heritage assets. Consequently, heritage needs to be considered in the context of both BNG and tree planting (links provided)
Loss of ancient woodland objection	10397	Mindful to oppose any development that results in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland etc. even in the case of exceptional reasons and despite any agreed and suitable compensation strategy, requires careful consideration
native species	10223	<p>recommend rewording e) to specify native species from UK sourced & grown tree stock. this is to help address threats of pests & disease and help boost resilience and biosecurity as well as supporting the domestic green economy and reducing the carbon footprint of the supply chain</p> <p>e) where it is demonstrated that any tree or hedgerow losses are unavoidable, the development provides for greater than 1:1 replacement and retention, with UK sourced stock from native species, planted onsite or in a suitable local location.</p>
Ancient woodland	Natural England 10140	Natural England and Forestry Commission have produced standing advice for planning authorities in relation to ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees. The standard advice should be referred to and additional guidance provided in the Natural England response.
	Natural England 10140	Welcome that policy makes clear reference to protection of ancient replanted woodland and / or ancient & semi natural woodland. Should consider impacts on ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees in line with paragraph 186 of NPPF.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Links to BIO2	Natural England 10140	This policy should make a clear connection to policy BIO2 for the protection of functionally linked land of protected bat species which are key to Mottisfont Bats SAC.
Other ecology	10052	Planting of new woodland highly commendable, however care should be taken that it is not achieved by destroying other important ecology.
Planting for future generations	10052	Would like to see planting for future generations - the planting of species such as oak, which are hugely important for biodiversity and a haven for significant numbers of species and no other tree species in the UK supports a greater diversity of like than ancient oak. Hedgerow oaks are declining due to age and root damage from developments. However, they are an important part of the landscape character of the hedgerows in the areas around Southern Test Valley.
Sourcing trees	10052	Care should be taken to source any replacement trees locally or within the UK to avoid the introduction of pests and diseases.
Space to grow	10052	Care should be taken that trees and woodlands are given enough space to grow and flourish with additional suitable planting on their margins for the future.
Support	10397	Agree with TVBC policy to increase tree cover throughout the borough through the planting of new street and other trees. Continue to require new and appropriate planting where possible and appropriate with new development. Planting must be of appropriate species, density and size
	11014	Strongly support the preservation of ancient woodland, ancient semi-natural woodland and ancient or veteran trees
Tree Planting	11014	Tree planting may form part of a new flood risk management plan to slow down water ingress into the river
Tree retention	10052	Existing native trees should be retained in all but the most exceptional cases. Their value for amenity, biodiversity, air quality and mitigation for climate change is irreplaceable.
	10052	Removal of existing mature trees cannot be immediately mitigated by planting new trees, which take many years to come to maturity.
Tree species	10760	Include fruit, berry, and nut trees suitable for birds and humans
Trees and Hedgerows	10812	Policy is welcome, every opportunity should be taken to ensure hedgerow and tree groups are linked together to create and maintain wildlife corridors
	10223	welcome the inclusion of a specific policy for trees and hedgerows but could be stronger wording Development will not be permitted where the proposed development takes account of trees, both above and below ground, (including on-site and off-site trees) unless; a) it provides for suitable new tree, woodland and hedgerow planting and future growth, to support an increase in overall tree cover

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Woodland margins	10052	Woodland margin species are also important in these locations.
Trees and hedgerows	10753	There should be preservation of ancient trees and hedges across the site and assessments should be carried out prior to any development.
	10938	It is wrong that the protection of trees and hedgerows is only given consideration during construction but is removed afterwards. Valuable biodiverse habitats should be given protection within planning permissions.
woodland	10694	The plan will lead to the destruction of woodlands
Natural environment	10694	The council should put restrictions on developers to look after the natural environment.
Landscape character	10720	There will be a damaging loss of landscape character and residential amenity as a consequence of the proposed developments being built on top of designated countryside.
Trees and hedgerows	11135	There should be strong protection for existing site trees and hedgerows when permission is granted for the duration of the build but also for many years after-in perpetuity
TPOs	11135	Consider use of TPO's routinely for any significant trees identified in development proposals
Natural Capital and Ecosystem Services	10139	Disappointed to the lack of references to Natural Capital and Ecosystem Services in the plan, the benefits are clear in NPPF paragraph 180(b), and it is fundamental to climate change and should be part of the Local Plan framework

Chapter 5 - Health and Wellbeing
Paragraphs - 5.273-5.298

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan and theme based policies will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Open Space -quality, access, health and wellbeing focus	
Local Green Space -protection and lack of policy that allows for designation	

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Public Open Space	Hampshire County Council 10099	This policy is mainly focused on formalised space provision and access/recreation rather than health and wellbeing. More focus on health benefits and outcomes is suggested.
Public Open Space	Hampshire County Council 10099	Consider open space quality as well as quantity. It is suggested that the following aspects of quality are embedded: accessibility and inclusion; safe spaces for women and girls; play and hang out space for children and young people; age-friendly spaces.
Public Rights of Way	11135	The width of PROWs should be actively maintained
Access	10602	The draft local plan 2040 does not consider the local area for cyclists and pedestrians, with no links into Eastleigh or Southampton.
Allotments	10124	General view that allotment provision needs to be doubled from the previous plan. Smaller developments also needed to be factored in through some form of contribution
	10124	Smaller gardens and increasing leisure time allied to an ageing population has led to an increasing requirement. Allotments provided after development are very expensive and beyond most local councils

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11020	No detail in Local Plan referencing using Test Valley owned land for allotments. Upper Clatford is looking for land for allotments and residents are no longer allowed access to those in Andover or Goodworth Clatford.
Design for Inclusivity	Hampshire County Council 10099	This, paragraph 5.277 has an opportunity to nurture intergenerational communities and inclusion, but as currently written suggests older residents will require different spaces to other parts of the community, which is not necessarily the case.
Health, Wellbeing and Recreation	11108	The introductory text to the policy is helpful and support the emphasis given to health and wellbeing, the guidance around ongoing management and ownership of open space.
Local Green Space	10170	Local Plan does not include a policy to enable Local Green Spaces to be designated either via the Local Plan or neighbourhood plans
	10170	HPC considers that a policy in the Local Plan would be a positive step
	10170	HPC therefore request that a policy be included in the Local Plan to enable Local Green Spaces to be designated
Open Space	11108	Support Criteria (a) as it sets out clear, concise guidance on the quantitative provision and measurement
	11108	Support Criteria (b) as it sets out clear expectations as to the level of detail/specification
	11108	Support Criteria (c) as it sets out clearly the ongoing maintenance and management
	10812	There is a need to look at open space in Romsey possibly including informal recreation areas in easy reach of the town centre
	10812	Principles are good, but the policy must allow for the consolidation of open space and recreation facilities across several developments to avoid isolated and under used areas and play parks
	10812	Implementation must avoid the current S106 problems of money allocation for areas with no available space
	10812	Land around the Rapids must be preserved for sports, recreation and open space use and any land not designated for those specific purposes must be made available as informal recreation areas within easy reach of the town centre
	10279	The 'early stage of the development' should be more specific. The policy should include that a timescale should be agreed before development is commenced.
	10113	Initial feasibility studies for additional development indicate development could provide play equipment for children and more recreational spaces to provide existing and future residents with better access to recreational opportunities within and around the village

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10114	requests additional wording is added to allow flexibility of provision to suit site circumstances. add to policy 'The appropriate of on-site provision of all the identified typologies will be assessed against site specific circumstances. Offsite contributions for open space will be secured if onsite provision is not delivered as part of a development.'
	11117	Ped/cycle paths should be included in calculation of POS. Policy is too restrictive in this regard, and the approach should be clarified/justified.
	11117	Request that the Council clarify the exclusion of ancillary buildings in POS calculation
SANG	11117	It is not clear whether SANG can also contribute towards Public Open Space provision. SANG provision can form a dual purpose in mitigating habitats impacts of and providing open space. It is considered that separating the two is too restrictive in approach.
Shading	10760	Leisure areas also need areas of shade for humans and wildlife, both from trees and built structures.
Specification and maintenance	10137	Request flexibility/acknowledgement within the criteria b and c, that the specification of play equipment and associated long term management arrangements do not necessarily need to be confirmed at planning permission stage and can be conditioned.
Stacking	10794	Important that the Council clarifies the extent to which the requirements of HE1 will be able to be used as dual purpose areas, including in relation to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and meeting Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements.
Existing Open Space	11108	The Introductory text of the policy is helpful and the intent is supported
	11108	No objection to the policy
	10812	Content with this policy
Green space	10760	Protect existing local green spaces and link these by making wildlife corridors which can include gardens if they have suitable planting and access for wildlife.
	10490	The Walworth Road playing fields should not be considered as an employment site as they are valued green space and support the health and wellbeing of residents.
	10540	It is important that the local plan protects as much green space as possible.
	10554	More housing in the area means a loss of greenspace, which will have a detrimental effect on climate change.
	10875	The proposed development will impact access to open space and will cause the destruction of local nature assets.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Public Open Space	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council request that this policy reflect the role and function of public sector land, specifically the role the disposal of surplus land within school sites, including school playing fields can be used to support improvement to education services. Section 77(1) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 and Part 1 of Schedule 1 to the Academies Act 2010 provides a robust justification for this approach.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	The emerging policy should be amended to allow sufficient flexibility to secure future improvements to education facilities, and it is made clear that school playing fields should not be included within the scope of this policy. This will then mean that the policy will potentially provide the flexibility that the County Council may require to justify the loss of school playing fields when it forms part of the County Council's operational plans for funding education improvements during the Plan period, and planning for a sufficient choice of school places to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Review whether to make suggested amendments
	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council requests that any emerging open space policy should include an additional clause in the policy: Surplus land within school sites, including school playing fields are excluded from this policy. Review whether to add suggested criteria to policy wording
	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council recommend including a footnote or reference in the new clause to: As per Section 77(1) of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 and Part 1 of Schedule 1 to the Academies Act 2010 Review whether to make suggested amendment
Loss of open space	10397	CPC intend to oppose any loss of open spaces especially as it would have a detrimental impact on the community. Open space contributes to green infrastructure which benefits health and wellbeing
Strengthen importance	Natural England 10140	The importance of Local Green Spaces could be strengthened to highlight opportunities to contribute to a wider ecological network.
Open Space	10502	The proposed plan will impact the existing open space in the area.
Access to the Countryside	11108	The Introductory text of the policy is helpful and the intent is supported

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10397	Determined to ensure areas marked as countryside remain as previously detailed and to enable full access to the countryside and local green spaces through network of PROW
	10397	Require TVBC and HCC to ensure the continuing use and care for all countryside access which currently exists, important where settlements expand such as Velmore Farm proposed development
	10812	Good policy but would be useful to have some policy that encourages joining up existing footpaths, cycleways and other PROWs
Fully support policy approach.	11161	Fully support policy approach which is embedded within the design work undertaken on proposals for residential development at Homestead Farm, Weyhill Road (alternative site promoted through SHELAA) through enhanced links to PROW network and preservation of its character.
Fully support the provision of opportunities to increase public access.	11161	Fully support the policy approach to increasing public access, subject to two criteria. An alternative site promoted at Homestead Farm, Weyhill Road, Andover, could potentially deliver improved access to the Harroway public right of way.
Green Space	10124	Andover has significantly less green space than some of our major urban centres, with wards coming under the mandated government standards Green space should be usable and not just areas of open space
Public Open Space	Hampshire County Council 10099	Suggest the addition of greenspace especially those in towns centres or communities where access to the countryside is limited and may depend on car ownership. This access should be equally balanced across all needs and access to transport.
Public paths	10938	Support policy that resists fencing of public rights of way inappropriately.
Public Rights of Way	10397	PROW important when they are close to other settlements such as Eastleigh and Southampton for access to forest areas close to parish boundaries. Intend to maintain benefits which provide those opportunities for recreation and exercise
	10397	Support that network of PROW must be secured and evolve with close attention paid to the edges of settlements. Important for circular, family friendly, accessible trails and cycle routes in order to meet the needs of many multiple users
	11135	fencing in of PROWs should be resisted
Support	10052	Helpful that this section points out that access to natural greenspace brings about a greater appreciation of nature and its importance.
Walking links	10052	It is important to seek to improve walking links from the centre of settlements out into the countryside. These would improve access to natural greenspace and act as green corridors (albeit narrow ones) for wildlife and should be seen as part of a healthier greener network.
Biodiversity	11027	The proposed development will do the opposite and lead to the destruction of natural assets.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Health, Wellbeing and Recreation	11077	Support of draft Policy HE1, states that a key part of helping to encourage and facilitate healthy lifestyles is to ensure access, protection and enhancement to open spaces, the countryside, recreational and sports provision, and that it is important that new developments provide open space to meet the needs of the future residents. Agree with these principles, and is aiming to deliver a significant gain to these aims through its proposals at Grateley

Chapter 5 - Design
Paragraphs - 5.299-5.347

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan and theme based policies will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Design- include more emphasis on design for people-led outcomes around health and wellbeing and reducing inequalities	
Flexibility-policy to allow for alternative approaches	

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Design	10732	identifying and addressing health requirements of existing and new development critical to ensuring deliver of healthy, safe and inclusive communities
	10119	Endorse the high-quality approach to design set out in policy DES1 and concur that Design Coding is an appropriate design tool for securing quality objectives and shape placemaking and beauty in larger multi-phased sites like the Manor Farm allocation.
	11108	The introductory text of the policy is helpful and support the focus of 'place making' principles consistent with the NPPF and National design Guidance
	11108	Support the need to articulate the design rationale in preapplication correspondence, as part of community engagement or within design access statements accompanying planning applications
	11108	p. 5.310 is supported
	11108	commend the reference to the importance of public realm and creating adaptable, durable and resilient spaces, including through the integration of infrastructure that can yield multiple benefits (e.g. SUDs)
	11108	The approach taken by the Council is supported
	10114	question the need for this policy - a combination of Policy DES1 and DES2 would more efficient.
	11117	Further guidance on the thresholds of development that criteria h) apply to, and level of detail expected would be useful in assisting applicants

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Design Considerations	11108	Support the additional tier of detail in this section of the LP
Flexibility	10114	<p>If the policy remains, seek additional flexibility be built into this policy to allow for an alternative approach to be agreed</p> <p>A. Development will should positively reflect the ten characteristics of well designed places, as set out in the National Design Guide (and any successor) and will be designed through a sound contextual analysis and understanding of the site and its surroundings, including any opportunities and constraints; B. Development should maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive character of the locality, through taking account of the individuality of the Borough's settlements, landscapes, buildings, ecology, topography, history and heritage assets; C. Development should contribute positively to, and not detract from, the distinctive character of the immediate and wider landscape; D. Development should take opportunities, wherever possible, to improve the public realm and to minimise opportunities for disorder and crime; E. Development will be designed to be resilient to the changing climate by adopting sustainable design practices; F. High quality green and blue infrastructure should be provided with new development, designed with resilient hard and soft landscaping, and integrating</p>
Green Spaces	10720	There will be a damaging loss of landscape character and residential amenity as a consequence of the proposed developments being built on top of designated countryside.
Habitat types	10564	<p>The wording needs to include the built environment alongside green and blue infrastructure, to reflect this can be a habitat in its own right. Amended wording suggested.</p> <p>"The design of new development will need to maintain and enhance nature and biodiversity, deliver enhancements to green and blue infrastructure and the built environment, including hedgerows, trees and waterbodies (particularly where these features offer a valuable habitat."</p>
Design	Hampshire County Council 10099	Policy should include more emphasis on design for people-led outcomes around health and wellbeing and consider inclusion of the following design principles to ensure that developments are of the best quality to promote good health, wellbeing and reduce inequalities: The 10 Indicators of Healthy Streets as set out within the LTP4: and Building for a Healthy Life Assessment.
Design	Hampshire County Council 10099	With regard to point H, the County Council would recommend altering the wording so it is clear that the masterplan, design and access statement and design code are all required to support major developments. Design and access statements and design codes do not achieve the same outcome.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		The design and access statement is intended to support the application process whereas a design code as more weight and can be enforced post decision.
Health Impact Assessment	10732	recommend use of HIAs on significant residential developments to ensure development contributes to promoting healthier lifestyles and improving overall health and wellbeing
High Quality Development	10812	Delivering high quality development is subjective, needs more definition, including what is possible considering central government rules
	11014	Ensure that any new development is well designed and conserves and enhances the natural and built environment of the Parish
	10113	Objectives related to housing and design are supported and the Estate would seek to promote development which would provide a range of safe, attractive, integrated, and well-designed homes and environments
	11077	Support the wording of draft Policy DES1.
delete text	Historic England 10049	paragraph currently includes text that simply states "Link to other policies delete Link to other policies
heritage asset settings	Historic England 10049	we support the policy, it would be improved to mention explicitly setting as a consideration in criterion B. We suggest wording for consideration. Development will maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive character of the locality, through taking account of the individuality of the Borough's settlements, landscapes, buildings, ecology, topography, history and heritage assets (including their setting);"
utilities infrastructure	National Gas Transmission 11159	The increasing pressure for development is leading to more development sites being brought forward through the planning process on land that is crossed by National Gas Transmission infrastructure
	National Gas Transmission 11159	National Gas Transmission advocates the high standards of design and sustainable development forms promoted through national planning policy and understands that contemporary planning and urban design agenda require a creative approach to new development around underground gas transmission pipelines and other National Gas Transmission assets addition of x. taking a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development including respecting existing site constraints including utilities situated within sites."

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
design and on site constraints	National Grid Electricity Transmission 10152	<p>increasing pressure for development is leading to more development sites being brought forward through the planning process on land that is crossed by NGET infrastructure. NGET advocates the high standards of design and sustainable development forms promoted through national planning policy and understands that contemporary planning and urban design agenda require a creative approach to new development around high voltage overhead lines and other NGET assets.</p> <p>add “p. take a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development including respecting existing site constraints including utilities situated within sites.”</p>
NPDs	11115	An element of design should continue to be reserved for the Neighbourhood Plan level
Public transport provision	10243	<p>Urban design that has little or no regard to facilitating safe and efficient bus penetration and operation is now a nationally recognised problem. The lack of any mention of public transport accessibility is typical and if perpetuated will no doubt lead to further failures to make suitable provision for public transport.</p> <p>Point G should be amended as follows: The layout of new developments will be permeable and legible allowing for suitable access and movement for all modes pursuant to a hierarchy that effectively prioritises active travel and public transport and supports their maximum possible use. Where cycle and car parking infrastructure, utilities and services are required, they will be provided in appropriate and convenient locations for the users and designed to integrate positively;</p>
self-build	10115	to boost contextual analysis and the delivery of schemes that have a sense of place, developments must be planned in a cohesive manner, with each building and its relationship to the next and street scene requiring close attention, particularly in sensitive locations close to Heritage Assets.
	10115	no service plot is ever going to achieve the continuity of scale, form and design than a property that has been developed as part of a cohesive design and constructed at the same time, using the same craftsmanship and trades as the other Open Market properties
	10115	where there are other material factors at play in respect of the design, scale and massing of the development such as heritage and design matters, the actual scope for ‘custom’ houses is very narrow, given the need for a cohesive architectural design
	10115	potential for conflict with Policy is great, as is the likely dilution of architectural quality and materials to the detriment of place making, particularly close to Heritage Assets.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Electric Vehicle Charging Points	Southampton CC 10098	Whilst requirement for electric vehicle charging points for new homes now addressed through Part S Building Regulations, need should still be explicitly recognised in local plan to prevent design issues
Sustainability	10279	There is much reference to this subject in the Plan however the definition of sustainability needs to be made clear.
Sustainable and High-Quality Design	10812	Suggested amendment Poorly worded, should be in the form "Development will only be permitted if..."
	10812	No apparent mention of designing development to minimise crime and maximise security. Add "so long as the safety and security of the neighbourhood is not compromised"
High Standard	11135	Generally, agree but should be implemented to a high standard as well
Bird nesting options	10952	<p>Policy DES2 needs adding to in relation to swift bricks, artificial nest cups and existing nest sites. Recommended wording has been provided. The National Model Design Code Part 2 Guidance Notes recommend bird bricks, the PPG Natural Environment section (paragraph 023) highlights the value of swift bricks which are a universal nest brick for small birds. This addition will enable implementation of a policy recommending swift bricks, by ensuring early inclusion on the drawings for an integrated design process and reliable installation on site.</p> <p>Text to add: Swift bricks should be installed in all new-build developments including extensions, in accordance with best-practice guidance such as BS 42021 or CIEEM which require at least one swift brick per home on average for each development. Artificial nest cups for house martins may be proposed instead of swift bricks where recommended by an ecologist.</p> <p>Existing nest sites for building-dependent species such as swifts and house martins should be protected, as these endangered red-listed species which are present but declining in the Test Valley borough return annually to traditional nest sites. Mitigation should be provided if these nest sites cannot be protected.</p>
Consistency with NPPF	10120	While the government has show support for development to incorporate good design principles, note that paragraph 133 of the NPPF sets out about the role of design guides or codes consistent with the principles in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code.
Design	10119	Policy text goes beyond NPPF (para 133-135) requirements in that it requires developments to improve character. Amend wording.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Final sentence of policy delete the word 'improve'.
	10204	Chilbolton generally support the delivery of high quality design and design details
Design Considerations	11108	No objection to the policy
Design Details	10812	Content with this policy
Ecology and Biodiversity	10067	Please add to the policy the following sentence Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species and should be installed in all new-build developments including extensions, in accordance with best practice guidance such as BS 42021:2022 or CIEEM. Swift bricks are a significantly better option than external boxes due to their long lifetime, no maintenance requirements, improved thermal regulation, and aesthetic integration. Artificial nest cups for house martins may be proposed instead of swift bricks where an ecologist specifically recommends it
	10067	National design code guidance recommends bird bricks and their inclusion at an early stage of the design process for effective integration into building design and reliable installation on site.
Energy Efficiency	10139	Disappointing this policy makes no mention of making residential and commercial buildings more energy efficient by having heat-pumps, solar panels and triple glazing.
	10139	Disappointing this policy makes no mention of energy efficiency, the global warming crisis surely implies this should not be left to the whim of the developer
	10120	Design policies should not be overly prescriptive and require some flexibility in order for schemes to respond to site specifics and the character of the local area. There will not be a 'one size fits all' solution.
Green Spaces	10840	Support the policies relating to trees and green infrastructure and seek assurance that the unique tree canopy in Whinwhistle Rd, home to wildlife is specifically recognised and protected by the Test Valley Local Plan 2040.
Access to Public Open Space	Hampshire County Council 10099	Links to greenspace provision and proximity and ease of access should be key for all housing within a development to consider landscape proposals as having a climate resilience purpose beyond the sometimes solely decorative, screening or buffering effect used by some developments.
Space Standards	Hampshire County Council 10099	Suggest including specifications for internal space standards private outside space for flats and apartments. This wording could also be picked up in Policy HOU6.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
heritage asset settings	Historic England 10049	<p>recommend adding a consideration to this paragraph that refers also to the setting of heritage assets.</p> <p>Larger scale buildings may be appropriate provided that important views, especially of landmark features from public places (including transport corridors, public realm and rights of way) are retained and consideration is given to potential impacts on the setting of heritage assets</p>
Swift bricks	10067	<p>Text should be added to policy DES2 in relation to swift bricks, with wording recommended. The reason for including in this policy is because this is in accordance with the National Design Code guidance which recommends bird bricks, and to ensure that swift bricks are included at an early design stage for effective integration into the building design and reliable installation on site.</p> <p>Insert: Swift bricks are a universal nest brick for small bird species and should be installed in all new-build developments including extensions, in accordance with best-practice guidance such as BS 42021:2022 or CIEEM. Swift bricks are a significantly better option than external boxes due to their long lifetime, no maintenance requirements, improved thermal regulation, and aesthetic integration. Artificial nest cups for house martins may be proposed instead of swift bricks where an ecologist specifically recommends it.</p>
Protecting Character of Settlement	10397	It is pertinent to all proposals that impact the size, use, spatial character and landscape of existing plots and gardens. Where subdivision is proposed, the resulting size and character of the proposed plot, and that the remainder of the original plot following subdivision, should not be significantly smaller than those within the immediate character area
	10397	It is essential that requirements relating to the size, scale, layout, type, siting and detailed design of proposed development does not harm the special character of the RASC, with regard to landscape buildings, street scene, trees, boundary treatment, spatial character and views. These criteria very importantly also include extensions, alterations, conversions, sub-divisions and redevelopment
RASC	10397	Applaud TVBC identification of Chilworth as a RASC, correct to formalise the defined area as having a distinct character, townscape and landscape which contribute to special character and quality
	10397	Intention to retain this RASC and retain its comprehensive policies to safeguard its character, aims to retain and preserve the distinct architectural, spatial and landscape character of the identified areas and supports development that retains and sustains the distinctive local character

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10397	Mindful concerning proposals that involve the subdivision of plots, the demolition, replacement, extension or division of existing buildings, new development, frontages and boundary treatments which have the potential to harm the special character of the RASC
	10812	Content with this policy
RASC boundary Chilworth	10157	<p>Objection to the definition of Residential Areas of Special Character as it relates to land at and around Woodside, Chilworth, and north of Carlisle House. These residential properties should be included within the DES3 RASC boundary (and within a similarly revised settlement boundary)</p> <p>Amend ENV4 RASC boundary to include properties at and around Woodside, Chilworth, and North of Carlisle House. Map provided.</p>
Subdivision of land	11135	Subdivision of land into smaller plots for sale as 'potential building plots should be actively resisted
Support	10858	Relating to Chilworth, I agree with the wording shown
Justification	10201	Question whether policy requirement is justified for residential development of 300 homes or more. Whilst could be seen as essential element of regeneration, this is not the same with residential development where public art should be secondary to a well designed development. Public art may form part of design, but this should be for developer to decide, not the Council
Public Art	10119	<p>Support the integration of public art within the Manor Farm (Policy NA5) development to help achieve beneficial placemaking and local identity design objectives.</p> <p>Final sentence of policy delete the word 'improve'.</p>
	10812	Content with this policy but would like to see the encouragement of public art that incorporates water and/or fountains to reflect ties to the River Test
	10279	<p>Suggested addition to policy</p> <p>The policy should include the submission of the public art details and by when they need to be submitted, as well as when its installation shall be completed.</p>
Support	10817	Support the role that public art has in contributing to place-making. Policy and supporting text should be modified to recognise that public art can take many forms. Engaging and interactive public art encompasses a vast spectrum of art practices and form and should be defined within the policy to define its benefits and roles.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Threshold	10137	Question the blanket approach of this policy and question the suitability of public art on all development of 300 or more homes. There will clearly be some development, like regeneration and redevelopment scheme in Andover Town centre, where public art may be appropriate, albeit this may not be the case for all developments of 300 or more homes elsewhere.

Chapter 5 - Housing
Paragraphs - 5.348-5.451

Key Issue	Officer Response
Affordable Housing	The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan and theme based policies will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Rural Affordable Housing	
Extra Care Housing	
Housing Mix	
Housing in Protected Landscapes	
Thresholds and Viability	
Community Led Development	
First Homes	
Housing for Older People and Specialist Housing	
Local Housing Needs	
Housing Mix	
Space Standards	
Self Build and Custom Build Housing	
Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Healthy Places	Hampshire County Council 10099	Suggest considering a cross link to policies DES1 and DES2 with the consideration of building for healthy life, healthy streets, lifetime homes and space standards to be incorporated into these developments. Living in an overcrowded household is associated with worse health outcomes. Inclusivity has been highlighted as a vision for the local plan and seeking homes that aim to address this issue will aid in not worsening health inequalities.
40%	10201	Given 40% affordable housing is challenging for a significant number of developments aside from those of highest value areas, the Council will need to consider whether a differential rate between value areas or at the very least between greenfield and brownfield land would be possible

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Affordable Homes Rural	10139	The current plan has not delivered many affordable homes in rural Test Valley, the borough wide figure is due to what has been secured on large sites in Andover and Romsey
Affordable Housing	10082	The policy ignores that fact that most residents are opposed to more affordable housing in the villages.
	10612	Lack of any plan to counteract very high cost of affordable housing within Test Valley.
	10812	Policy still requires the building of unaffordable housing at a ratio of 60:40, does nothing to ensure affordable housing can actually be afforded by young residents and less well off families
	10812	Would be useful to explain what is meant by affordable housing and even better if the cost could be tied to local salaries rather than local housing prices
	10279	Suggested amendment
	10279	The criteria of the size of the sites in hectares should exclude the land taken for roads, drives and access as in the SPD on Affordable Housing. The policy and the SPD should read the same.
	10279	The requirement of appropriate integration of affordable housing and market housing should include some specific mix
	11014	Recognises that affordability is different for older and younger residents and is thus difficult to define in a policy. The former may own a house and be capital rich but cash poor, while the latter lack both capital and cash
	11014	Defining affordability simply in terms of income is manifestly unfair to the younger age groups, given the ability of a house owner to convert capital into cash when downsizing. A measure of case-by-case judgement is likely to be required, based on local needs
	10777	SHMA identifies affordable housing need of 437 affordable homes for rent and 215 affordable home ownership homes per year. A figure which is significantly above current affordable housing delivery targets
	10777	Draft Local Plan (para 5.356) accepts the affordable housing threshold does not provide for the affordable housing need in full and that the Council will seek to provide for the maximum affordable housing it can achieve
	10777	Evident that large scale strategic sites are an important delivery mechanism for affordable housing across the borough and within the NTV HMA
	10082	The policy states that it allows for alternative formal planning mechanism-Who will use this mechanism?
	10592	The plan should give due consideration to affordable housing, and help should be given to people born in the village so they can stay in the village.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10139	The affordable housing policies repeat the existing policies which have delivered few exception sites and community led schemes
	10139	If there is development in a village where people need affordable housing it is not satisfactory to move the provision to outside the village by accepting a financial contribution in lieu.
	10652	Concerned that developers often claim providing shared ownership properties are not financially viable and contributions are often accepted in lieu of affordable housing
	10722	Developers prefer to build for profit which includes a reduction in the amount of affordable housing which is likely to be the greatest need
Affordable Housing - Trigger	10006	CPC believe affordable housing should be a top priority, we wouldn't want to see our NDP policy at Peake Way eroded by the introduction of several smaller developments (up to 9 houses) in the village
	10204	Request TVBC consider again no requirement that affordable homes should be built in the parish where new development takes place or when houses are sold under right to buy
Affordable Housing - viability	10777	Viability of the draft Plan is prepared on the basis of sites delivering up to 40% affordable housing which the Whole Plan Viability Assessment confirms should be retained; to improve affordable delivery allocate further housing sites to ensure meeting identified affordable housing needs, whilst also ensuring that sites remain viable
Affordable housing requirement	10139	The affordable housing requirement is extremely high and cannot be solely met by relying on 40% of development being affordable. If it were, the housing target would need to be increased but this would only produce more houses that are not needed, increase greenfield take and the population adding more strain to services
designated rural areas	10641	Believe it's a mistake that Wellow has not been designated as a rural area-if not could there be an explanation as to why
Differential rates	10120	Given 40% is challenging for a significant number of developments aside from those in the highest value areas, the Council will need to consider whether a differential rate between value areas would be a more suitable approach.
Downsize Housing	10204	The local population support new affordable housing and downsize housing to meet established need, the option to pay cash in lieu of houses should be denied and suitable affordable or downsize houses must be provided
Education - Test Valley School	10727	Difficulties of recruiting teachers given the fact that Stockbridge has the highest average house prices in the County.
Financial Contribution	10386	It is not satisfactory to move the affordable provision to outside the village by accepting a financial contribution in lieu

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Extra Care Housing	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council has a statutory duty to ensure that there is diversity and quality in the supply of care providers so that there are enough high-quality services for eligible people to choose from.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	In response to demographic change, the County Council is undertaking an ambitious Extra Care Housing programme to allow older adults to maintain independence in a home of their own. Link provided to HCC guidance
	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council has commissioned a Service Demand and Needs Study for affordable adult extra care housing in Hampshire.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council's Strategic Commissioning Lead for Older Adults Extra Care Housing would welcome opportunity to meet with Borough Council Planning Officers to discuss the identified affordable older persons housing needs further once this report is available. This is likely to support the text in para. 5.365 that the inclusion of an element of specialist residential accommodation and facilities for older people within the affordable housing provision may be appropriate depending on the proposal.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Suggested amendment to include supported/specialist housing that is not just for retirement as follows: 'Proposals which include the provision of extra care accommodation, assisted living, or other form of retirement or specialist housing [...]'. 'pepper-potting' affordable provision with the market housing would not be appropriate for an affordable Extra Care housing scheme. Affordable Extra Care requires a minimum number of units (min 60 units) to be built in a block to be economically viable and managed which makes pepper-potting with market housing within the building unachievable. Suggest amending text to account for the flexibility required in terms of the accommodation schedules for proposed blocks of affordable Extra Care scheme.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	
Higher delivery	10120	If the affordable housing need cannot be reliably delivered through the current level of allocations which require a high percentage affordable homes on site, the Council should consider an uplift in their housing requirement to allow more sites to come forward with a lower level of affordable housing to help meet these needs.
Housing	11029	"Right to acquire" applying to houses built as "low cost" or "social" housing denies people looking for a low or regular-cost rental house.
	11029	Priority that all new "social" houses built in Test Valley be retained in the rental market.
Housing mix	10139	Disappointing there is no mention of housing mix, it is important to seek a mix of housing reflecting future needs and composition of housing stock.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Need	10727	Sustainably located new homes to provide a much-needed boost to local pupil numbers and the affordable homes proposed will be able to attract new teachers if designated for key workers. This could be achieved by both a cascade provision within a S106 agreement, to favour people who work within Stockbridge
Housing Waiting List	10139	The need for affordable housing is emphasised by the size of TVBC's housing waiting list which is one of the largest in South East England as seen in the Department for Levelling Up Housing and Communities 'total households on the housing waiting list at 31 March 2022/23' graph
Infrastructure - Local Amenities	10840	East and West Wellow should be identified separately in Figure A, Page 204 due to their difference in terms of access to local amenities.
Infrastructure - Public Transport	10840	East and West Wellow should be identified separately in Figure A, Page 204 due to their difference in terms of their access to Public Transport.
Landscape Character	10840	East and West Wellow should be identified separately in Figure A, Page 204 due to their difference in terms of character and identity.
Need	10139	The aim of providing 200 affordable dpa does not appear to come close to providing for the real needs of the borough
Negotiation	10201	If Council relies on negotiation it must be made clearer in local plan this is the case, in order to convey to decision makers that lower level of affordable housing acceptable and not exceptional occurrence in para.5.358 of local plan
	10201	Whilst approach consistent with NPPF para.58, clear that Council considers it necessary to depart from this approach and as such must clearly state its position in both policy and supporting text. This will ensure where development comes forward with affordable housing provision below that set out in the local plan, decision makers will not seek to prevent it on basis of NPPF para.58 that decision makers can assume that accords with local plan policies is viable
	10120	Concerned with negotiation being the development starting point of affordable housing delivery as the NPPF and PPG both seek to limit the extent to which negotiation is required as a result of local plan policies. As such, a local plan that relies on negotiation to secure the delivery of its development requirements will face challenges as to its soundness.
Percentage to reflect infrastructure costs and values	10729	A balanced approach should be taken to percentage requirement for affordable housing, reflecting evidence of infrastructure costs and values associated with wider delivery of the plan
Settlement Hierarchy	10840	Wellow has been designated as non-rural on Figure A Page 204, whereas East Wellow remains distinctly rural in comparison to West Wellow.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10840	The inclusion of separate inset maps for East and West Wellow (51 & 52 respectively) contradicts Figure A on page which labels them both as Wellow and therefore non-rural.
	10840	East and West Wellow should be identified separately in Figure A, Page 204 due to their difference in terms of geographical situation.
Site size equivalent	10201	Not clear how set size threshold for development between 10 and 14 units that is lower than for major development in NPPF para.65. If including site size threshold this should be 0.5ha consistent with definition.
Support	11135	Generally agree
Threshold	10139	The 15 dwelling threshold for rural development to contain the full quota of affordable housing should be dropped. The NPPF paragraph 65 allows LPAs to set the threshold, so why not 2 or 3?
	10386	The 15 dwelling threshold for rural development should be dropped, affordable housing is much needed and new homes in the villages are highly marketable so removal is unlikely deter development
	10386	The NPPF (para 65) allows LPA's to set the threshold in rural areas, so why not 2 or 3?
Viability testing	10729	Recognise importance of affordable housing and need for this to be considered through the plan making process in context of up to date and detailed local evidence of housing need and viability
	10729	Important that plan tested for viability purposes, to ensure deliverable, with policy requirements refined accordingly depending on the outcome of assessment work
	10201	That Council will negotiate affordable housing on basis of policy based upon viability study which suggests no uniform level of provision where it can be said most schemes are viable. NPPF and PPG both seek to limit extent to which negotiation is required as a result of local plan policies. As such, this approach faces challenges as to its soundness.
Consistency	Wiltshire C 10202	Policy broadly consistent with Wiltshire LP requirements
Caravans	10204	Request TVBC consider again no prevention of caravans becoming permanent dwellings in the countryside
Housing	11029	Provision to be made to provide low-cost and rental houses for those working in the agricultural sector.
Protected Landscapes	Natural England 10140	This policy should make reference to, where relevant, the importance of having note of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, and potential for additional consideration of the New Forest National Park. Their management plans could be key for assessing development proposals or seeking the opinions of the landscape advisor / planner for the National Landscape or National Park.
Occupational accommodation	10812	Content with this policy but it would be helpful to strengthen it to avoid such applications being used as a trojan horse to get a non-agricultural dwelling in the countryside contrary to settlement policy

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
for Rural Workers		
	10279	Suggested amendment
	10279	This should require to be relevant to 'temporary accommodation' as well as a dwelling.
Existing Dwellings and Ancillary Residential Development	10812	Content with this policy
Housing Extensions	10204	Request TVBC consider again no limiting to 50% extensions of housing in the countryside (old COM11/COM12)
Protected Landscapes	Natural England 10140	This policy should make reference to, where relevant, the importance of having note of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, and potential for additional consideration of the New Forest National Park. Their management plans could be key for assessing development proposals or seeking the opinions of the landscape advisor / planner for the National Landscape or National Park.
	11135	A limit on extension/replacement size should be considered not only for character/landscaping but also in considering the overall range of dwelling types/sizes in the area
links to other policies	Historic England 10049	suggest adding cross-references to other relevant local plan policies in the supporting text to policies CL11 and CL13, noting the role of embodied carbon in the decision-making process, and encouragement for re-use where practicable in accordance with policy EC2
links to other policies	Historic England 10049	suggest adding cross-references to other relevant local plan policies in the supporting text to heritage significance, seeking to avoid the loss of features of heritage interest and the presumption in favour of retaining non-designated heritage assets in policy ENV2.
Protected Landscapes	Natural England 10140	This policy should make reference to, where relevant, the importance of having note of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, and potential for additional consideration of the New Forest National Park. Their management plans could be key for assessing development proposals or seeking the opinions of the landscape advisor / planner for the National Landscape or National Park. Recognise this is touched on in relation to this policy.
Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside	10812	Content with this policy
	11135	A limit on extension/replacement size should be considered not only for character/landscaping but also in considering the overall range of dwelling types/sizes in the area

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Affordable Housing	10082	The policy ignores the reality that many residents do not wish to have affordable housing in the rural communities.
Affordable Housing - Viability	10204	Developments should be predominantly affordable to meet housing need and market housing is supported by local evidence. To be able to afford to build affordable there needs to be some market to sell, policy is vague on the proportions required to make projects viable
Community Developments	10697	Any housing developments should be walkable, mixed-use neighbourhoods and more infrastructure to support these developments.
Community Led Development	10058	AA PC welcomes the proposal to encourage community led development but opposes criterion e) which we think will considerably limit the number of community led projects that will come forward
	10170	This policy will replace COM9 of the current Local Plan and is more onerous than the current policy
	10170	Would make it more challenging for a community to bring forward schemes as it requires PCs to take the lead and only in exceptional circumstances can third parties be the lead
	10170	Could limit the potential of such schemes unless a PC had the resources to undertake what would be required to satisfy the policy
	10812	A good policy but would it be better to actively encourage rather than just permit? The wording seems a bit discouraging
	10279	Why would community led development be required to add more than a S.106 agreement or CIL to support the viability of existing services or facilities?
	11014	Ensure that new development meets the needs of the local community, preferably by being community-led
	11014	Seek a community-led planning system that better protects the environment, allows communities to participate in planning their future and delivers the right homes in the right places with the right infrastructure
	11014	A community led housing scheme is being investigated by CPC to deliver up to 20 smaller houses comprising 10 affordable and 10 retirement properties, believe that a contribution of 20 homes to the northern Test Valley total of 260 homes is proportionate for the size of the village.
	11014	Believe that leaving the decision to the village in the shape of a community land trust seems the fairest approach.
	11014	Schemes will need to be innovative, affordable and capable of meeting needs and aspirations (yet to be established) for the duration of the plan and beyond. However, with further increases in population of the town generated by the extensive new builds, TVBC must continue to remember the needs of the many surrounding rural villages.
	11014	Wish the LP to spell out the level or kind of support that could be expected from TVBC by these communities

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10139	The community led policy is more onerous in meeting the criteria as under the current policy, schemes have been initiated by landowners/developers
	10139	This policy is less flexible and potentially more challenging for communities to satisfy
	10058	Suggested amendment to criterion b)
Suggested Amendment	10058	
	10058	
Viability	10058	"Predominantly" suggests only a minority of market homes be permitted, would severely limit the number of viable schemes contrary to the desire to integrate market and affordable homes
	10058	Numbers of affordable and market homes that are viable should be determined on a case by case basis, taking into account evidence of need and community benefit.
Housing in the Countryside	10204	Chilbolton generally support affordable housing and community led development, the policy for rural exception and first homes gives details of how you can build homes in the countryside
Housing Need	10037	Support inclusion of a rural exception site policy within the Local Plan as a mechanism to deliver small scale rural affordable housing. However, modifications are required in order to address NPPF paras 16 and 35 to ensure a positive framework is set for rural exception sites
	10037	It would be helpful if this clarification on how the Council expect needs to be evidenced is also included within criterion a) of the policy text
	10037	There are other cases where exception sites may meet the needs of adjoining parishes, particularly where a range of smaller parishes or settlements and development in one will support a range of communities. A flexible wording is required to address these concerns in criterion a)
Meet Borough wide needs	10729	Rural Exception Sites area to deliver housing to meet local needs in areas or on sites that would not otherwise deliver housing. Need should not be restricted to immediate parish as stated in criterion a)
	10729	If a need remains Borough wide, if a suitable site has been identified it should be able to meet unmet need across the Borough
Open Market Housing	10139	The policy including an element of open market housing may make securing and delivering exception sites more challenging as landowners will want to maximise the value of their site
Rural Exception Affordable Housing	10036	Schemes brought forward as rural exception affordable housing provision the 20% percentage is to be set at a level that ensures true affordability and must be demonstrated in development proposals as achievable. Social housing provision for lower income households should be included
	10036	Our experience is this exception has acted as a loophole which some developers seek to exploit, rather than as intended to encourage affordable homes for local low paid workers in rural areas
	10036	We have seen developers concoct local needs by taking or combining multiple sources from surrounding areas, not local needs. Most applications in recent years in Thruxton have sought to exploit this exception

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10036	We suggest the following addition to the planning criteria
	10036	We suggest to discourage large speculative attempts at development and to keep rural areas as rural, the exception should be limited to a maximum of 4 dwellings within a 3km radius
	10036	To discourage building houses that can easily be adapted to more expensive housing, defeating the original objectives, we suggest strict limits on total rooms/size/square footage for this exception
	10037	Object to supporting text in para 3.385. NPPF does not restrict the location of rural exception sites to only that which is well related to community facilities and public transport but rather permits them to come forward in any location.
	10037	May be desirable for sites to come forward in close proximity to facilities, rural areas by their very nature have limited access to services and facilities. This restriction would therefore be highly restrictive and counter-productive to the aim of rural exception sites, preventing the provision of housing to meet local need. This supporting text should be deleted
	10037	Criterion d) should be deleted, do not support a policy that contains inherent blockages to the delivery of rural exception sites given the national and local imperatives to meet needs at the earliest opportunity. Sustainability of land must be guided by land-use considerations and not a public competition for potential candidate sites
	10037	Amend Policy HOU3 text as follows
	10204	Chilbolton do not agree that development should be predominantly for affordable housing and that affordable housing be changed to affordable and downsize housing to reflect local needs
	10812	A good policy but would it be better to actively encourage rather than just permit? The wording seems a bit discouraging
Rural Exception Affordable Housing - viability	10279	Is this restriction consistent with the terms of the relevant S.106 agreement for the affordable housing provision?
	10037	Support recognition that market housing may be needed in some cases to deliver schemes and ensure affordable housing needs are met. Supportive of the requirements for this to be limited to the necessary maximum in order to achieve viability.
	10037	Important to ensure primary purpose to provide affordable housing in perpetuity, it is increasingly necessary to provide some market housing to make the proposal viable and deliverable in the short term, as a result of external factors such as higher build costs and land owner expectation, which must be balanced against delivering affordable housing at the restricted rents affordable to their tenants
Affordable Housing	10139	The policy allows for other forms of affordable housing which raises the question of the need for policy HOU1

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
First Homes Exception Affordable Housing	10812	A good policy but would it be better to actively encourage rather than just permit? The wording seems a bit discouraging
Housing	10937	This section removes the constraint that any proposed development must provide a mix of smaller houses in order to ensure property affordability in the area and a balanced population.
Support	11135	Generally agree
Affordable Housing - Viability	10204	Developers should deliver a range of accommodation that reflects local needs, a mix should take into account local housing stock and needs. Support but with the caveat that affordable housing must be integrated and there be no option to pay cash in lieu for not building affordable housing
Downsize Housing	10204	Local housing initiatives should be for affordable housing to meet housing need, in the last housing needs survey analysis showed that some downsize housing would meet the local housing need
Elderly Care Provision	10376	The Draft Local Plan should ensure the needs of older people are fully considered in accordance with the latest National Planning Policy Framework.
	10376	The Local Plan should allocate specific sites to meet the needs of older people that are in the most sustainable locations close to key services.
Existing households	10201	Whilst welcome relatively flexible approach to housing mix it is not justified to base considerations of mix on needs of newly formed households.
	10201	Whilst needs of newly forming households should be considered there will be existing households that have need for larger home as a family expands, or indeed smaller home as they seek to downsize. By restricting consideration of mix to just newly formed households there is potential for needs of current households to be dismissed
	10201	Suggest criterion a) amended to 'a mix of homes by size (including number of bedrooms), type and tenure, which take account of the composition of the current housing stock, identified needs and other appropriate local evidence on needs and the supply of new homes'.
	10120	Agree that the housing mix on development sites should reflect local needs at the time of permission, however this should not be limited to the needs of newly forming households. There will be existing households that have a need for a larger home as a family expands or a smaller home as they seek to downsize. By restricting the consideration of housing mix to just newly formed households, the needs of current households have the potential to be dismissed. Recommend the policy is amended accordingly.
First Homes	10201	Question of size mix of affordable homes interacts with requirement to ensure 25% of all affordable homes are First Homes. Assume delivery of First Homes would be required to provide mix in

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		para.5.399. However, three bed houses as First Homes will have impact on viability and deliverability, given in Test Valley such homes even with 50% discount would be well in excess of £250k price cap.
	10201	50% discount on First Homes would significantly reduce residual land values especially on larger sites and should it be increased due to cap, impact will be even greater. For many developments scenarios viability is challenging when cumulative impacts taken into account. To require affordable mix on First Homes would impact viability, which does not seem to have been considered in viability assessment. Until tested para.5.399 cannot be considered sound.
	10201	Be more specific with regard to how mix for First Homes is applied by removing need for First Homes to come forward on homes or more bedrooms. This would ensure that fewer First Homes sold fall outside the cap reducing negative impacts of First Home requirement on viability
Older Housing	Hampshire County Council 10099	Where specialist housing provision is required for older adults, the recommendation is to include reference to the HAPPI inclusive design principles. Link provided
	10099	Adaptable homes benefit older populations and also support families of all ages through life changing events and poor health. This will enable people of all abilities to continue to live in a community of their choice. This is particularly important as the older population grows, as referenced by the Borough Council and within the JSNA.
Housing	10937	The size of bedrooms in these properties should be limited by the accepted standards of 20sq metres for a double bedroom and 80-120 sq metres for a three-bedroom in a rural area.
Housing for Older People	10376	The Local Plan should recognise that housing for older people has its own requirements and cannot be successfully considered against criteria for adaptable and accessible general family housing.
	10376	The Draft Local Plan is supported by a Strategic Housing Market Assessment, JGC consultation, 2022, which identifies the specialist housing need for older people.
	10376	The Local Plan should make housing for elderly people a priority to accommodate the significant increase in older people and therefore the need for the provision of suitable housing.
	10376	The Local Plan should ensure specialist housing to meet the needs of older people, including that sheltered housing, extra care housing and care homes are addressed separately and not confused with other specialised housing.
	10376	The Local Plan should identify the older person's housing need.
	10376	The Local Plan should include a standalone policy supporting the delivery of specialist older people's housing with good access to services and facilities for older people.
Housing Mix	10722	Mix of housing should be considered for example, smaller properties for older people like bungalows and not just 'retirement living'

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Housing Need	10170	Note the policy follows NPPF advice that a range of houses in terms of type, size and tenure and the needs of different groups in the community should be provided
	10170	Policy criteria includes 'size (including number of bedrooms) type and tenure...needs of newly forming households and local evidence
	10170	HPC supports this policy as a way of controlling the type and size of housing to be permitted in those areas in tiers with a settlement boundary
	10204	It is not clear what standard if any will apply to "efficient use of land"
Insufficient to meet all needs	10729	Plan does not adequately address need for specialist housing
Limited locations only	10729	Policy HOU5 does give certainty of delivery and would concentrate specialist use to only a few locations where need is across the Borough
Local Housing Need	10732	Suggest Council consider need for affordable housing for NHS staff and those employed by other health and care providers in borough
	10732	when staff cannot afford to rent or purchase suitable accommodation near to workplace this affects ability of NHS to recruit and retain staff
	10732	new housing development results in additional health services and NHS workforce growth required to adequately serve population
	10732	recommend Council engage with local Integrated Care Board, NHS Trusts and other relevant ICS partners
	10732	recommend Council ensure local need for affordable housing for NHS staff is factored into housing need assessments and other relevant evidence are e.g. employment or other economic policies
	10732	recommend Council consider site selection and site allocation policies in relation o any identified need for affordable housing for NHS staff, particularly where sites are near large healthcare employers
Major developments only	10729	Only other potential for delivery of specialist housing is Policy HOU5, which requires major developments to consider provision of specialist housing
	10729	Major development is only asked to consider provision which means there is no certainty of delivery of enough housing to meet all needs
	10729	Limiting provision to major developments reduces the locations where provision will be made, rather than addressing the Borough wide need
Market led approach	10729	Market led approach will ensure type of housing is provided for the relevant need in a given location

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Meeting local housing need	10106	Accept additional housing development in and around the settlement will be required to meet local needs, a NDP is on course and anticipated this will identify future housing need based on needs assessment and will seek to allocate sites
Not justified	10120	Do not consider the requirements for all residential development to meet the nationally described space standards to be justified. Robust evidence is required to demonstrate why this is necessary and evidence that delivery of these requirements will not impact the viability or delivery of much needed market and affordable homes in Test Valley.
Provision of housing to meet our needs	10812	A good policy but is it enforceable with developers adept at claiming viability problems?
	10279	This should include that the development reflects and enhances the character and appearance of the local area.
	11014	One specific objection to section 5.402 which removes the constraint that any development site must comprise a mix of smaller houses.
	11014	Vehemently object to removing the constraint that any site must comprise a mix of smaller houses. This effectively provides developers with a licence to build large houses and would remove the right for local communities to decide their own future
	11014	Developers may apply to build close together several 3-bedded homes, yet the large floor area and open design easily allows conversion to 4- or even 5-beds without further permission.
Social Housing	10376	The plan needs to address the need for specialist housing for older people.
	10376	A range of provisions need to be planned for to provide housing for older people.
High density housing	Southampton CC 10098	Developments that focus on reduced car dependency, or even car free should be key feature of higher density development where in sustainable locations, reducing pressure on transport network, reduce emissions and reflects technology trends
Town centre housing	Southampton CC 10098	Support ambitions to incorporate more dwellings into town centres and strongly encourage high quality, high density developments near to transport nodes such as bus and train stations, high frequency bus routes, cycle corridors and other key interchanges
Specialist housing for older people	10201	Policy requirement for major development to consider needs of those requiring specialist accommodation is insufficient and not a positive approach to meeting the specialist accommodation needs of older people
	10201	Recommend housing needs of older people are included either in the policy or the supporting text. Important for decision makers to be aware of need for such homes and for delivery to be monitored against those needs.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10201	Include positively worded policy in local plan that supports provision of specialist accommodation for older people and where shortfalls are identified will implement a presumption in favour of sustainable development
Specialist housing outside of strategic allocations	10729	Little provision for range of specialist housing that is need in all locations across the Borough
	10729	Policies should allow specialist housing to come forward on unallocated sites on the edge of sustainable locations, so assist meeting need
Support	11135	Generally agree
Evidence	10201	Could not find evidence to support requirement for all residential development to meet the national described space standard as required by national policy. If Council wants to implement these standards it will need to provide robust evidence that these standards are needed and will not impact on the viability of development of the affordability of housing in the Borough
Space Standards	Hampshire County Council 10099	It is suggested that the wording for the inclusion of Part M4(3)A and Part M4(3)B, which states 'where there is demonstrable need in the local area' be revised. Rather, this should be considered the default position unless there is demonstrable evidence that this is not required.
	10204	Request TVBC consider again no space standards for 1, 2 and 3 bedroom homes
	10204	Chilbolton generally support residential space standards include matter such as the minimum size required, the approach is welcomed although the policy itself is unsatisfactory
	10204	This policy will only cover new builds and conversions, but apparently not additions or extensions. Still refers to the number of bedrooms and not the overall floor area
	10204	Concerned that new builds could include several living rooms in plans that could turn into a large 6-8 bedroom house, the house is then no longer affordable, nor is it suitable for downsizing. This serious lack of clarity must be corrected in the next draft
	10204	Recommend the TVBC local plan uses overall floor area together with number of bedrooms to ensure new builds are affordable and/or suitable for downsizing and that all planning applications should show the gross internal floor area so that this information is readily available and taken into account
	10204	Suggest TVBC consider spatial standards, a maximum gross internal floor area should be used rather than a minimum gross internal floor area and this should be linked clearly to number of bedrooms
	10204	Suggest TVBC consider that all planning applications should show the gross internal floor area and area of the site so that parish planning committees and officers are able to consider these essential parameters
	10812	Suggested amendment

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10279	Why would the Council 'negotiate on major residential sites ...', these size standards should be required as it is with the requirement for 'All new residential homes'.
	11014	Suggest that Site Coverage should be a maximum around 40%, given that house owners often have a right to extend by 10-15% without permission.
	11014	Note that Government standards set minimum bedroom sizes but not maximum, while several credible sources quote about 20 square metres as average for a double bedroom and 80-120 square metres for a 3-bed house in rural areas.
	11014	Suggested addition to policy
Wiltshire C: Consistency	10202	Policy broadly consistent with Wiltshire LP requirements
Allocations or grant permissions	10201	Alternative policy mechanisms could be used to ensure reliable and sufficient provision of self and custom build opportunities across the Borough, including allocation of small and medium scale sites for self and custom build housing, and permitted self and custom build development outside but adjacent to settlement boundaries on sustainable sites, especially if proposals would round off the developed form
Evidence	10201	Evidence of average of number of people have requested to be added to self-build register each year since 2016, stated as giving indication of future needs but gives no explanation as to why and whether it has revisited this evidence and considered whether those on the list are still seeking to self-build and have the financial capacity to do so. Council need to ensure evidence is robust and reflects an on-going demand for self-build
Excessive marketing	10120	24-month market period is excessive and recommend that this is reduced to 12 months. If a plot is suitably marketed for 12 months, with no reasonable interest, the plot should revert to market housing to be developed by the housebuilder on site.
Housing	10910	As part of Vision articulated in paragraphs 2.24-2.26, 'Right to Build' legislation should be included and supported within Test Valley.
Housing need	10320	Policy is encouraging though the sole reliance on 100 sites is an inappropriate method in order to meet demand as there are problems surrounding delivery issues for self and custom build dwellings as part of large schemes.
Marketing period	10201	24 month marketing period is unjustified. If demand for plots, then longer period is unnecessary. Marketing period of 12 months would be more appropriate
Other delivery options	10201	PPG sets out how local authorities can increase number of planning permissions which are suitable for self and custom build other than that by means of proposed policy. These include supporting neighbourhood planning groups to include sites in their plans, effective joint working, using Council owned land and working with Homes England.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Policy wording	10213	The policy should be amended to better address the site location and type of requirements of those seeking self and custom build plots
Rural self build	10201	Need to consider whether those on register are likely to want a plot on a large development. Notably a significant number of those on the list are seeking a plot in a rural area or village location. As such Council need to identify alternative solutions to meeting
self build	10115	To have multiple serviced plots within a construction site raises a number of H&S problems in respect of access, movement and monitoring.
	10115	it is feasible that self build or custom build project could extend well beyond the timeline of the construction of the development within which it is located
	10115	construction of such individual properties can stall for lengthy periods of time leaving a blight on the development as a whole
	10115	the serviced plot is to be marketed at a valuation to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority - concerned as there is no provision for an arbitrator should there be a disagreement over the valuation; it cannot be the case that the Local Authority who is seeking to provide serviced plots is the judge on how much those plots are sold for
	10115	Any serviced plot within a large development will be required to take an equal share of all of the infrastructure and borrowing costs associated with the development
	10115	It is not the case that the residual 51% Open Market properties will carry infrastructure and borrowing costs
	10115	The true cost of a single serviced parcel would not be known until all of the developments associated costs and infrastructure burden is known, let alone the margin required for the developer in order to facilitate such a service plot against the borrowing costs and risks so achieving a valuation will be a highly complex process
	10115	there are inherent problems with the current approach advocated by Policy HOU7
	10115	In order to be considered 'justified' and an appropriate strategy, the Policy approach must be assessed against the reasonable alternatives
	10115	self-build properties can promote individuality and offer the potential for a much wider scope of materials and architecture than plots enveloped by much larger housing developments.
	10115	stand alone self build sites are not burdened by the infrastructure and S.106 costs associated with larger developments, thus making the starting point more affordable to those seeking a self-build or custom product
	10115	A stand alone, or multiple stand alone schemes with an associated LPA Design Code would provide for a more appropriate reasonable alternative approach.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10115	strategic sites - the scale affords the ability to decompartmentalise the self-build into a specific area of the site much more easily than smaller sites of circa 100 dwellings
	10115	a threshold of 200 dwellings would provide significant headroom over the threshold for each site in order to for self build requirement to apply.
	10115	HOU7 places a burden on Policy SA5 with 9 of the last 10 homes being given over to Affordable Housing and Serviced Plots, for Policy NA4, it acts as a ceiling to any improvement in the quantum of housing delivered
	11152	support policy in that it will help to address the need for people wishing to commission or build their own homes
	11152	do not support the proposed approach of meeting this need through a proportion of dwellings on larger strategic sites. It is challenging to incorporate self-build plots effectively on strategic sites which are usually brought forward by housebuilders who seek to masterplan their developments comprehensively and provide shared infrastructure and open space.
	11152	there is no evidence that people on the Council's Self Build Register want to build their own homes on strategic sites
	11152	the strategy to seek self-build plots on larger developments would not be meeting the identified demand and therefore specific suitable sites should be identified for the sole purpose of providing self-build homes, having regard to the requirements of those individuals on the Council's Self Build Register.
	11152	support the principle that where serviced plots remain unsold after the marketing period, serviced plots may be developed for housing other than as self-build or custom build housing. However, it is considered that the 24-month marketing requirement is too onerous. If there is the demand for such plots, then a marketing period of 6 months would be more than sufficient
	11152	There is no justification for the self-build requirement on large housing developments, this should be replaced with specific allocations for self and custom-build housing, reflecting the requirements of those individuals on the Council's Self Build Register
	10204	Chilbolton generally support policy for self-build, only 5% self-build plots on a development of 100 or more is too low, would prefer a policy delivering 10% self-build on development of 10 houses or more
	10204	Only 5% self-build plots on a development of over 100 is too low, would prefer a policy delivering 10% self-build on any development of 10 houses or more
	10812	A good policy but is it enforceable with developers adept at claiming viability problems?
	10124	Residents have complained that TVBC is not particularly friendly towards self-builds, there was a feeling that TVBC was too focused on larger developments.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10115	the current approach as put forward within Policy HOU7 brings with it inherent problems, particularly at the scale of development proposed
	10115	the Policy remains silent on tenure, in reality a strategic site in excess of 100 dwellings will have 40% of the dwellings given over to Affordable Housing, leaving 60% for Open Market, from which the 5% is going to be derived. In reality the 5% would equate to 8.3% when taken from this smaller pool of housing, which is then likely to be rounded up, to 9% of the open market homes not being able to be designed, built and sold by a housebuilder within its development, which is a significant amount. For a scheme of 100 dwellings or close to that quantum, this is a significant amount and one which will have an impact across many facets,
	10213	The requirement for a proportion of serviced plots on larger sites is too blunt an approach to effectively respond to the Boroughs need and location requirements of self-builders- it should be encouraged and not mandatory.
	10213	There is no indicative evidence to show that the self build register has been revisited to indicate future needs and that it reflects the ongoing demand for self-build and custom-build plots
	10213	A bespoke policy would be more responsive to the Boroughs self-build needs rather than mandating portioning sections of large sites for self build homes such as a policy that enables self -build development on smaller sites adjacent to settlements.
	10213	Self -build housing could be included as an option under draft Policy HOU2 (Community Led Development) or through amendments to Policy HOU7 to enable individual proposals to come forward on suitable sites outside larger developments.
	10213	Self /Custom Build development should not be burdened with any additional sustainability requirements above non-self/custom build housing
	10213	A marketing period of 24 months is excessive and unjustified, particularly as there is demand for self-build plots. A period of 12 months would be more appropriate.
	10722	There should be consideration given to providing plots with services to self-builders which could help those requiring affordable housing
Consistency	Wiltshire C 10202	Policy broadly consistent with Wiltshire LP requirements
Duty to Cooperate	Basingstoke and Deane BC 10757	Anticipate continued dialogue on issue of needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople through duty to cooperate as local plans progress
Unmet needs	Basingstoke and Deane BC 10757	Noted plan doesn't identify sufficient land to meet the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople and that approach to meeting needs subject to further evidence gathering.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Unmet needs	Basingstoke and Deane BC 10757	Basingstoke and Deane not in position to assist in meeting the identified need for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople, given level of needs and suitable site to accommodate those needs.
Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	10204	Request TVBC consider again no policy charging gypsies and travellers a contribution to council tax and or site maintenance
	10471	The provision of traveller's facilities in the Local Plan seems minimal
Meeting the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	10812	Necessary policy but with little indication how the required number of pitches will be met. Presumably based on case law and guidance there is no longer a possibility to tie the need to people who have a strong connection with the Borough
	10279	Regularisation of unauthorised plots would encourage, present or in the future, unauthorised changes of use of land to gypsy, traveller or travelling showpeoples' occupancy subsequent application should be approved in accordance with the policy.
Links to BIO1&BIO2	Natural England 10140	Recommend policy makes clear reference to policies BIO1 and BIO2 in regard to provision of any required mitigation for impacts on designated sites.
New Forest SAC, SPA, Ramsar	Natural England 10140	Falls within 13.8km of New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar, or within the wider 15km catchment, therefore necessary to address impacts of increased recreational pressure in accordance with policy BIO2. Mitigation will be expected to satisfy interim mitigation strategy, or the joint strategic solution.
River Test SSSI	Natural England 10140	For the site at Bunny Lane, many need to consider hydrological impacts on the River Test SSSI and demonstrate changes to groundwater would not adversely affect the designated site, due to its proximity.
Salisbury Plain SAC & SPA	Natural England 10140	Bunny Lane site falls within 6.4km of Salisbury Plain SPA, therefore necessary to address impacts from increased recreational impact in accordance with policy BIO2. Recognise the Council is working with Wiltshire Council to establish whether mitigation can be secured towards existing mitigation strategy.
Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and	10106	Accept the need to provide permanent sites for these groups and no comment on the proposed policies. Concerned about site access to the site on Bunny Lane which is narrow and has no footpath

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Travelling Showpeople		and carries regular HGV traffic. Future residents would need to travel by car for reasons of safety. Strongly recommend providing safe pedestrian access from the site to Timsbury
Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	10812	Corollary to HOU8 and could be combined with it
	10812	Makes no provision for temporary sites to accommodate groups on their travels which has been a major issue in the Borough
Links to BIO1&BIO3	Natural England 10140	Recommend policy makes clear reference to policies BIO1 and BIO2 in regard to provision of any required mitigation for impacts on designated sites.

Chapter 5 - Economy and Employment
Paragraphs - 5.452-5.484

Key Issue	Officer Response
Employment Use Classes-policy should provide more flexibility	The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan and theme based policies will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Inconsistency- contradiction between Policy SS2 and Policies NA9 and NA10	
Criterion b)- restrictive, unclear how 'proven need' is demonstrated	
MOD-policy to consider meeting of MOD needs and functions	

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Economy, Employment and Skills	11108	Welcome the introductory text which will ensure that the Lp2040 is accessible to a broad audience.
	11108	the draft policy is sensible and consistent with national planning guidance
Employment Future Needs	10373	Essential that Policy supports future intensification and potentially redevelopment. Otherwise, the building may remain underutilised and unfit for changing future needs
	10373	Would not be appropriate to restrict Class E uses to a sub-set of uses within Class E: Need or demand may change in the future, with over-restrictive Policy becoming a barrier to addressing future demand
Employment Use Classes	10373	Strongly recommend that Policies provide for flexibility in relation to new and existing Employment allocations
	10373	Policy must maintain sufficient flexibility to respond to changing needs and demands. The priority should be to ensure a suitable supply of available land but thereafter to provide for a broad range of uses that could be accommodated subject to all necessary detail being satisfactory.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10373	Mixed use sites policy should not control or restrict changes between uses within acceptable Use Classes. Instead, policy should allow and encourage flexibility to meet needs and demands as they emerge or change over the course of the Plan period
	10373	Employment policies – whether relating to existing or new allocations – must not restrict to a range of uses or sub-uses unless there is exceptional need to do so
	10373	Would not be appropriate to restrict Class E uses to a sub-set of uses within Class E: Those uses already exist on site or could be permitted under current Policy
	10373	Would not be appropriate to restrict Class E uses to a sub-set of uses within Class E: The definition of Use Classes may change in future
Employment Sites	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council request that the emerging Policy EC1 provides sufficient flexibility to accommodate the unique role and function of public service providers and their need for managed change.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	it would be helpful for there to be clarity as to whether the requirements c) and d) are both required, or whether one of the requirements is applicable only.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	Propose the following amendments to the draft policy wording: a) the land is no longer required to meet economic development needs of the area; or b) continued use of the site for employment use is no longer commercially viable; or c) the current business activity is causing, or could cause significant harm to the character of the area or the amenities of residents; or d) it would not have a significant detrimental impact on the operation of the remaining occupiers of the site; or e) the loss forms part of a public service provider's programme that necessitates the loss, in line with the Local Government Act 1972 (General Disposal Consent 2003)." review wording
PD Conversion	Hampshire County Council 10099	The County Council note the recent changes to permitted development rights introduced by the government under Class MA of Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015. This allows Class E (commercial, business and service) to be converted to Class C3 (dwelling houses) subject to certain restrictions and prior approval. The County Council recommend that the supporting policy text of draft Policy EC1 should acknowledge and reflect the national legislation to provide clarity in guiding development proposals and planning applications.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
MOD	10121	important that LPs recognise MOS establishments are of strategic military importance to UK in line with NPPF
	10121	operational development on MOD establishments should be supported
	10121	due to need to maintain operational capabilities, development in proximity of MOD establishments should be required to demonstrate align with agent of change principle in para 193 of NPPF
Adanac Park and Nursling Estate	New Forest DC 10028	Land designated on both western and eastern sides of M271 corridor into Southampton as existing Strategic Employment Sites and that strategic employment sites will be prioritised for employment uses
Non-employment and ancillary uses	11081	<p>Whilst makes sense for existing employment land, policy also applies to 'allocated employment sites' (which may or may not be within existing employment use). Policy would benefit from additional criteria which acknowledges potential for non-employment or ancillary uses to come forward on allocated employment sites where justified.</p> <p>Additional criteria to allow non-employment or ancillary uses on allocated employment sites</p>
Policy inconsistency over allocation in countryside	11081	As Policy EC1 is listed under Criterion a) of Policy SS2 as currently worded neither Policy SS2 nor Policy EC1 acknowledges proposed allocation at Thruxton Aerodrome for employment (Policies NA9 and NA10). This results in inherent contradiction between Policy SS2 and Policies NA9 and NA10 which allocate land beyond a settlement boundary, and Policy SS2 which seeks to restrict development in the countryside. Imperative this conflict is rectified, and plan is consistent and clear
Retention of Employment Land and Strategic Employment Sites	10812	Content with this policy
typo	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	Typo as "local building styles and materials" is repeated.
Planning-DM	11135	Class Q conversions should not be used as a backdoor method for gaining planning permission for developments that would otherwise not be supported by the plan-especially when any further proposal does not utilise the agricultural buildings given conversion permission under Class Q

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Policy inconsistency over allocation in countryside	11081	As Policy EC2 is listed under Criterion a) of Policy SS2 as currently worded neither Policy SS2 nor Policy EC2 acknowledges proposed allocation at Thruxton Aerodrome for employment (Policies NA9 and NA10). This results in inherent contradiction between Policy SS2 and Policies NA9 and NA10 which allocate land beyond a settlement boundary, and Policy SS2 which seeks to restrict development in the countryside. Imperative this conflict is rectified, and plan is consistent and clear
Re-use of buildings	10384	Criteria e) and f) are overly restrictive and shouldn't prioritise employment over residential uses. The policy is out of date as it doesn't take account of what can be done under PD rights. Marketing requirement is not justified given what can be done under PD (Class MA).
Re-use of buildings in the countryside	10812	Policy does not seem to be strong enough to cover the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings into dwellings under Class Q interpretations which would appear to be regularly abused
Rural workers	10384	Not clear why rural workers requirement is needed when policy HOU10 makes provision. This policy could give greater emphasis to existing buildings.
Existing employment sites	10978	Policy EC3 should be amended to allow for the expansion of existing employment sites beyond their current boundaries
Policy inconsistency over allocation in countryside	11081	As Policy EC3 is listed under Criterion a) of Policy SS2 as currently worded neither Policy SS2 nor Policy EC3 acknowledges proposed allocation at Thruxton Aerodrome for employment (Policies NA9 and NA10). This results in inherent contradiction between Policy SS2 and Policies NA9 and NA10 which allocate land beyond a settlement boundary, and Policy SS2 which seeks to restrict development in the countryside. Imperative this conflict is rectified and plan is consistent and clear
Rural Diversification	10812	Content with this policy
Rural employment sites	10384	Criteria b) and c) are not supported. More restrictive than current policy LE17. How is 'proven need' demonstrated. Policy creates uncertainty and is onerous and contrary to para 88 and 89 of NPPF.
Criterion b) restrictive	10101	Requirement to utilise existing tourist facilities and buildings is unduly restrictive and prohibitive of more innovative and sustainable proposals Amend or remove criterion b)
Flexibility	10101	Allow rural enterprises sufficient flexibility to change and adapt their businesses

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10101	Rural tourism means of diversifying agricultural, and land based rural businesses. Policy should not unduly restrict or stifle innovation and diversification
Policy inconsistency over allocation in countryside	11081	As Policy EC4 is listed under Criterion a) of Policy SS2 as currently worded neither Policy SS2 nor Policy EC4 acknowledges proposed allocation at Thruxton Aerodrome for employment (Policies NA9 and NA10). This results in inherent contradiction between Policy SS2 and Policies NA9 and NA10 which allocate land beyond a settlement boundary, and Policy SS2 which seeks to restrict development in the countryside. Imperative this conflict is rectified and plan is consistent and clear
Skills and Training	11108	Welcome the introductory text which will ensure that the Lp2040 is accessible to a broad audience.
	11108	Support the E&S planning process
Support	10101	Support policy to sustain Test Valley as visitor destination necessary to protect, but also enable further visitor accommodation
Tourism	10812	Would like to see the encouragement of rather than just the permission of tourist developments. This policy may need to amplified when the new tourism strategy gets promulgated
	10113	The Estate also contributes to the local visitor economy through existing attractions such as Leckford Abbas and the Longstock Park Water Garden
Tourism allocations	10101	Consider making allocations for tourism uses alongside smaller 'windfall' tourism developments Consider Tourism allocations
Skills and Training	10812	There is a need to support a wider range of skills training including in the newer green industries and in hospitality, the latter going hand in hand with tourism objectives
	11108	Support the policy
support employment and skills	10119	The potential developer (Bellway Homes) is conversant with and supportive of the employment and skills policy requirement. Working with our contractors we would be pleased to support and achieve CITB objectives at Manor Farm (NA5) allocation.
MOD	10121	suggest additional policy to address meeting MOD needs - 'New development at military establishments that helps enable or sustain their operational capacity will be supported. Redevelopment, conversion of change of use of redundant MOD sites and buildings will be supported. Non-military or non-defence related development within or in the areas around an MOD site will not be supported where it would adversely affect military operations or capability, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a defence or military need for the site
		Consider adding new policy

Chapter 5 - Sustainable Transport

Paragraphs - 5.485-5.510

Key Issue	Officer Response
Access- for disabled including wheelchair users, work vans, etc.	The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan and theme based policies will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Bus service improvement- specific reference to improved bus services not only improved bus stop infrastructure lacking and link to IDP	
EV charging- not specifically addressed in the Plan	
Transport (Health)- policy does not include reference to health and link between physical activity, physical and mental health.	
Infrastructure (Public Transport) – plan should be clear on improvement and provision of public transport or provision	
Parking standards - specific standard is required, it should be included in the local plan	

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	10069	The LP does not state how people who cannot use steps or stairs will be catered for
	10069	Flats need to be large enough to accommodate electric mobility scooters and have a secure place for storage and charging
	10069	Accommodation should have secure storage for bikes to encourage use of cycle paths

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10069	Roads need to have adequate number of dropped curbs to enable people in wheelchairs to cross the road.
	10069	All houses and bungalows need an entrance without steps with wide space enough for access via wheelchairs.
	10069	All houses should have downstairs toilets for disabled access
	10069	There needs to be 1hr parking for those visiting elderly and sick people and delivery drivers.
	10069	Garages should no longer be counted as parking spaces as no one uses them to park their cars
	10069	New housing estates need to have spaces large and high enough for work vans but using a system of allocated spaces
	10069	Roads on estates need to be wider than those built in the early 2000s to make it easier for roads and new estates.
Access to facilities	10052	The position in paragraph 5.489 regarding development locations and access to facilities appears to be the wrong way around. It reinforces some settlements which have access to facilities but further impoverishes others that do not. Development in rural areas should be encouraged to provide local facilities for use by people where at present the facilities are inadequate.
Active and Sustainable travel	10842	Network Rail supports the inclusion of a Policy covering the promotion of active and sustainable travel.
	11108	Welcome the introductory text which will ensure that the Lp2040 is accessible to a broad audience.
	11108	Support the focus on active travel
	11108	Support the policy
	10812	Good policy but frustrated by the lack of public transport and the potential loss of some community transport initiatives due to spending cuts
	10812	Cycleways must be designed as dedicated rights of way with priority over vehicular access at junctions and must be maintained in good condition with fragmented cycleways being joined up
	10114	cannot comment on this policy without being clear what the standards will be. The Partnership would issue a holding objection to this policy pending receipt of the proposed standards
Assessing transport impacts	11108	Welcome the introductory text which will ensure that the Lp2040 is accessible to a broad audience.
	11108	Welcome, in particular, the reference to the need for the '...timely and phased delivery of infrastructure to serve the development' -Criteria C.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11108	Explicit encouragement could be given to new stand-alone EV charging facilities, particularly as part of mixed-use developments. Recommend that explicit encouragement be given to new stand-alone EV charging facilities, particularly as part of mixed-use developments.
	10812	Good policy provided that it is deemed reasonable to require developers to fund travel improvements that are not immediately adjacent to the development site but can be impacted by development
	10279	The wording requires 3.c) to be done irrespective of the Transport Assessment in 1.a)?
Bus service corridors	10243	We note with great concern the statements made. The key issue the plan ought to recognise is that while the strategy rightly builds on the principle that localities and sites accommodating significant development need to be directly related to existing bus service corridors as much as possible, most of the borough including many of the proposed allocations, have no demonstrable access to high-quality public transport. The existing network needs substantial reinforcement in most places and in a few locations extension of the existing network would be required.
Bus service improvement	10243	Policy needs to make specific reference to improved bus services not only improved bus stop infrastructure, this will need to be further reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, site specific policies and Appendix 3.
bus transport cuts	10243	Several much less busy and non-strategic routes are unable to cover their operating costs in this way and are financially supported by Hampshire County Council. Severe budgetary constraints have led to the entire budget being proposed for withdrawal, under "Savings Plan 25" ("SP25") in which case these routes would cease from Summer 2025. However, with the exception of some lesser used routes in Andover, none are very regular or of particular relevance to the Plan or the plan strategy.
Car use	10760	Use of the car is high in Test Valley, higher than most other parts of Hampshire adding to the carbon emissions making Test Valley one of the boroughs with the highest emissions in the country.
Community Transport	11014	Support investigation of options for the community to deliver a shared mobility scheme to residents in the short, medium and long terms
	11014	Agree that an efficient public transport network is essential to enabling the community to access key services and facilities easily and without always needing a car.
Comprehensive network	10052	Unless there is a comprehensive joined-up walking and cycling network throughout the borough, the aims of the Local Plan are useful only within new development and thus will not achieve the aims set out in paragraphs 5.485, 5.490-4493, and 5.495. The LCWIP is mostly 'aspirational'.
Connectivity	10760	The Local Plan doesn't consider how walking, cycling and public transport would tie in with access to nearby work and education by making the cycleways safe all the way, or to work, college and

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		University outside of the borough i.e. Basingstoke, Salisbury, Winchester, and Southampton. There needs to be joined up thinking with other Boroughs and District Councils on transport plans to reduce car journeys
Cycle parking	10052	Safe and secure cycle parking should be provided at the ends of the designated primary cycle routes, i.e. close to employment / shopping / entertainment hubs. Covered cycle parking is needed to encourage use of cycling.
Cycle paths	10052	Whilst a cycle path has been established along the A27 between the football ground roundabout and Lee Lane, the comments in the Preliminary Transport Assessment are still true and will remain so with the proposals of the draft Local Plan.
Cycle storage in Romsey	10052	In Romsey town centre there is little covered cycle parking for those who spend their day working in Romsey and at Romsey Rapids there is no covered cycle parking and only a few places to leave cycles by the main entrance, which are often well occupied.
Developer funded services	10243	We have no interest in developer funded service packages that simply distort the most effective delivery of the network.
Development funding	10243	We understand the reluctance to direct development funding towards bus service improvements however, without such improvements there will be no meaningful choice of modes at all which is contrary to the NPPF (paragraph 108-109) and the objectives in the plan. In several cases based on current understanding, several major allocations will have no public transport at all.
Early engagement	10243	Elsewhere in Hampshire we have had to be clear that where sites have been allocated without supportable public transport measures being agreed at the outset with operators, there is no point pursuing bus services enhancements at great developer expense that can have no relevance, especially where access by cycle to all key local facilities is demonstrable – including major public transport interchanges. It is for this reason that engagement with transport operators during plan preparation is so important.
EV charging	10069	Accommodation should have charging points for electric vehicles
	Chilbolton Parish Council 10204	Request TVBC consider again no requirement for charging points for electric vehicles
	Kimpton Parish Council 11001	Concerned there is no statement about provision of charging facilities for EVs, the need for sufficient charging facilities will increase dramatically over the plan period This should be specifically addressed in the Plan

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Kimpton Parish Council 11001	Concerned there is no statement about provision of charging facilities for EVs, the need for sufficient charging facilities will increase dramatically over the plan period This should be specifically addressed in the Plan
	Melchet Park and Plaitford Parish Council 10072	Disappointed that there is no mention of the layout of the provision being such that it would facilitate charging at home for electric vehicles
	10760	Ensure new houses and flats have electric vehicle charging points for all homes
Active Travel	Hampshire County Council 10099	Sustainable modes of transport and the needs of pedestrians and cyclist: This wording could be strengthened by incorporating the hierarchy of transport so that 'walking and wheeling' modes are prioritised. 'Wheeling' represents the action of moving as a pedestrian, whether or not someone is walking or wheeling unaided or using any kind of wheeled mobility aid, including wheelchairs, mobility scooters, walking frames, prams or buggies. review wording
LTP4	Hampshire County Council 10099	At present this is not clear in the wording of the policies. LTP4 underpins that reduced parking need brings benefits for quality of public realm, better healthy travel choices, reduced climate impacts and lower population health impacts from emissions, as such should form part of this policy balance.
Transport	Hampshire County Council 10099	Emissions from transport are harmful to human health and their reduction could be referenced in more detail within this policy aim.
: Transport - Health	Hampshire County Council 10099	Reference to health is recommended within this policy and demonstrating the link between physical activity, physical and mental health.
Transport - Healthy Streets	Hampshire County Council 10099	Policy should include the 10 indicators of healthy streets design principles as a point of reference for developers in line with the now adopted LTP4. Link provided review wording

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Transport - LTP4	Hampshire County Council 10099	Policies related to health and wellbeing, carbon reduction climate change, healthy streets, site allocations and inclusivity would usefully be strengthened by reference to the LTP4. In this regard the aims of TR1 should be expanded to embrace these strategic objectives.
Transport - Parking	Hampshire County Council 10099	The framework created in policy TR2 should form a related point in policy TR3, whereby parking can be reduced if successful and robust methods are set out within the transport plan.
Hampshire LTP4 policy	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The text references the County's LTP4 policy which is much more ambitious in securing a shift to sustainable modes than it has been in the past and the plan needs to take a clearer and stronger lead from it. The district is far off having a "carbon-neutral, resilient and inclusive transport system designed around people" (as opposed to cars). Consistent, focused and robust action will need to be progressed by all stakeholders, developers and transport operators such as ourselves, to make this a reality.
Infrastructure - Public Transport	10842	The rail network within Test Valley provides a good basis to pursue development opportunities and to promote sustainable transport as a genuine alternative to using the car. However, this is generally limited to Andover and Romsey
	10842	Network Rail supports the identification of public transport and promotion of active and sustainable travel within the Plan, however stronger wording would allow for this to become more embedded within draft site allocations and other policies.
	10842	The Plan should continue to be developed, with appropriate policies and site allocations which promote the rail network in encouraging its usage and pursuing development opportunities.
	10279	What Test Valley people want is a transport infrastructure which provides convenient travel to work and to shop. The Local Plan should make clear just what can be provided from Borough resources and how much subsidy can be made available.
	11014	Acknowledge the significant challenges of sustaining good public transport arrangements in the villages; community-based shared mobility schemes may need to be considered where conventional public transport is limited or not available
	10052	This section refers to public transport in passing but there is no proposal to improve public transport or provide it for communities lacking it.
	10720	There is insufficient links to transport infrastructure in the local area and there will be significant effects on surrounding roads as a result.
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	the plan can and should seek to maximise the attractiveness and relevance of sustainable modes, and public transport in particular

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10243	
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	<p>The policy is vague and ineffective where public transport is concerned, it makes no reference to the quality of services on offer or what level of connectivity is required. It does not provide anything remotely approaching a “genuine choice of modes” as expected by NPPF paragraph 108.</p> <p>Policy needs amendment as follows: “c) Access can be made safe, accessible, attractive and functional in connecting and integrating with the highway network and linking to sufficiently frequent public transport, services and facilities, including pathways, cycleways and the Public Rights of Way network;</p>
	10720	There is insufficient links to transport infrastructure in the local area and there will be significant effects on surrounding roads as a result.
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The baseline position for public transport use is low even in the Tier 1 settlements, the plan needs to robustly focus on strategies and sites that allow residents of existing and new developments to be presented with better public transport choices than those on offer today especially in the south of the borough.
Infrastructure - Roads	10025	The main junctions in North Baddesley have been shown to be working at over capacity, with this in mind should yet another large housing estate be built near this problem, further impacting these junctions and roads
Mobility scooters	10760	Ensure new houses and flats have suitable storage and charging for mobility scooters.
MOD	10121	MOD establishments have specific operational access requirements (particularly logistics) such as the dimensions and weights of some vehicles used by MOD may be more than that of public/ commercial vehicles
Alternatives to car and safe and reliable transport network	National Highways 10291	In accordance with national policy look to local plan to promote strategies, policies and allocations that will support alternatives to car and operation of safe and reliable transport network
Cumulative impact of growth	National Highways 10291	Proposed new growth will need to be considered in the context of the cumulative impact from already proposed development on the strategic road network

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	National Highways 10291	When assessing spatial options need to consider cumulative impact of new sites that might be taken forward together with already planned growth on strategic road network
Delivery of mitigation	National Highways 10291	Important that any identified mitigation has reasonable prospect of delivery within timescale of when identified growth is planned
Development cannot progress without infrastructure in place	National Highways 10291	Important that local plan provides framework to ensure development cannot progress without appropriate infrastructure being in place
Identify and mitigated impacts in strategic road network	National Highways 10291	When considering proposals for growth, any impacts on the strategic road network will need to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably possible
Identify and mitigated impacts in strategic road network	National Highways 10291	When considering proposals for growth, any impact on strategic road network will need to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably practicable
Improvements to strategic road network last resort	National Highways 10291	Infrastructure improvements on the strategic road network should only be considered as a last resort
Policy to prevent development until transport infrastructure in place	National Highways 10291	Local Plan does not include policy on transport infrastructure that effectively prevents development from occurring until necessary infrastructure is available. Suggest such policy included so that impacts of new development do not cause congestions on the strategic road network without mitigation required being in place Policy to prevent development until necessary transport infrastructure in place
Strategic road network	National Highways	Infrastructure improvements on the strategic road network should only be considered as a last resort

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
improvements last resort	10291	
Support	National Highways 10291	Support policy which relates to provision of sustainable transport infrastructure
Support	National Highways 10291	Support policy which ensures transport impacts of new development recognised and used to shape proposals at an early stage
Sustainable transport measures	National Highways 10291	Will support a local authority proposal that considers sustainable measure, which manage down demand and reduce need to travel
Sustainable transport measure to manage demand	National Highways 10291	Support proposals that consider sustainable measures which manage down demand and reduces need to travel
parking	10114	cannot comment on this policy without being clear what the standards will be. The Partnership would issue a holding objection to this policy pending receipt of the proposed standards
Parking Standards	11108	Welcome the introductory text which will ensure that the Lp2040 is accessible to a broad audience.
	11108	Endorse this approach in the policy but encouragement could be given to new stand alone EV charging facilities, particularly as part of mixed use developments. Recommend that explicit encouragement be given to new stand alone EV charging facilities, particularly as part of mixed use developments.
	11014	Believe villages will continue to need private car ownership, and thus the provision of adequate parking spaces is essential, if necessary, above the standards set out in the LP.
	10796	Policy requires development to be in accordance with standards set out in the Council's adopted parking standards. This is unsound as it seeks to confer the status of a local plan policy on guidance published outside of the plan-making process
	10796	Council can provide guidance in an SPD, but it cannot require development to accord with it. If a specific standard is required, it should be included in the local plan. If not, the policy should be amended to state that development should have regard to the adopted parking standards

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10812	Policy lacks direction as to where parking provision is to be located
	10812	Recent developments have shown parking courts to be unpopular and should be discouraged
	10812	Parking should be such that vehicles are overlooked as a primary security measure, also not clear what parking standards are without referencing other material and what is different for town centre developments
	11115	Policy is unsound because it confers the status of a local plan policy on guidance outside of the plan making process. The council cannot require development to accord with guidance set out in an SPD. Standards should be included in the local plan, or policy working amended to say that development should have regard to the adopted standards.
	10219	Policy requires development to be in accordance with standards set out in the Council's adopted parking standards. This is unsound as it seeks to confer the status of a local plan policy on guidance published outside of the plan-making process. The Council can provide guidance in an SPD, but it cannot require development to accord with it. If a specific standard is required, it should be included in the local plan. If not, the policy should be amended to state that development should have regard to the adopted parking standards
Public Rights of Way	11014	Support creating opportunities for enhancing the existing highway network by providing quiet roads or alternative traffic free routes to complement the existing Rights of Way network
Pump-prime develop funding	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The cost of running new or improved bus services over many years at a huge loss in the hope of at best, a very modest financial return thereafter is not something that is reasonable to expect bus operators to assume. Thus, the principle of develop funding to pump-prime improvements if necessary is well established in Hampshire and beyond.
Railway stations	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	Network Rail would support inclusion within the draft Policy in seeking opportunities to promote access to and from rail stations via station travel plans
Rural isolation	10760	Currently it is essential to have a car in a rural community as isolation and lack of services have a huge impact on elderly, disabled and those on a low income.
S106 contributions for bus services	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Where S106 contributions for bus services have been made in support of previous plan allocations, these have generally led to commercial services becoming established with both East Anton and Picket Twenty being examples of this, despite unusually severe challenges during the delivery.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Safety	10052	The walking and cycling network must be well maintained so it is safe for walkers and cyclists to actually use. Shared paths must allow for the safety of pedestrians to walk in safety but also for the safety of cyclists from unpredictable pedestrians and dog leads.
Air Quality	Southampton CC 10098	Transport emissions are significant contributor to poor air quality and this is significant issue in Southampton
Cross boundary transport issues	Southampton CC 10098	Southampton work closely with Hampshire County Council on cross boundary strategic transport planning and would welcome working with Test Valley on cross boundary transport issues
Electric Vehicle Charging Points	Southampton CC 10098	Important that electric vehicle charging points (and ideally alternative fuel provision as well) and fully designed into new development and not an after-thought
Southampton LTP	Southampton CC 10098	Southampton Local Transport Plan sets long term strategy with approach to look at connections and corridors from city into surrounding city region. Relevant for Test Valley includes: high quality public transport with metro level of service including mass rapid transit routes to Romsey; high quality segregated cycle routes connecting city with Hampshire to reduce M27 and M271 severance; travel plans, travel demand management and delivery service plans; and sustainable patterns and forms of new development in areas around Southampton designed to be well served by public transport and cycle networks to increase travel into the city, but not number of car trips
Sustainable travel modes	Southampton CC 10098	Strategic sites tend to be better to deliver more practical items of sustainable transport infrastructure such and coherent and direct cycle corridors with safe and segregated cycle, walking and wheeling facilities (which meet current design standards) rather than just small sections of cycle routes
Sustainable travel modes	Southampton CC 10098	Encourage incorporation of all possible approaches that would lead to a more sustainable transport future
Transport carbon emissions	Southampton CC 10098	Southampton declared climate emergency 2019 and recognises transport is one of the most significant contributors to carbon emissions with potential to be influenced by local government policy and decision making
Travel movements to Southampton	Southampton CC 10098	Strong travel movements between Southampton and southern part of Test Valley. Around 4,700 daily trips in each direction
Spatial strategy	11115	The policy should refer to the overall spatial strategy
SPD	10201	Requires development in accordance with standards set out in Council's adopted parking standards. This is unsound as seeks to confer status of a local plan policy on guidance published outside of the plan making process. If wish to include specific standard should include in local plan, if not policy should be amended to state that development should have regard to adopted parking standards

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Include parking standards within local plan or amend policy to state that development should have regard to adopted parking standards
Standards to be reviewed	10119	Supporting text states that standards are to be reviewed for Regulation 19 stage. Therefore respondent will comment at that stage.
Station Travel plans	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	station travel plans should become a consideration for all development to determine if such access is possible. This would allow for para 5.496 in the Plan to be fully implemented as part of a holistic approach towards improving access which should be reflected throughout the Plan.
Support period	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Many services have failed to outlast the support period is always a product of the fact the development strategy was inappropriate and the service specified by the authorities was never likely to be relevant in terms of frequency or destinations.
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Many services have failed to outlast the support period is always a product of the fact the development strategy was inappropriate and development delivery, including phasing, meant buses were unable to serve the site until long after car-based behaviours were entrenched
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Many services have failed to outlast the support period is always a product of the fact the development strategy was inappropriate, and demand evolved far too slowly or was insufficient at build-out due to development scale being too small and unable to synergise with existing established demands
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Many services have failed to outlast the support period is always a product of the fact the development strategy was inappropriate and urban design makes it physically impossible to serve the development as policy anticipated, or so slow and reliable as to make provision as unattractive to residents as it is uneconomic to sustain.
Sustainable Travel - safety	10106	Support the aspiration in terms of enhancing the provision of cycling and walking routes. There is no safe route from the settlement to Romsey. A safe walking route from Timsbury to Romsey would be of great benefit to the village and open up an additional route to people in Romsey
Traffic	10502	Opposes the plan due to the impacts it will have on traffic.
	10960	The plan will have detrimental impacts such as increased traffic.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Transport	10204	Chilbolton generally support policies for active and sustainable travel, transport impacts and parking
Vague language	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	<p>The policy is vague and ineffective where public transport is concerned, it makes no reference to the quality of services on offer or what level of connectivity is required. It does not provide anything remotely approaching a “genuine choice of modes” as expected by NPPF paragraph 108.</p> <p>Policy needs amendment as follows: “c) Access can be made safe, accessible, attractive and functional in connecting and integrating with the highway network and linking to sufficiently frequent public transport, services and facilities, including pathways, cycleways and the Public Rights of Way network;</p>
Walking and Cycling	10124	Insist on having a proper walking and cycling network. We note that we have developments coming on stream in Andover which do not plug into a network because there effectively is none
	11014	Support the creation of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans to promote walking and cycling as the primary means of making local journeys, such as commuting to work or travel to school; await Test Valley North LCWIP due this year.
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The language in paragraph 4.290 needs to be altered substantially. If not, both operators will vigorously object to any draft strategic allocation that has no credible public transport choice as being fundamentally unsound. Such an eventuality would be out of conformity with the NPPF, wider national policy, Hampshire’s LTP4 and the plan’s own vision and objectives.

Glossary and Appendices

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Designated Rural Areas- needs definition in glossary	The National Planning Policy Framework defines designated rural areas as National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and areas designated as 'rural' under s157 of the Housing Act 1985. The Council will review the contents of the glossary in the next stage of preparing the draft local plan.
Minerals and Waste- inclusion of consideration of the Minerals Consultation Area	The Council will review the inclusion of the Minerals Consultation Area in the next stage of preparing the draft local plan.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
AONB impact	10119	<p>Noted the policy requires site allocations to conserve and enhance the scenic beauty and landscape of the New Forest National Park North Wessex Downs AONB. Amend wording to ensure relevance.</p> <p>After 'Landscape' add words 'where relevant/applicable'.</p>
Appendix 3	10817	<p>Welcome clarity within Appendix 3, subject to suggested amendments. 1. Housing: Provision of affordable housing should be subject to the viability of provision. 2. Design: Reference to densities should also include the need to make effective use of the land. 3. Social and community facilities: Infrastructure provision should take into account the need and proximity to existing services and facilities, including those existing and proposed in neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Suggested amendments to Appendix 3. 1. Housing: Provision of affordable housing should be subject to the viability of provision. 2. Design: Reference to densities should also include the need to make effective use of the land. 3. Social and community facilities: Infrastructure provision should take into account the need and proximity to existing services and facilities, including those existing and proposed in neighbouring authorities.</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Bus service improvement	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	<p>The language needs amendment to be effective in securing necessary bus service improvements whether by extension or frequency uplift, or both. These improvements should be agreed to benefit from a business case that they would become commercially sustainable at the end of an agreed revenue support period. This is entirely congruent with existing County Council practice.</p> <p>Language should be altered to read: "Improvements to transport infrastructure and services will be required in accordance with Policy TR1-3. This may include the requirement for contributions for improvements to highway infrastructure, including active travel infrastructure or junction improvements, and potentially improvements to public transport infrastructure and services. This may take the form of a financial contribution."</p>
glossary	10799	The Plan refers to 'designated rural areas'. This should be defined in the glossary
Health Impact Assessment	Hampshire County Council 10099	HCC encourage a health impact assessment (HIA) to be included as requirement of larger developments
Minerals and Waste	Hampshire County Council 10099	In addition to inclusion of consideration of the Minerals Consultation Area as a general requirement, wording should be added to the supporting text of the applicable allocated site policies to reflect the presence of potential mineral resources and the need to investigate these. See comments on Chapter 4.
	Hampshire County Council 10099	should add reference to Policy 16 (Safeguarding – mineral infrastructure) and Policy 26 of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan. Further information on minerals and waste safeguarding is available in the adopted Minerals and Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire SPD.
	10797	LP doesn't include mineral safeguarding and mineral consultation areas designated by Hampshire minerals and waste plan
	10797	Goodworth Well site is identified as a safeguarded mineral site with a MCA. Identifying MCAs helps to ensure that the MPA is consulted on planning applications and development is not granted which could prejudice a mineral site or its infrastructure. This inclusion also helps applicants identify when their site is within a safeguarded area and overall raises awareness of the importance of minerals and waste planning.
	10797	An appropriate policy cross referencing relevant section of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan should be included; this should implement the 'agent of change' principle introduced in the NPPF too.
	10797	The safeguarding of mineral resources and infrastructure is critical for the success of the new Test Valley Local Plan in delivering all forms of new development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Utilities	10573	"Proposals will need to demonstrate that there is adequate water and wastewater capacity to serve the development" - there is no proposal that could show this because there isn't adequate wastewater capacity. Significant investment and work from Southern Water is needed to make this plan achievable.
Water Cycle Study	CPRE Hampshire 10139	The conclusions from the Water Cycle Study should be summarised and included in the appendices
Water Provision	CPRE Hampshire 10139	A stronger provision of water and wastewater is necessary Suggest adding 'Provision must have been secured in detail from the water companies before the development is given permission and permission shall depend on it being adequate in the long term'
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	We note and welcome this point.

Policies Maps and Inset Maps 1-57

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. The matters covered in this section of the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Settlement Boundaries Amends	This will be considered in preparing the Regulation 19 stage.
Recognition of New Forest- Remove relevant designations in New Forest National Park from Policies Maps	Noted. The Policies Map only shows the New Forest National Park designation within this area for transparency.
Designated Local Green Spaces	Noted, these have been added to the draft Policies Map.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Settlement Boundaries	Charlton Parish Council 10006	The Charlton NDP shows Charlton as a separate village with its own settlement boundary, and this should be reflected in the Local Plan. However, currently Charlton is shown as part of Andover in Inset Map 1 we would ask this is corrected in the Reg 19 version
SINCs	Upper Clatford Parish Council 10074	Inset map 11 requires updating to show SINC TV609 Pillhill Brook and SINC TV613 south of All Saints Church. We also note designated LGS are not shown on the inset map and suggest these should be included because they are an approved planning tool
Settlement Hierarchy	Houghton Parish Council 10170	Inset map 24 appears confusing as there is a boundary marked in red, it would appear that this corresponds with the current conservation area boundary, but can this be clarified?
	Houghton Parish Council 10170	HPC asks TVBC to ensure that the relevant inset maps in the Local Plan reflect the fact that Houghton would be in Tier 4 with no settlement boundary
Local Gap - Romsey - North Baddesley	10722	It positive that the plan largely includes the maintenance of the strategic gap between Romsey and North Baddesley.
	10722	The remaining gap should be retained between Abbey Industrial Estate and North Baddesley and the trees protected. More trees should be planted to thicken the screen between North Baddesley and the proposed industrial estate.

North of Oxlease Meadows SHELAA Ref 384	10352	Objection. Omission of land north of Oxlease Meadows SHELAA site 384 as housing allocation Include Land N of Oxlease SHELAA site 384 as allocation for housing
	10352	Objection. Omission of developed land around Oxlease Meadows, Romsey within settlement boundary Include existing developed land around Oxlease Meadows, Romsey within settlement boundary
Land north of Jacobs Folly, Braishfield (SHELAA 46)	10795	Object to the omission of Land north of Jacobs Folly, Braishfield (SHELAA 46) from the Braishfield settlement boundary Recommend change to inset maps 3 and 15 to include Land north of Jacobs Folly (SHELAA 46) within the settlement boundary
Countryside	10366	Delighted the designated countryside need is recognised and the rural character is being protected from inappropriate development
Settlement Boundaries	10860	Concerning the Eastern end of Streetway Road southern frontage: would like to see settlement zone gap included in settlement zone as frontage is unsightly due to multiple absent owners who neglect their plot. Were the frontage allowed limited development by a combined developer, it would enhance the area and stop neglect as a result of ownership by several people.
	10860	Concerning the Eastern end of Streetway Road southern frontage: would like to see settlement zone gap included in settlement zone as this end of Streetway Rd is not in accordance with the rest of the road as there has been gradual improvement of the Western end creating an imbalance.
	10860	Concerning the Eastern end of Streetway Road southern frontage: would like to see settlement zone gap included in settlement zone as the Eastern end would benefit from infilling on the Southern frontage such as road improvements in future development as it is currently narrow and neglected.
	10860	Concerning the Eastern end of Streetway Road southern frontage: would like to see settlement zone gap included in settlement zone as the far end of the road is in constant use as an access point to 7 detached properties despite the access point not being good enough for large vehicles.
Settlement Boundary - Ampfield	10821	Support the inclusion of Land at Sleepy Hollow, Ampfield (SHELAA 47 and 48) within the Ampfield settlement boundary
Support	10821	Support the change to the boundary shown on inset map 9 Ampfield West
	10795	Support the change to the boundary shown on inset map 9 Ampfield West

Settlement Boundaries	Michelmersh & Timsbury Parish Council 10106	Unfortunate that the draft plan continues to identify Michelmersh and Timsbury as separate settlements, they have coalesced and there is no significant physical separation. It is a single village administered by a single PC, we are a single community and would prefer if documents like the LP recognised this
Minerals and Waste	10797	request that adopted MCAs, as identified in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan, are also identified on the emerging Test Valley Policies Map. An appropriate policy cross referencing relevant section of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan should also be included; this should implement the 'agent of change' principle introduced in the NPPF too
New Forest National Park Authority- Recognition of New Forest	10696	Relevant designations in the National Park in Test Valley should not be shown on the Policies Map (or Inset Map 52) as the Policies Map should only cover the area within the remit of the Council's Local Plan Remove relevant designations in New Forest National Park from Policies Maps
Proposed Allocation	10194	neither the settlement boundary, nor the Local Gap boundary is shown as having been updated to reflect the proposed allocation. Paragraph 4.207 in allocation policy states that the local gap boundary is proposed to be amended to reflect the proposed allocation - issue with mapping and Policies Maps should be updated to show the site excluded from the Local Gap and included within the Settlement Boundary

Other Sites

Key Issue	Officer Response
Alternative Site	The site appraisal process undertaken for Regulation 18 Stage 2 is as set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper and detailed in the Sustainability Appraisal. In light of the Government's changes made to national planning policy and the revised standard method of local housing need, which has led to a significant increase in the number of homes for the draft local plan to plan for, the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy have been reviewed and potential SHELAA sites have been re-appraised to inform the determination of those to be now further allocated to seek to meet the increased housing requirement. The representations made on alternative sites at Regulation 18 Stage, together with any additional information provided, has informed this re-appraisal, as relevant.
Alternative Site – Not proposed for allocation	<p>The consultation was only on the content of the draft local which includes the sites proposed for draft allocation by the Council. Whilst comments on other sites not proposed for allocation are noted, these did not form part of the consultation proposals. The site appraisal process undertaken for Regulation 18 Stage 2 is as set out in the Site Assessment Topic Paper and detailed in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>In light of the Government's changes made to national planning policy and the revised standard method of local housing need, which has led to a significant increase in the number of homes for the draft local plan to plan for, the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy have been reviewed and potential SHELAA sites have been re-appraised to inform the determination of those to be now further allocated to seek to meet the increased housing requirement. This includes other sites not proposed for draft allocation at Regulation 18 Stage 2. The representations made on alternative sites at Regulation 18 Stage, together with any additional information provided, has informed this re-appraisal, as relevant.</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Alternative Site	10801	The Ridings in Weyhill is a partial brownfield site that is available, suitable and deliverable of up to 20 dwellings and would help meet Test Valleys housing need in a sustainable way.
Alternative Site - Allotments North of EA	11102	The Old allotments North of the Environment Agency Offices, Canal Walk is a derelict site which could be used for development.

Other Sites

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Offices, Canal Walk		
Alternative Site - Brentry Nursery	11120	the decision not to supply plants to other non-Hillier rival centres and the requirement for increased automation approximately half of the current Brentry site will become surplus. Placement in new technology does not come cheap and in order to achieve its aspirations Hillier needs to realise a value from the surplus area of the site to fund the necessary improvements that will safeguard jobs and the strength of the business going forward the promotion and delivery of sustainable development on this surplus land forms an essential part of the business case.
Alternative Site - Brewery	11102	The Brewery site is a derelict site which could be used for development.
Alternative Site - Finkley Down Farm SHELAA Ref 165	10133	Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) suitable and logical development location, providing coherent and sustainable extension to Augusta Park (East Anton) at only Tier 1 settlement within NTV HMA Allocate Land at Finkley Down (SHELAA Ref 165)
	10133	Land at Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) represents suitable, sustainable and logical development location at Andover. Allocate Land at Finkley Down (SHELAA Ref 165)
	10133	Land at Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) represents more appropriate and suitable development location, when compared to other sites which are proposed to be taken forward as allocations Allocate Land at Finkley Down (SHELAA Ref 165)
	10133	Land at Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) provides genuine opportunity to support delivery of significant number 1,500 dwellings and associated infrastructure, and supporting role of Andover as top tier settlement
	10133	Location of Land at Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) recognised in SHELAA as being accessible to widest range of facilities and services present at Andover. Location maximises sustainable transport choices and is more accessible due to better public transport provision
	10133	Development at Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) can support highly sustainable movement strategy, maximising sustainable transport choices, specifically public transport connection to key destination in and around Andover. Supporting robust and deliverable strategies for carbon

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		reduction/neutral measures, net gains in biodiversity, landscape enhancements and protections, and protection of heritage assets
	10133	Based on Council's own findings Land at Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) presents one of the least sensitive options in landscape and visual terms for strategic growth in the Borough
	10133	Transport submission concludes that Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) ranks as highest placed site within considering SA transport objectives
	10133	Ecology note for Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) shows site contains habitats of limited ecological interest, with those of greatest value associated with the native hedgerows and mature trees at field boundaries. Any potential negative effects on protected or priority species could be readily addressed through habitat creation within strategic green infrastructure corridors
	10133	Scoring assigned to Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) are misplaced. Presence of parcels of Ancient Woodland and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation within surrounding landscape are not considered to represent a constraint to principle of development and no significant risk of development impacting off-site TPO trees
	10133	Constraints such as need to deliver nutrient neutrality and secure net gain in biodiversity are ubiquitous requirements for all strategic allocations
	10133	No overriding constraints have been identified to suggest development at Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) could not be achieved in a manner consistent with emerging policies BIO1-BIO5
	10133	Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) represents a more appropriate and sustainable development option in transport and landscape terms, and critically evidence base does not support decision to allocate sites at Ludgershall.
	10133	Finkey Down Farm ranks second in all the sites when taking transport related SA objectives into account
	10133	Council's assessment does not include proposals set out in indicative masterplan which would further enhance sustainability of the Finkley Down site Not included masterplan enhancements
	10133	For 20-minute neighbourhood principles, 20 minute walking catchments for site in Ludgershall only include Ludgershall, whereas Finkley Down Farm walking catchment include facilities and amenities in Andover and Walworth Business Park.
	10133	Land at Ludgershall is listed in SA as being sequentially preferred over land at Finkley Down Farm, despite clear and obvious disparities in accessibility of Ludgershall compared with Finkley Down Farm.
	10133	Finkley Down Farm out performs Ludgershall sites in respect of Objectives 2, 3 and 10.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10133	With remaining objectives little in analysis to suggest Ludgershall sites perform noticeably more positively than Finkley Down Farm. More accurate to conclude that Finkley Down Farm performs better than proposed sites at Ludgershall SA scoring
	10133	Paragraph 5.130 only refers to Ludgershall sites being sequentially preferable to Forest Lane and Penton Corner, and less constrained and perform better through SA compared to remaining Andover sites. Lack of references to Finkley Down Farm raises some questions and creates lack of clarity on Council's position in comparing SA performance compared to Ludgershall sites
	10133	SA clear in sequentially placing Ludgershall sites above Finkley Down Farm, yet little by way of analysis within SA to demonstrate why this is the case Lack of analysis
	10133	Paragraph 5.130 that Ludgershall sites are less constrained and perform better through SA can evidently not be accurate in respect of comparison with Finkley Down Farm. SA does not support such conclusion
	10133	Site selection process does not support identification of Ludgershall sites as sequentially preferable to Finkley Down Farm
	10133	Officer assessed capacity of 900 dwellings not supported
	10133	Clear that site proposed to be allocated within Regulation 18 consultation have higher landscape sensitivities than Finkley Down Farm
	10133	More suitable and appropriate site options, Finkley Down Farm are available and would deliver sustainable patterns of development that support the objectives of spatial strategy.
	10133	Based on findings land at Finkley Down Farm presents one of least sensitive options in landscape and visual terms for strategic scale growth
	10133	From Council's own landscape evidence clear site proposed to be allocated have higher landscape sensitivities than land at Finkley Down Farm
	10133	For assessing landscape impacts sets quantum of 900 dwellings. Whilst do not support conclusions on total capacity, concludes capable of being delivered without significant landscape impacts.
	10133	Transport related impacts key driver behind ranking of Finkley Down Farm. Do not agree on conclusions that transport impacts referred to as significant provide appropriate basis to reject site as potential allocation or reduce relative performance of growth scenarios which include site (Scenarios 3 and 4). Traffic modelling does not support this conclusion.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10133	Concludes that network is able to accommodate additional traffic movements from growth scenarios subject to appropriate mitigation to avoid significant effects. Whilst acknowledging will be impact volume/capacity results are still below theoretical capacity at 91% in both AM and PM peak without mitigation. As such modelling demonstrates delivery of both Manor Farm and Finkley Down Farm is realistic option in terms of identified quantum.
	10133	Council's own modelling show network capable of accommodating quantum of development at both Manor Farm and Finkley Down Farm. Therefore, conclusion within site selection process that Finkley Down Farm likely to cause significant issues on local network and Enham Arch is not supported by evidence.
	10133	Sites to the north of the Borough around Andover have greater access to existing facilities and public transport. This conclusion supports sustainable and active travel potential of Finkley Down Farm located within walking and cycling distance of facilities and amenities in Andover, as well as existing bus and rail services
	10133	Approach to assessment raise serious questions on soundness of site selection process and in particular, way Finkley Down Farm is appraised relative to other potential locations
	10133	No logical rationale to explain why Finkley Down Farm, as alternative to Manor Farm, does not form part of reasonable growth scenario which includes land at Ludgershall. Comparative performance of Finkley Down Farm against Manor Farm, does not support its exclusion from forming part of a wider range of growth scenarios.
	10133	Figure 5 sets out a summary of preferred sites suitability for the NTV sub-area. There is no summary within the topic paper to explain why other sites, including Finkley Down Farm were rejected
	10133	Finkley Down Farm only considered through SA as site in addition to Manor Farm, yet Finkley Down Farm outperforms Manor Farm. Reference to modelling and capacity issues on local network, including Enham Arch only applied as constraint on basis that site is additional.
	10133	Do not agree with conclusion that transport impacts associated with Finkley Down Farm provide appropriate basis to reject site as potential allocation. Traffic modelling does not support this conclusion
	10133	Sequential order preference which ranks Finkley Down Farm 5th, with Manor Farm top performing variable site, not supported by Council's own assessment in SA
	10133	Main driver for rejecting Finkley Down Farm, related to transport impacts is not supported by Council's own evidence, which clearly shows than even in combination with Manor Farm, and in advance of any mitigation and sustainable transport measures, the local network has capacity.
	10133	Walking and cycling catchments demonstrate Finkley Down Farm is better located to access larger range of services and facilities, compared to Ludgershall allocations. Do not agree with paragraph 6.9

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		of topic paper, which does not reflect challenges faced by allocations in providing suitable and sustainable access to services and facilities.
	10133	Finkley Down Farm has not been considered on a fair and comparable basis. Ability of site to deliver strategic scale development in a manner which supports sustainable development, consistent with objectives of local plan, whilst supporting role and function of Andover artificially curtailed through the site selection process and assessment of reasonable growth scenarios
Alternative site - Halterworth	10269	Since the decision to prevent development between Halterworth and Highwood Lane the landowner has deliberately tried to downgrade the land with very little maintenance/management
Alternative Site - Hilliers Brentry	10787	Object to the Ganger Farm proposal as the Hilliers Brentry proposal would appear a better alternative due to being a brownfield site with its own access onto Jermyn's Lane and footpath access to Ampfield Wood from Kings Chase development
Alternative Site - Land adjoining West Portway Industrial Estate	11119	The site is in a sustainable location close to strategic highway network that can contribute toward employment land. The site is currently used for agriculture and evidence suggests it has not undergone previous development. The site could provide more than 27,000 sqm (296,000 sqft.) employment floorspace in E(g)(i)/B2/B8 use and contribute to needs for logistics space. The site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory landscape, ecology or heritage designations but the most northern part abuts a conservation area.
	11119	The developable area is outside the minerals safeguarding area. Technical inputs consider the site's landscape sensitivity is not as high as stated in the SHELAA. The designation of the site within a local gap is not considered a constraint as future proposals can be sensitively and appropriately designed also ensuring any impact to nearby heritage assets are appropriately considered and assessed. There is no flood risk constraint and the landscape-led concept allows space for any potential mitigation, at least 10% biodiversity net gain can be achieved.
	11119	A vehicular access can be provided in the northeastern corner with pedestrian and cycle access provided alongside with further access provided to connect to the existing Harrow Way Byway. Infrastructure to support existing equestrian, pedestrian and cycle movements along the bridleway can be provided and there are opportunities to improve the existing cycle network to the east of West Portway Industrial Estate.
	11119	Contributions from the development could help deliver the needs identified in the Test Valley Cycle Strategy and Network SPD.
Alternative Site - Land at Hook Road (SHELAA 44 & 45)	10795	Object to the omission of Land at Hook Road (SHELAA 44 & 45) from the settlement boundary Alterations to map 8 Ampfield East to include Land at Hook Road (SHELAA 44 & 45) within the settlement boundary

Other Sites

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10795	Land at Hook Road (SHELAA 44 & 45) is located where development is considered acceptable in principle on either side and would provide a logical infill
	10795	Development on Land at Hook Road (SHELAA 44 & 45) would provide support to existing services and facilities
	10795	Land at Hook Road (SHELAA 44 & 45) is within walking distance of a daycare nursery, primary school and public house
	10795	Land at Hook Road (SHELAA 44 & 45) is within a regular bus route between Romsey and Winchester
Alternative Site - Land at Redburn Farm, SHELAA 93	10343	Promoting site adjacent to Ampfield (Tier 3 settlement) in STV which has good access to primary school, village hall, bus services to Romsey and Winchester, public house, open space and place of worship, for 40 - 70 dwellings. The site could deliver homes within 1-5 years.
Alternative Site - Land at Sleepy Hollow SHELAA 47 & 48	10821	Land at Sleepy Hollow (SHELAA 47 & 48) is located between continuous residential frontage on the A3090 and represents a logical addition for development in the village
	10821	Land at Sleepy Hollow (SHELAA 47 & 48) is not in the conservation areas and not identified for its landscape value
	10821	Existing services run through the site Land at Sleepy Hollow (SHELAA 47 & 48) to the business park
	10821	Land at Sleepy Hollow (SHELAA 47 & 48) is within walking distance of the primary school, village hall, public house and sports field which ensures future occupiers would make a valuable contribution towards sustaining the villages services and facilities
	10795	Support the inclusion of Land at Sleepy Hollow, Ampfield (SHELAA 47 and 48) within the Ampfield settlement boundary
	10795	Land at Sleepy Hollow (SHELAA 47 & 48) is located between continuous residential frontage on the A3090 and represents a logical addition for development in the village
	10795	Land at Sleepy Hollow (SHELAA 47 & 48) is not in the conservation areas and not identified for its landscape value
	10795	Existing services run through the site Land at Sleepy Hollow (SHELAA 47 & 48) to the business park
	10795	Land at Sleepy Hollow (SHELAA 47 & 48) is within walking distance of the primary school, village hall, public house and sports field which ensures future occupiers would make a valuable contribution towards sustaining the villages services and facilities
	10795	Land at Sleepy Hollow (SHELAA 47 & 48) is within walking distance of the primary school, village hall, public house and sports field which ensures future occupiers would make a valuable contribution towards sustaining the villages services and facilities
Alternative Site - Land at	10389	The Highwood Group makes incorrect and misleading claims to the population of Stockbridge saying that it has been halved since 1851. This is misleading due to the decline in agricultural workers, unsanitary properties being demolished and cottages being combined into larger single dwellings.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Stockbridge School		
	10389	There is a generous mix of affordable housing in Stockbridge and more than the 17 properties claimed by the Highwood Group. There are in fact 37 properties: Rosalind Hill House, Old School Close, Trafalgar Way, Blandford Row, bungalows at Milsoms.
	10389	Incorrect claims that Stockbridge has an exceptional level of public transport, as there are poor public transport links that are regularly reduced and their claims that there are rail links locally with Winchester are contradicted by the fact that private car use is needed to get there.
	10389	Concern that TVBC is sympathetic to the submission document that is purely a promotional document for developers that are interested in the land adjacent to Test Valley school.
Alternative Site - Land north of Hill View Farm	10391	The plan proposes to create an accessway to the proposed development at the T-junction where Old Stockbridge Rd meets Wallop Rd - the T-junction is used as a main commuting route for cars and HGV traffic and is a dangerous route, making it unsuitable for access to the proposed development. The traffic calming measures to narrow the route on Wallop Rd has also increased the number of HGVs using the junction.
	10391	There is not enough rough to add a pavement which links to the current footpath on Wallop Rd from the proposed development.
	10391	The proposed development would greatly increase the flooding in the area as the houses will connect into an overflowing network.
	10391	The small housing development on the land occupied by The Shire Horse PH has increased the amount of surface water and covering up more area of land with housing will reduce the area of natural drainage and would exacerbate flooding issues.
	10391	The existing properties will become trapped between the commuter road and the railway lines on one side and a housing site on the other side, as a result of the proposed development.
	10391	Residents on Wallop Rd are greatly affected by the noise of the busy road outside their properties and use the fields north of Hill View Farm to find quiet behind their houses.
	10391	The majority of the north field of Hill View Farm is protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and supports a variety of wildlife and is free from pesticides.
	10391	Part of the land borders land on Grateley railway station which SWR has adopted as an area of natural land and is an environment home to the UK's smallest butterfly - the Drew Smith development would create a disturbance to the natural habitat.
	10393	The plan proposes to create an accessway to the proposed development at the T-junction where Old Stockbridge Rd meets Wallop Rd - the T-junction is used as a main commuting route for cars and HGV traffic and is a dangerous route, making it unsuitable for access to the proposed development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		The traffic calming measures to narrow the route on Wallop Rd has also increased the number of HGVs using the junction.
	10393	There is not enough rough to add a pavement which links to the current footpath on Wallop Rd from the proposed development.
	10393	The proposed development would greatly increase the flooding in the area as the houses will connect into an overflowing network.
	10393	The small housing development on the land occupied by The Shire Horse PH has increased the amount of surface water and covering up more area of land with housing will reduce the area of natural drainage and would exacerbate flooding issues.
	10393	The existing properties will become trapped between the commuter road and the railway lines on one side and a housing site on the other side, as a result of the proposed development.
	10393	Residents on Wallop Rd are greatly affected by the noise of the busy road outside their properties and use the fields north of Hill View Farm to find quiet behind their houses.
	10393	The majority of the north field of Hill View Farm is protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and supports a variety of wildlife and is free from pesticides.
	10393	Part of the land borders land on Grateley railway station which SWR has adopted as an area of natural land and is an environment home to the UK's smallest butterfly - the Drew Smith development would create a disturbance to the natural habitat.
	10394	The plan proposes to create an accessway to the proposed development at the T-junction where Old Stockbridge Rd meets Wallop Rd - the T-junction is used as a main commuting route for cars and HGV traffic and is a dangerous route, making it unsuitable for access to the proposed development. The traffic calming measures to narrow the route on Wallop Rd has also increased the number of HGVs using the junction.
	10394	There is not enough rough to add a pavement which links to the current footpath on Wallop Rd from the proposed development.
	10394	The proposed development would greatly increase the flooding in the area as the houses will connect into an overflowing network.
	10394	The small housing development on the land occupied by The Shire Horse PH has increased the amount of surface water and covering up more area of land with housing will reduce the area of natural drainage and would exacerbate flooding issues.
	10394	The existing properties will become trapped between the commuter road and the railway lines on one side and a housing site on the other side, as a result of the proposed development.
	10394	Residents on Wallop Rd are greatly affected by the noise of the busy road outside their properties and use the fields north of Hill View Farm to find quiet behind their houses.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10394	The majority of the north field of Hill View Farm is protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and supports a variety of wildlife and is free from pesticides.
	10394	Part of the land borders land on Grateley railway station which SWR has adopted as an area of natural land and is an environment home to the UK's smallest butterfly - the Drew Smith development would create a disturbance to the natural habitat.
	10395	The plan proposes to create an accessway to the proposed development at the T-junction where Old Stockbridge Rd meets Wallop Rd - the T-junction is used as a main commuting route for cars and HGV traffic and is a dangerous route, making it unsuitable for access to The proposed development. The traffic calming measures to narrow the route on Wallop Rd has also increased the number of HGVs using the junction.
	10395	There is not enough rough to add a pavement which links to the current footpath on Wallop Rd from the proposed development.
	10395	The proposed development would greatly increase the flooding in the area as the houses will connect into an overflowing network.
	10395	The small housing development on the land occupied by The Shire Horse PH has increased the amount of surface water and covering up more area of land with housing will reduce the area of natural drainage and would exacerbate flooding issues.
	10395	The existing properties will become trapped between the commuter road and the railway lines on one side and a housing site on the other side, as a result of the proposed development.
	10395	Residents on Wallop Rd are greatly affected by the noise of the busy road outside their properties and use the fields north of Hill View Farm to find quiet behind their houses.
	10395	The majority of the north field of Hill View Farm is protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and supports a variety of wildlife and is free from pesticides.
	10395	Part of the land borders land on Grateley railway station which SWR has adopted as an area of natural land and is an environment home to the UK's smallest butterfly - the Drew Smith development would create a disturbance to the natural habitat.
	10769	The plan proposes to create an accessway to the proposed development at the T-junction where Old Stockbridge Rd meets Wallop Rd - the T-junction is used as a main commuting route for cars and HGV traffic and is a dangerous route, making it unsuitable for access to the proposed development. The traffic calming measures to narrow the route on Wallop Rd has also increased the number of HGVs using the junction.
	10769	There is not enough rough to add a pavement which links to the current footpath on Wallop Rd from the proposed development.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10769	The proposed development would greatly increase the flooding in the area as the houses will connect into an overflowing network.
	10769	The small housing development on the land occupied by The Shire Horse PH has increased the amount of surface water and covering up more area of land with housing will reduce the area of natural drainage and would exacerbate flooding issues.
	10769	The existing properties will become trapped between the commuter road and the railway lines on one side and a housing site on the other side, as a result of the proposed development.
	10769	Residents on Wallop Rd are greatly affected by the noise of the busy road outside their properties and use the fields north of Hill View Farm to find quiet behind their houses.
	10769	The majority of the north field of Hill View Farm is protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and supports a variety of wildlife and is free from pesticides.
	10769	Part of the land borders land on Grateley railway station which SWR has adopted as an area of natural land and is an environment home to the UK's smallest butterfly - the Drew Smith development would create a disturbance to the natural habitat.
	10770	The plan proposes to create an accessway to the proposed development at the T-junction where Old Stockbridge Rd meets Wallop Rd - the T-junction is used as a main commuting route for cars and HGV traffic and is a dangerous route, making it unsuitable for access to the proposed development. The traffic calming measures to narrow the route on Wallop Rd has also increased the number of HGVs using the junction.
	10770	There is not enough rough to add a pavement which links to the current footpath on Wallop Rd from the proposed development.
	10770	The proposed development would greatly increase the flooding in the area as the houses will connect into an overflowing network.
	10770	The small housing development on the land occupied by The Shire Horse PH has increased the amount of surface water and covering up more area of land with housing will reduce the area of natural drainage and would exacerbate flooding issues.
	10770	The existing properties will become trapped between the commuter road and the railway lines on one side and a housing site on the other side, as a result of the proposed development.
	10770	Residents on Wallop Rd are greatly affected by the noise of the busy road outside their properties and use the fields north of Hill View Farm to find quiet behind their houses.
	10770	The majority of the north field of Hill View Farm is protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and supports a variety of wildlife and is free from pesticides.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10770	Part of the land borders land on Grateley railway station which SWR has adopted as an area of natural land and is an environment home to the UK's smallest butterfly - the Drew Smith development would create a disturbance to the natural habitat.
	10771	The plan proposes to create an accessway to the proposed development at the T-junction where Old Stockbridge Rd meets Wallop Rd - the T-junction is used as a main commuting route for cars and HGV traffic and is a dangerous route, making it unsuitable for access to the proposed development. The traffic calming measures to narrow the route on Wallop Rd has also increased the number of HGVs using the junction.
	10771	There is not enough rough to add a pavement which links to the current footpath on Wallop Rd from the proposed development.
	10771	The proposed development would greatly increase the flooding in the area as the houses will connect into an overflowing network.
	10771	The small housing development on the land occupied by The Shire Horse PH has increased the amount of surface water and covering up more area of land with housing will reduce the area of natural drainage and would exacerbate flooding issues.
	10771	The existing properties will become trapped between the commuter road and the railway lines on one side and a housing site on the other side, as a result of the proposed development.
	10771	Residents on Wallop Rd are greatly affected by the noise of the busy road outside their properties and use the fields north of Hill View Farm to find quiet behind their houses.
	10771	The majority of the north field of Hill View Farm is protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and supports a variety of wildlife and is free from pesticides.
	10771	Part of the land borders land on Grateley railway station which SWR has adopted as an area of natural land and is an environment home to the UK's smallest butterfly - the Drew Smith development would create a disturbance to the natural habitat.
	10772	The plan proposes to create an accessway to the proposed development at the T-junction where Old Stockbridge Rd meets Wallop Rd - the T-junction is used as a main commuting route for cars and HGV traffic and is a dangerous route, making it unsuitable for access to the proposed development. The traffic calming measures to narrow the route on Wallop Rd has also increased the number of HGVs using the junction.
	10772	There is not enough rough to add a pavement which links to the current footpath on Wallop Rd from the proposed development.
	10772	The proposed development would greatly increase the flooding in the area as the houses will connect into an overflowing network.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10772	The small housing development on the land occupied by The Shire Horse PH has increased the amount of surface water and covering up more area of land with housing will reduce the area of natural drainage and would exacerbate flooding issues.
	10772	The existing properties will become trapped between the commuter road and the railway lines on one side and a housing site on the other side, as a result of the proposed development.
	10772	Residents on Wallop Rd are greatly affected by the noise of the busy road outside their properties and use the fields north of Hill View Farm to find quiet behind their houses.
	10772	The majority of the north field of Hill View Farm is protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and supports a variety of wildlife and is free from pesticides.
	10772	Part of the land borders land on Grateley railway station which SWR has adopted as an area of natural land and is an environment home to the UK's smallest butterfly - the Drew Smith development would create a disturbance to the natural habitat.
	10773	The plan proposes to create an accessway to the proposed development at the T-junction where Old Stockbridge Rd meets Wallop Rd - the T-junction is used as a main commuting route for cars and HGV traffic and is a dangerous route, making it unsuitable for access to the proposed development. The traffic calming measures to narrow the route on Wallop Rd has also increased the number of HGVs using the junction.
	10773	There is not enough rough to add a pavement which links to the current footpath on Wallop Rd from the proposed development.
	10773	The proposed development would greatly increase the flooding in the area as the houses will connect into an overflowing network.
	10773	The small housing development on the land occupied by The Shire Horse PH has increased the amount of surface water and covering up more area of land with housing will reduce the area of natural drainage and would exacerbate flooding issues.
	10773	The existing properties will become trapped between the commuter road and the railway lines on one side and a housing site on the other side, as a result of the proposed development.
	10773	Residents on Wallop Rd are greatly affected by the noise of the busy road outside their properties and use the fields north of Hill View Farm to find quiet behind their houses.
	10773	The majority of the north field of Hill View Farm is protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and supports a variety of wildlife and is free from pesticides.
	10773	Part of the land borders land on Grateley railway station which SWR has adopted as an area of natural land and is an environment home to the UK's smallest butterfly - the Drew Smith development would create a disturbance to the natural habitat.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10774	The plan proposes to create an accessway to the proposed development at the T-junction where Old Stockbridge Rd meets Wallop Rd - the T-junction is used as a main commuting route for cars and HGV traffic and is a dangerous route, making it unsuitable for access to the proposed development. The traffic calming measures to narrow the route on Wallop Rd has also increased the number of HGVs using the junction.
	10774	There is not enough rough to add a pavement which links to the current footpath on Wallop Rd from the proposed development.
	10774	The proposed development would greatly increase the flooding in the area as the houses will connect into an overflowing network.
	10774	The small housing development on the land occupied by The Shire Horse PH has increased the amount of surface water and covering up more area of land with housing will reduce the area of natural drainage and would exacerbate flooding issues.
	10774	The existing properties will become trapped between the commuter road and the railway lines on one side and a housing site on the other side, as a result of the proposed development.
	10774	Residents on Wallop Rd are greatly affected by the noise of the busy road outside their properties and use the fields north of Hill View Farm to find quiet behind their houses.
	10774	The majority of the north field of Hill View Farm is protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and supports a variety of wildlife and is free from pesticides.
	10774	Part of the land borders land on Grateley railway station which SWR has adopted as an area of natural land and is an environment home to the UK's smallest butterfly - the Drew Smith development would create a disturbance to the natural habitat.
Alternative Site - Land north of Hill View Farm and Land to the north of Streetway Road	10391	Object to the proposals to build 160 dwellings submitted in the document prepared on behalf of Drew Smith by A2 - Architecture & Development and Savills Planning, in response to the Reg 18 Stage 1 public consultation exercise. Objections refer specifically to the land north of Hill View Farm and includes comments regarding the land north of Streetway Road.
	10393	Object to the proposals to build 160 dwellings submitted in the document prepared on behalf of Drew Smith by A2 - Architecture & Development and Savills Planning, in response to the Reg 18 Stage 1 public consultation exercise. Objections refer specifically to the land north of Hill View Farm and includes comments regarding the land north of Streetway Road.
	10394	Object to the proposals to build 160 dwellings submitted in the document prepared on behalf of Drew Smith by A2 - Architecture & Development and Savills Planning, in response to the Reg 18 Stage 1

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		public consultation exercise. Objections refer specifically to the land north of Hill View Farm and includes comments regarding the land north of Streetway Road.
	10395	Object to the proposals to build 160 dwellings submitted in the document prepared on behalf of Drew Smith by A2 - Architecture & Development and Savills Planning, in response to the Reg 18 Stage 1 public consultation exercise. Objections refer specifically to the land north of Hill View Farm and includes comments regarding the land north of Streetway Road.
	10769	Object to the proposals to build 160 dwellings submitted in the document prepared on behalf of Drew Smith by A2 - Architecture & Development and Savills Planning, in response to the Reg 18 Stage 1 public consultation exercise. Objections refer specifically to the land north of Hill View Farm and includes comments regarding the land north of Streetway Road.
	10770	Object to the proposals to build 160 dwellings submitted in the document prepared on behalf of Drew Smith by A2 - Architecture & Development and Savills Planning, in response to the Reg 18 Stage 1 public consultation exercise. Objections refer specifically to the land north of Hill View Farm and includes comments regarding the land north of Streetway Road.
	10771	Object to the proposals to build 160 dwellings submitted in the document prepared on behalf of Drew Smith by A2 - Architecture & Development and Savills Planning, in response to the Reg 18 Stage 1 public consultation exercise. Objections refer specifically to the land north of Hill View Farm and includes comments regarding the land north of Streetway Road.
	10772	Object to the proposals to build 160 dwellings submitted in the document prepared on behalf of Drew Smith by A2 - Architecture & Development and Savills Planning, in response to the Reg 18 Stage 1 public consultation exercise. Objections refer specifically to the land north of Hill View Farm and includes comments regarding the land north of Streetway Road.
	10773	Object to the proposals to build 160 dwellings submitted in the document prepared on behalf of Drew Smith by A2 - Architecture & Development and Savills Planning, in response to the Reg 18 Stage 1 public consultation exercise. Objections refer specifically to the land north of Hill View Farm and includes comments regarding the land north of Streetway Road.
	10774	Object to the proposals to build 160 dwellings submitted in the document prepared on behalf of Drew Smith by A2 - Architecture & Development and Savills Planning, in response to the Reg 18 Stage 1 public consultation exercise. Objections refer specifically to the land north of Hill View Farm and includes comments regarding the land north of Streetway Road.
Alternative Site - Land north of Jacobs Folly SHELAA 46	10795	Land north of Jacobs Folly (SHELAA 46) is located on the main approach into Braishfield and represents a logical addition for development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10795	Land north of Jacobs Folly (SHELAA 46) is not in the conservation area and not identified for its landscape value
	10795	No meaningful changes have been made to the Braishfield boundary and any inclusions will not contribute towards supporting the vitality and viability of the villages services and facilities
	10795	Land north of Jacobs Folly (SHELAA 46) is within walking distance of the primary school, village hall, public houses, shop and all amenities available in Braishfield which ensures future occupiers would make a valuable contribution towards sustaining the villages services and facilities
Alternative Site - Land north of Streetway Road	10750	Concerned by the proposed developments in the submitted proposals by the Drew Smith Organisation for sites in Grateley such as the land off Streetway Rd.
Alternative Site - Land off Station Close	10750	Concerned by the proposed developments in the submitted proposals by the Drew Smith Organisation for sites in Grateley such as the land off Station Close.
Alternative Site - Land South East of Dunkirt Lane	10116	Note preferred strategy is to defer development policy in many of the villages (Tier 3 and 4 settlements) including Abbots Ann, which is recognised in the evidence base as having all the key facilities for sustainable growth, to community led initiatives and community planning. We take the opportunity to confirm site 190 remains available. It is appropriate it is included in the SHELAA.
Alternative Site - Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows	11010	Maintaining open connections between Fishlake Meadow Nature Reserve (FMNR) and surrounding countryside is critical to attracting diverse species and sustaining wildlife welfare
	11008	Overdevelopment along Cupernham Lane will harm the nature and visual character surrounding Oxlease Meadows Nature Reserve
	11008	Maintaining open connections between Fishlake Meadow Nature Reserve (FMNR) and surrounding countryside is critical to attracting diverse species, sustaining wildlife welfare and maintaining Romsey character
	10963	Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows is an open countryside location and the plan should protect this and sustain wildlife, any development would alter the character of Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and result in the loss of local amenity
	10963	Any development on Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows would affect noise, pollution, safety and traffic within the area

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10990	Maintaining open connections between Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and surrounding countryside is critical to attracting species and sustaining wildlife, current development is already displacing local wildlife
	10990	Further development on Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows and to the West of Cupernham Lane would result in loss of amenity and alter the character of Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve
	10991	Further development on Land to the North of Oxlease Meadows and to the West of Cupernham Lane would result in loss of amenity and alter the character of Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve where rare birds exist in small numbers
	10993	Maintaining open connections between Fishlake Meadows Nature Reserve and surrounding countryside is critical to attracting and maintaining diverse species and sustaining wildlife
	10470	Any proposed development or the offering of sites for development of housing, business or gypsy, traveller or show people use outside of the defined settlement boundary particularly on land identified as open countryside must be resisted and not included in the Local Plan for consideration. This in particular reference to Land North of Oxlease Meadows as this part of Romsey has already seen expansive urban sprawl.
	10470	Land North of Oxlease Meadows is not suitable for the SHELAA because urban sprawl to the north east of Romsey has already had a detrimental effect on local infrastructure, traffic, noise pollution, schools and health services any new development will exacerbate these issues
	10470	Urban sprawl to the north east of Romsey has caused extensive overlooking particularly from multi-storey development which in turn affects amenity, noise and the
	10470	Land North of Oxlease Meadows is not suitable for the SHELAA because urban sprawl to the north east of Romsey has caused the substantial loss of timber which is destroying swathes of wildlife habitat and natural breaks and corridors
	10470	Land North of Oxlease Meadows is not suitable for the SHELAA because Sites such as Fishlake Meadows, SSSI, the Romsey Barge Canal, the River Test and all its chalk stream subsidiaries must remain unaffected by urban blight and pollution
	11071	It is critical to maintain the existing settlement boundaries around Fishlake Meadow Nature Reserve and the scenic canal path as per the current and proposed plan
	11071	The current local plan has not designated Land North of Oxlease Meadows and it is outside the settlement boundary-the proposed plan should protect this status
	11071	There has been too much development along Cupernham Lane and the Canal path and nature reserve, further development will be against the principle of the existing boundary-use brownfield land instead and protect the character of Romsey
	11022	Further development along Cupernham will be detrimental to Romsey.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11022	Existing permissions in the immediate area of Cupernham provide a substantial amount of housing for the future and so other areas should be prioritised for further residential development.
	11022	Concerned on the fate of the Horse Field adjacent to Oxlease Meadows.
	11022	TVBC to uphold settlement boundary North of Oxlease Meadows and not allow speculative building to the west of Cupernham Lane.
		Uphold settlement boundary and do not allow speculative building to the West of Cupernham Lane.
	10871	The proposed strategic housing allocations cater for the needs of Romsey and therefore it is not necessary to propose housing west of Cupernham Lane.
	11022	Avoid development that has a negative impact on the Barge Canal and the Wildlife reserve.
Alternative Site - Land to the north of Streetway Road	10391	The Land North of Streetway Rd is very close to Porton Down and Quarley Hill Fort which are both SSSIs. Porton Down is also a Special Area of Conservation and a Special Protection Area and is of international importance. The scale of building proposed would disrupt the natural environment.
	10393	The Land North of Streetway Rd is very close to Porton Down and Quarley Hill Fort which are both SSSIs. Porton Down is also a Special Area of Conservation and a Special Protection Area and is of international importance. The scale of building proposed would disrupt the natural environment.
	10394	The Land North of Streetway Rd is very close to Porton Down and Quarley Hill Fort which are both SSSIs. Porton Down is also a Special Area of Conservation and a Special Protection Area and is of international importance. The scale of building proposed would disrupt the natural environment.
	10395	The Land North of Streetway Rd is very close to Porton Down and Quarley Hill Fort which are both SSSIs. Porton Down is also a Special Area of Conservation and a Special Protection Area and is of international importance. The scale of building proposed would disrupt the natural environment.
	10769	The Land North of Streetway Rd is very close to Porton Down and Quarley Hill Fort which are both SSSIs. Porton Down is also a Special Area of Conservation and a Special Protection Area and is of international importance. The scale of building proposed would disrupt the natural environment.
	10770	The Land North of Streetway Rd is very close to Porton Down and Quarley Hill Fort which are both SSSIs. Porton Down is also a Special Area of Conservation and a Special Protection Area and is of international importance. The scale of building proposed would disrupt the natural environment.
	10771	The Land North of Streetway Rd is very close to Porton Down and Quarley Hill Fort which are both SSSIs. Porton Down is also a Special Area of Conservation and a Special Protection Area and is of international importance. The scale of building proposed would disrupt the natural environment.

Other Sites

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10772	The Land North of Streetway Rd is very close to Porton Down and Quarley Hill Fort which are both SSSIs. Porton Down is also a Special Area of Conservation and a Special Protection Area and is of international importance. The scale of building proposed would disrupt the natural environment.
	10773	The Land North of Streetway Rd is very close to Porton Down and Quarley Hill Fort which are both SSSIs. Porton Down is also an Special Area of Conservation and a Special Protection Area and is of international importance. The scale of building proposed would disrupt the natural environment.
	10774	The Land North of Streetway Rd is very close to Porton Down and Quarley Hill Fort which are both SSSIs. Porton Down is also a Special Area of Conservation and a Special Protection Area and is of international importance. The scale of building proposed would disrupt the natural environment.
Alternative Site - Land West of Dean Road	10213	Nova planning Ltd supports the promotion of land west of Dean Road, Kimpton to deliver approximately 5-10 dwellings.
Alternative site - North of Sandy Lane, Romsey	11115	Questions whether other allocations at Romsey (Ganger farm, South of Bypass) are sequentially preferable to north of Sandy Lane. The allocated sites have significant constraints. Sandy Lane should be allocated alongside these sites.
Alternative site - North of Sandy Lane, Romsey	11115	The site is outside the settlement boundary but in a sustainable location. The settlement boundary could be redrawn.
Alternative Site - SHELAA 83	10801	Further expansion of the settlement boundary for Weyhill West to include Shelaa site 83 would be encouraged.
Alternative Site - SHELAA sites 237 and part of 236 plus newly promoted site to the east of Test Valley School	11151	The concept masterplan sets out a vision for development on the existing playing fields for Test Valley school while providing new playing fields to the immediate south of the school to meet the deficit of 12,000 sqm of playing fields.
	11151	The proposal includes a new full sized running track, a youth football pitch and improvements to the school access through provision of a dedicated bus turning area and additional parking to alleviate school drop off and pick up.
	11151	The proposals will also deliver around 150 new homes to help Stockbridge grow and remain a sustainable place. The promoter is exploring with the school whether new playing fields could be made open to the public outside of school hours

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11151	The remainder of the southern part of the land forming 236 also provides continued opportunity for green and blue infrastructure to possibly serve the site and wider district, including potential BNG and Nutrient credits, while preventing any coalescence with Houghton.
	11151	There are also opportunities to provide a park and stride type facility on land to the north of Test Valley school in the same control as the sites, which could be used by staff working in Stockbridge to free up parking for customers in the centre of the settlement.
	11151	Highwood have been working with Test Valley School and the HiSP academy trust to understand the acute issues that face the school including most recent Ofsted rating of 'inadequate' across all categories. Issues also include ongoing viability with the school at just over 50% capacity, substandard access arrangements resulting in long waits for buses and safety issues, under-provision of school playing fields against Department of Education guidelines and difficulty in recruiting teachers locally. The promoters has produced a concept plan which provides opportunities to address the school's issues while providing c. 150 new homes to help Stockbridge grow sustainably. The southern part of site 236 is no longer promoted for residential development.
	11151	Technically the site's being promoted are outside of the administrative boundary of Stockbridge parish, sites 236 and 237 both directly adjoin the Stockbridge settlement boundary and would need the direct needs of Stockbridge as well as the wider rural area.
Alternative Site - Whitbread Old Brewery	11022	Avoid using up further green space along and develop existing sites such as the Whitbread Old Brewery site. Proposed developments should be planned on existing sites.
Alternative site - Former Goods Yard, Dunbridge	11109	Proposed site for small/medium scale development, which is available now. The parish council and local community are supportive of the site coming forward.
Alternative Site: Fields Farm, Rownhams	11095	Endorse the representations made by Pigeon on behalf of Rownhams Promotions Ltd in respect of Fields Farm, Rownhams.
Alternative Site: Land at Coombs Meadow	10816	Strongly recommend the Council review the spatial strategy and site allocation process to include land at Coombs Meadow, Lockerley (SHELAA ref. 166) as a draft allocation as it is in a sustainable location, immediately available, deliverable, has been assessed in the SHELAA 2024, is achievable, commenceable in 5 years and has no significant development constraints.
	10817	The Land at Coombs Meadow Site is adjacent to Settlement Boundary of Lockerley, a tier 3 settlement in STV. Has access to primary school, village hall, public open space, village centre, place of worship, no significant constraints, SHELAA indicates site is deliverable within 1-5 years

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10817	The draft plan does not sufficiently recognise the important contribution that the site - Land at Coombs Meadow- could make to the housing land supply and the soundness of the draft local plan.
	10817	This strategic allocation may not deliver its stated development capacity and therefore the Land at Coombs Meadow, Lockerley should be allocated to meet the housing requirement for Test valley.
	10821	Land at Coombs Meadow, Lockerley is well enclosed between railway embankment, existing residential development and is unconstrained by landscape sensitivities.
	10828	Land at Coombs Meadow, Lockerley relates well to the urban edge of Lockerley and is accessible by walking and cycling to facilities and services such as a primary school, community hall, open space, place of worship and local shops.
	10829	Land at Coombs Meadow, Lockerley has been assessed by the Councils SHELAA, it is not constrained by statutory landscape designations and not largely visible from its surroundings unlike Velmore Farm.
	10830	The allocation of Land at Coombs Meadow, Lockerley could assist the housing supply and deliver a range of housing types, sizes and tenures including affordable housing in the early plan period
	10816	We object to the policy as it fails to allocate Land at Coombs Meadow, Lockerley for a minimum of 25 dwellings and consequently, to ensure a sufficient supply and mix of sites to meet the borough's housing requirement and to direct development to the most sustainable locations.
	10816	The site is immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Lockerley, a Tier 3 sustainable settlement in the south. It is well located with access to primary school, village hall, public open space, village centre and place of worship.
	10816	It is not considered the draft plan sufficiently recognises the contribution this site could make to the housing land supply.
	10816	This allocation may not deliver its stated capacity therefore, Land at Coombs Meadow should be allocated to assist in meeting the housing requirement for southern Test Valley.
	10816	Land at Coombs Meadow is well enclosed between a railway embankment, existing residential development and is unconstrained by landscape sensitives.
	10816	This allocation is not sustainably located therefore, Land at Coombs Meadow should be allocated as a more suitable location to help meet the housing requirement for southern Test Valley.
	10816	The Land at Coombs Meadow relates well to the urban edge of Lockerley and is accessible by walking and cycling to a wide range of facilities and services, including primary school, community hall, open space, place of worship and local shops.
	10816	The site has been assessed as part of the SHELAA and identified as a deliverable site for housing. The site is not constrained by any statutory landscape designations, low risk of flooding, is not largely visible from its surroundings unlike Velmore Farm, does not adjoin ancient woodland/SINC unlike

Other Sites

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Ganger Farm, unconstrained by high noise levels, poor air quality and has a footpath link to the primary school, community hall and public open space unlike Upton Lane.
	10816	The allocation of this site for housing could assist in bolstering the housing supply to deliver a range of housing types, sizes and tenures, including affordable housing, especially in the early part of the plan period
Alternative Site: Land south of Nursling Street, Nursling	11095	Site of 1.2 hectares. Used for grazing. Site does not benefit from a vehicular access and unfortunately cannot be provided. Vehicular access would need to be taken off Nursling Street. Promoting site for mixed use, including some residential units. This would be focussed on western parcel and eastern parcel suit small scale commercial use.
Alternative Site: Land South of Weston Lane, Nursling	11095	Promoted for commercial uses which the Council is looking for to ensure sufficient land for class use B8 is identified. Site is relatively free from constraints. It does include two pylons. Well connected to Nursling Industrial Estate and would provide a logical extension Alternatively would be an appropriate site for sustainable power infrastructure.
Alternative Sites - Brownfield Land	CPRE Hampshire 10139	The large flour mill complex, switch sites adjacent to Andover station and industrial zone on Anton Mill road would all be suitable for housing
Alternative Sites - Land west of Holdbury Lane SHELAA ref 7 and planning app 24/00310/ FULLS	10622	The planning application feels like a stepping stone to further development which would destroy the meadow valued by residents.
	10622	The planning application feels like a stepping stone to further development which would destroy local biodiversity and wildlife.
Land North of Oxlease Meadows	10466	Recommend that Land North of Oxlease Meadows be classified as unsuitable for development in the Local Plan
	10466	Development of Land North of Oxlease Meadows will result in displacement of vital habitat for flora and fauna as well as owls, deer and migratory birds and will cause noise and light disturbance to animals and birds
	10466	Land North of Oxlease meadows has been a SINC and if developed will impact visually on important wildlife and the water meadows

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10466	Development of Land North of Oxlease Meadows will exacerbate problems of drainage as flooding is already an issue on Cupernham Lane and will cause harm to water meadows and the canal
	10466	Other infrastructure is overloaded due to the Abbotswood and Cupernham Lane developments - this includes roads, GPs, pharmacies, dentists, schools and nurseries.

Miscellaneous

Key Issue	Officer Response
	The officer responses reflect the position at the point in time of the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan. Some of the matters covered in these comments on the draft local plan will be reviewed for inclusion in the future Regulation 19 draft local plan and have not been updated for Revised Regulation 18. At present the Council's position on these matters remains as set out in the Regulation 18 Stage 2 draft local plan.
Accessibility	The Council review the consultation arrangements and accessibility of documentation for the next stages in preparing the draft local plan.
Affordable Housing	The evidence base will be reviewed for the Regulation 19 draft local plan. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment Study will be updated to inform affordable housing needs and housing mix.
Infrastructure	Developments would make a financial contribution towards enhancement of local primary care provision based upon existing capacity and increase in population and towards the enhancement of local schools as required based existing capacity and need to accommodate additional pupils.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Access	10779 (2)	The application was refused because of a number of issues that have been alluded to in previous comment submitted such as unsafe and insufficient road access
Accessibility	CPRE Hampshire 10139	The tone and content of the plan is not readily accessible to ordinary readers
	10541	The accessibility to the documents provided for the Local Plan is awful - more effort needs to be made so that interested parties can identify matters that affect them. The contents of the PDF files need to be ported to an easily browse able website where a user can easily navigate to relevant information.
Affordable Housing need	11151	Waiting times for affordable housing in the local area also remain exceptionally high. Data from Hampshire Home Choice website indicated a 76-week average wait for a property in Stockbridge, with only 20 properties being available, 17 of which are 1-bed flats. There is a Compelling case on affordability grounds alone to look to increase the housing delivered within rural areas to assist in meeting the need for housing overall.
	11151	Census data for 2021 indicates that 43% of residents of Stockbridge were 65 and over indicating an ageing population within the town and leading to reduced levels of economic activity. The latest census data also indicated that 79% of households within Stockbridge are under-occupied resulting

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		in issues for families wishing to move to the area and options for families to downsize to more suitable accommodation, leading to increased issues with affordability.
	11151	Local affordability issues are highlighted in house price data where the average house price in the S020 postcode area is £832,157, an average £50,000 increase since April 2022. Latest median earning for the area of £35,058 would mean an average house price to median Borough earning ratio would be 23.7, greater than the Borough average of 10.11, indicating that Stockbridge is exceptionally unaffordable. According to the 2021 Census data, 25 of Stockbridge's 239 working residents work in sales, customer services, caring or other leisure services making it highly likely that employees of the town's retail and leisure related businesses commute to the town and are unable to afford a home locally.
Consultation	10121	Request that Council consults DIP on all significant planning applications within at least 250 metres of the boundary of an MOD establishment (contact provided)
	10121	Contact details provided for safeguarding of MOD assets
	10656	The Council will claim they have advertised the new plan but will ignore comments received from the few interested people while the majority are silent because they don't believe they will be listened to.
Consultation with Parish and TV Councillors	10840	Parish and Test Valley Councillors should have been given the opportunity to consult in a separate arena prior to the public exhibitions which in turn limited their ability to answer residents' questions.
Documents	10999	Frustrating that the document titles on the website do not always match the titles of the downloaded document
Elected councillors	10735	It is disconcerting that the locally elected Councillors were not involved in the discussion or process of forming the plan which questions the accountability
Facilities & Amenities	10779 (2)	The application was refused because of a number of issues that have been alluded to in previous comment submitted such as the absence of facilities and amenities to support either the existing or increased population
font of LP draft	11135	The font used in the draft should be changed as some of the lettering/numbers used in the document are difficult to read e.g. 'S' and '2'
Green Space	10492	Unfair to lose the space where horse is kept.
	10669	Very concerned about development in this area and suggest that the green field is left as it is
	10669	The development is not required in this area that had already lost a lot of green fields
Guide	10999	When you publish the next iteration can you please provide a guide to help follow the plan
Design for Inclusivity	Hampshire County Council: 10099	The ambition around inclusion should be enhanced and strengthened, for example in the following areas: areas of deprivation and greatest need; women and gender bias in planning; children and

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		young people outside the narrow focus of play; environments for an ageing demographic; space for more vulnerable groups and provision for women and girls.
Minerals and Waste	Hampshire County Council: 10099	There is no mention of safeguarded minerals and/or waste infrastructure in the Draft Local Plan. Further advice can be provided if that would be of assistance.
	Hampshire County Council: 10099	It is requested that the requirement to not constrain existing or allocated minerals or waste infrastructure is included in the supporting text
Housing figures	11079	There needs to be an updated Local Plan that takes account of the clarification on housing figures as advisory but also on the effects of development on the environment, especially local rivers
Impact of development	10779 (2)	The application was refused because of a number of issues such that have been alluded to in previous comment submitted as the fact that the development would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties
Information on each proposal	10734	It would be helpful if all information relating to each proposal could be grouped into one area rather than being separate
Infrastructure	10779 (2)	The application was refused because of a number of issues that have been alluded to in previous comment submitted such as lack of infrastructure
	10669	There is no infrastructure to support all the over development such as doctors surgeries, schools and amenities
Land South of Thruxton Aerodrome	11081	On basis that proposed allocation is supported by evidence base, accords with objectives of NPPF para.86 and is deliverable within plan period Council's approach is considered to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy and therefore sound
Landscape character	10779 (2)	The application was refused because of a number of issues that have been alluded to in previous comment submitted such as; the urbanising effect on the open countryside with an adverse effect on its rural landscape and character
Language	10734	Too much technical jargon has been used for general understanding
Consultation	10471	It is difficult to access the relevant local information
	10471	The consultation event was lacking in creativity and diversity
	10471	The consultation event did not have enough staff, no presentations and no introductions to new people
	10471	The consultation event posters were too hard to understand
Marine Management Organisation -	10242	The Plan does not make reference to the Marine Management Organisation (MMO), the Marine Policy Statement or the South Marine Plan. Decisions that could impact the marine area should have regard to the relevant marine plan. The MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
statutory consultee - local plan needs to reference MMO, MPS and South Marine Plan		English inshore and offshore waters, up to Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) mark, including the tidal extent of any rivers. The objectives in the plan overlap with key themes in the South Marine Plan, including climate change, ecology and biodiversity, water quality, tourism, recreation, heritage, health and well being. Specific guidance signposted.
Misc	10042	The plan has balanced the requirement for development to provide jobs and affordable housing with the need to provide infrastructure to support development while protecting the countryside, open space, ecology, preserving local gaps and bringing forward energy efficient measures.
NDPs	10121	Designated neighbourhood plan areas should exclude MOD establishments
AONB	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	We are now referred to as a National Landscape but would advise having AONB in brackets afterwards for the public to understand the change.
Graphics	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	Would be helpful for quick reference to have a contents page for policies
	North Wessex Downs National Landscape 10405	Document feels a little dated in style and layout - advise looking at the joint plan submitted by the Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire.
Orchard Homes development refusal	10779 (2)	The local plan should take into account the decision made by the Planning Committee on 26 March regarding the proposed development by Orchard Homes of 14 houses on agricultural land in Thruxton-this is in the Andover Advertiser but not yet on the planning portal and the application has been refused for the third time
Overdevelopment	10921	Concerned as to the volume of housing proposed within the proposed development(s).
Planning Application Process	Chilbolton Parish Council 10204	Request TVBC consider again no requirement to include gross internal floor area and land area in planning applications
	Chilbolton Parish Council 10204	Request TVBC consider again no procedure for early discussions of planning applications with PC before or after submission

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Planning Portal	11135	The TVBC planning portal should be more transparent with accurate records of when documents were made publicly available
Planning Standards	10720	Current developments such as Fen Meadows and Broadleaf Park have not been held to the correct planning standards and developers have not seen consequences for actions against planning conditions.
Pollution	10669	The area already has issues with pollution that will be exacerbated with the new development
presentation	10799	The Policies should be more clearly labelled. The presentation of white ink on a blue/green background is hard to read and impossible to copy electronically. In order for quotes in planning statements and appeals to be accurate it is preferable to copy and paste the text electronically rather than copy type.
Scale of development	10669	The area is already overcrowded with developments over a small area
Digital planning	10098	Willing to share learning on digital planning to assist Council in meeting future requirements in this field
Supporting Documents	10999	It is not clear from the main webpage how all of the supporting document's link to the plan
Title of LP draft	11135	The title of the LP draft should be changed
Traffic	10921	Concerned that the development of more housing will lead to an increase in traffic in the area.

Evidence – Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)

Key Issue	Officer Response
Education	The Council has engaged with Hampshire County Council Children's Services as Local Education Authority, on the provision of school age and early years provision needed for the delivery of new residential development. This includes taking into account of proposed capacity at sites alongside existing capacity.
Healthcare	The Council has engaged with both Bath North East Somerset Swindon and Wiltshire ICB and Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB to discuss current challenges faced by surgeries in the area. The Council has also worked in Partnership with Wiltshire Council on the proposed allocation sites where there are potentially cross boundary considerations. There is an expectation that most allocated sites will contribute financially to existing surgeries across the Borough which is likely to be secured through Section 106 agreements. Engagement with GP surgeries will also continue, as relevant.
Rail Infrastructure	The Council continues to engage with Network Rail to discuss challenges faced on the rail network across the number of stations and to discuss potential impacts new proposed development could bring forward as a result. Hampshire County Council have developed Station Travel Plans which identify a number of potential improvements to stations. There is potential for contributions to be secured for such improvements or others which have been identified with Network Rail as part of the site selection process.
National Grid Gas Transmissions	Developers are made aware that a connection is likely to be required for any proposed sites. The undertaking of surveys is encouraged to ensure that any issues are understood prior to masterplanning.
Active Travel	The Council has worked in partnership with Hampshire County Council to prepare and adopt two Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans which cover both Andover and Romsey areas. Active travel is promoted in and around settlements as part of new residential development.
Bus travel	The Council supports the expansion of bus services in terms of frequency and choice of routes to provide opportunities for sustainable travel but acknowledges the need for bus services to be commercially viable. The Council will continue working with Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority and local transport operators to identify opportunities to enhance patronage of public transport including the use of community transport and transport on demand where commercial bus services are limited or infrequent.
Highways	The Council has worked with Hampshire County Council, who are the Highway Authority to discuss highway concerns as part of the site selection process. Developers are encouraged to engage with their pre-application service. There are currently no plans for the IDP to identify a strategic road network.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Education (primary)	10137	It is not clear how the requirement for a new 2 form entry primary school has been identified. The site promoter reserves the right to make further comment on this once supporting education evidence is provided as currently it appears that the need for a school has been identified solely based on the scale of the proposed allocation rather than the existing capacity position in the area. The site promoter purports that, according to their own findings, there is capacity in the local area. However, land for a primary school could be made available along with associated funding for its delivery
Education (secondary)	10137	A proportion of families moving to this site will already live withing Test Valley and will already have a place at a local secondary school so will be important for any contributions to take this into account.
Electricity transmission	National Grid Electricity Transmission 10152	National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators, so it can reach homes and businesses
Ventures	National Grid Electricity Transmission 10152	National Grid Ventures (NGV) develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States. NGV separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses and should consult with NGV separately from NGET
IDP	10732	south IDP must ensure that planning obligations and capital allocation process for CIL effectively support and result in capital funding towards delivery of required infrastructure
Gas transmission	11159 National Gas Transmission	National Gas Transmission owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use
High pressure gas pipelines	11159 National Gas Transmission	High-Pressure Gas Pipelines form an essential part of the national gas transmission system and National Gas Transmission's approach is always to seek to leave their existing transmission pipelines in situ. Contact should be made with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in respect of sites affected by High-Pressure Gas Pipelines.
National gas transmission	National Grid Electricity Transmission 10152	National Grid no longer owns or operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK - the responsibility of National Gas Transmission, a separate entity and must be consulted independently
IDP	NHS Property Services 10732	Sound IDP must include sufficient detail to provide clarity around the healthcare infrastructure required to support growth

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Infrastructure - health	10761	Castle Practice support a 55 bed Nursing Home at Millway House and have worked with Hampshire Practices and ICB to ensure care homes on borders are supported and under one GP practice to ensure continuation of care
	10761	request Council engages with BSW ICB on future growth requirements for Primary care provision
	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB 10730	The Castle Practice part of Sarum North Primary Care Network (also includes sites in Amesbury and branch surgery in Tidworth)
	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB 10730	Castle Practice currently operating close to space capacity for provision of primary care services to the existing residential population
	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB 10730	There is minimal space capacity in Ludgershall that could accommodate additional primary care provision for new housing growth
	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB 10730	Other healthcare and social services (in addition to primary care) would be impacted by housing growth and impact on wider services will need to be considered and factored in with co-ordination with Hampshire ICB and BSW ICB
	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB 10730	Based on BSW ICB standard approach, 1,500 homes proposed by NA7 and NA8 will generate estimated total primary care floorspace requirement of 309sqm/ capital cost £1.7 million (extension and refurbishment) to 2.2 million (new build)

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB 10730	BSW ICB standard approach indicates that contribution per unit of £1,100 per unit - higher than the £621 assumed ins strategic sites viability testing
	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB 10730	BSW ICB will develop and refine estates strategy and costings may change
	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB 10730	Specific mitigation projects not identified at this time as they will depend on specific location and timing of growth, model of care and PCN strategy at the time development comes forward
	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB 10730	General expectation of BSW ICB is that mitigation of direct impact on local healthcare services should be secured as financial contribution - S106
	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire ICB	IDP doesn't identify BSW ICB in addition to Castle Practice Add reference to BSW ICB

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10730	
Viability	10137	Highways costs of around £6,517 per dwelling have been set out in the IDP. This will need to be clarified as the LP progresses.
	10137	Indicative costs set out in IDP do not consider the reduced cost of £1,887,652 in Strategic Sites Viability Assessment resulting from the upgrades to wastewater treatment works by 2030 which will significantly reduce nitrate pollutions resulting in a reduced burden on developers.
Active Travel	10137	The development requires the proposed realignment of Footpath 2
Healthcare	10137	Financial contributions will need to be fully evidenced and CIL compliant.
Rail - Andover	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	Andover railway station is heavily used and is likely to see continued growth. Andover has been identified as a key station for delivering step free access improvements to ensure all users can safely access the station and the platforms. Specific improvements would help to Address existing deficiencies and future proof the station. There is an identified need for improving direct access to Platform 1 and this could include the provision of a footbridge and lifts.
	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	Network Rail identify Andover as being a Priority 1 station for such improvements meaning it is the highest priority in the short term (over next 5 years). Network Rail would encourage the Council to work with NR to secure contributions that could be used towards funding these improvements. Developments in and around Andover could contribute towards funding these improvements and reference to this within draft site allocations or used as part of the planning application process would assist in this.
Rail - Grateley	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	Grateley railway station is located towards the west of the Borough but does continue to see strong usage as it potentially allows for passengers to get a seat prior to reaching Andover. Given the high usage, Grateley is identified as being a Priority 2 station for access improvements, meaning it is categorised as being high priority in the short term (over next 5 years). Network Rail would encourage the Council to work with NR to secure contributions that could be used towards funding these improvements from development close to Grateley.
Rail - Mottisford & Dunbridge	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	Mottisford station is located near to a National Trust site and is within a fairly rural location. However, there are issues around pressures of car parking at the station and there are opportunities to pursue enhancing parking to reduce these pressures.
Rail - Romsey	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	Romsey railway station is identified as a priority 4 station for access improvements. This makes it a low category station, but it still remains a priority due to existing deficiencies. Further development close to Romsey will worsen this and continue to impact on the passenger experience. Network Rail would encourage the Council to work with NR to

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		secure contributions that could be used towards funding improvements to the station where these have been identified.
Station Travel plans	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	Station Travel Plans devised by South Western Railway have identified a catalogue of potential improvements and developments that could be made at stations within the Test Valley borough
Whitenap Railway bridge	Network Rail and South Western Railway 10842	The site is allocated within the Revised Local Plan 2016 and is subject to an existing planning application that has yet to be determined. The site allocation requires that pedestrian/cycle links are provided via a new bridge over the railway line. The need for the bridge remains and should be carried forward as part of the new Local Plan. Network Rail request that this is also identified within the IDP as essential infrastructure to allow the development to come forward.
National Highways - IDP	National Highways 10291	Once transport impacts understood, Infrastructure Delivery Plan should set out any strategic road network mitigation required to deliver local plan development
	National Highways 10291	Welcome opportunity to discuss strategic road network mitigation in Infrastructure Delivery Plan
bus transport	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Bluestar is the trading business name of Go South Coast in most of the plan area. It is the principal bus operator in Southampton and its immediate urban hinterland extending to Romsey, as well as in the neighbouring authorities of Eastleigh Borough and New Forest District
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Bluestar services are mainly operated from depots at Southampton, Totton and Barton Park, Eastleigh. A much more limited amount of mileage serving Romsey, including a link to Salisbury is run from the Salisbury Reds business and its depot in Salisbury
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Stagecoach South ("Stagecoach") is the principal bus operator in Test Valley North, as well as Winchester and in Basingstoke and Deane. Services are operated from a depot within the District at Andover, supplemented on some routes with vehicles and staff based at Winchester and Basingstoke.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The key interurban bus link between Andover, Ludgershall, Tidworth Amesbury and Salisbury known as “Activ8” is an important component of the District’s public transport offer. It is jointly Operated by Stagecoach South and by Go South Coast’s “Salisbury Red” business, under its own distinct brand

Evidence – Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

Key Issue	Officer Response
Higher housing figure should be tested	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the scenarios tested through the SA have been updated to reflect this.
Inconsistency in scoring of sites and application of methodology	The process undertaken to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal. In light of the Government's changes made to national planning policy and the revised standard method of local housing need, which has led to a significant increase in the number of homes for the draft local plan to plan for, we have revisited our site assessment. We have updated our site selection topic paper to update the methodology and explain why sites have been discounted.
Sites have been inaccurately assessed	The process undertaken to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal. This includes the five stages in the site selection process for the site assessment undertaken. A range of datasets and evidence were used to inform the assessment including engagement with stakeholders. In light of the Government's changes made to national planning policy and the revised standard method of local housing need, which has led to a significant increase in the number of homes for the draft local plan to plan for, we have revisited our site assessment. We have updated our site selection topic paper to explain the sources of information and set out the assessment of each site.
Future mitigation (infrastructure) influenced appraisal – too uncertain	The NPPF sets out the local plans should avoid significant adverse impacts. Where such impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigations measures should be proposed. Where this is not possible compensatory measures should be considered. Mitigation measures are taken account of in the policy drafting, reflecting impacts identified in the assessment stage. It is recognised that mitigation will reflect the stage we are at in the process, with certainty increasing as proposals develop and progress through the planning process.
Needs to be clear if mitigation-on or mitigation-off assessment	The NPPF sets out the local plans should avoid significant adverse impacts. Where such impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigations measures should be proposed. Where this is not possible compensatory measures should be considered. The approach to site assessment has been reviewed and updated for the Revised Regulation 18 draft local plan and now sits alongside the SA in a site assessment topic paper. A mitigation off approach is taken in the assessment, which identifies impacts. Mitigation is factored into the relevant policies which identify any measures needed to mitigate the identified impacts.
Lack of information on the assessment process and	The process undertaken to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal. This includes the five stages in the site selection process for the site assessment undertaken. In light of the Government's changes made to national planning policy and the revised

explanation of why sites were discounted	standard method of local housing need, which has led to a significant increase in the number of homes for the draft local plan to plan for. We have updated our site selection topic paper to explain the sources of information and set out the assessment of each site including a summary of why they have been discounted.
Less sustainable sites chosen over more sustainable sites	The process undertaken to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal. This includes the five stages in the site selection process for the site assessment undertaken. A range of datasets and evidence were used to inform the assessment including engagement with stakeholders. In light of the Government's changes made to national planning policy and the revised standard method of local housing need, which has led to a significant increase in the number of homes for the draft local plan to plan for, we have revisited our site assessment. We have updated our site selection topic paper to update the methodology and explain why sites have been discounted.
Conclusions on landscape sensitivity/impact is flawed and inconsistent with evidence	The analysis and findings of the Landscape Sensitivity Study have been taken into account within the site assessment process, as and where relevant. The process undertaken to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal. We have updated our site selection topic paper to update the methodology and to explain why sites may have been discounted, the sources of information and to set out the assessment of each site.
Multiple comments about specific sites and concerns with scoring against multiple objectives. Often related to the distances to services/facilities.	The process undertaken to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal. This took account of the sustainability of sites in light of key facilities and accessibility by sustainable transport modes. In light of the Government's changes made to national planning policy and the revised standard method of local housing need, which has led to a significant increase in the number of homes for the draft local plan to plan for, the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy have been reviewed and potential SHELAA sites have been re-appraised to inform the determination of those to be now further allocated to seek to meet the increased housing requirement. We have updated our site selection topic paper to update the methodology and explain why sites have been discounted
Information provided in supporting documents has not been taken into account	The content of the draft local plan has been informed by the evidence base and other supporting documentation, as relevant. The evidence base will be reviewed for the Regulation 19 draft local plan.
A more dispersed scenario should be tested	In light of the significant increase to our housing need as a result of the revised NPPF, the scenarios tested through the SA have been updated to reflect this.
Iterative	The process undertaken to site selection is set out in the Site Selection Topic Paper and Sustainability Appraisal. This includes the five stages in the site selection process for the site assessment undertaken. We have updated our site selection topic paper to update the methodology and explain

	why sites have been discounted, the sources of information and to set out the assessment of each site.
--	--

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Baseline	Natural England 10140	For baseline information, note some overlap between these assessments and the HRA, so please be aware of Natural England's comments on the HRA which remain of relevant to the Sustainability Appraisal and the additional associated documents.
Iterative approach	Natural England 10140	It is clear that the HRA will be carried out alongside the Sustainability Appraisal - this should be an iterative process where the findings of the HRA are fed into the assessment of sustainability.
Support	Natural England 10140	Content with the summary of key issues and objectives.
	Natural England 10140	Welcome the key focus placed on climate change, and ecology & biodiversity as fundamental topics underpinning the Sustainability Appraisal, its issues and main objectives.
	Natural England 10140	Welcomed that most of the key objectives of the SA framework are focussed on protecting and enhancing the environment of the borough.
Terminology	Natural England 10140	European sites are now referred to as Habitat Sites in the context of planning policy.
Ongoing advice	Natural England 10140	Natural England would be pleased to advice on the SA further should any changes or updates be made to the report.
Consistency	10794	Paragraph 5.30 of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is clear that the Spatial Position Statement does not provide any clear evidence to justify exploring setting housing requirements above the local housing need. However, this is complicated by paragraph 5.41 of the SA which suggests no compelling reason to set housing requirements above the local housing need, there is merit in appraising growth scenarios above this for southern Test Valley, along with comments in paragraphs 5.52 and paragraphs 5.79 of the SA.
Spatial strategy	10794	Note that paragraph 5.57 of the Sustainability Appraisal concludes about the settlement hierarchy around the approach to distributing growth. Romsey is the only Tier 1 settlement in Southern Test Valley, with Valley Park defined as a Tier 2 settlement which is capable of accommodating strategic scale growth (in line with policy SS1). Paragraph 5.82 of the SA suggests Valley Park encompasses access to a range of services, facilities and employment centres that can be considered for a proportion of new housing supply commensurate with this status. Also note commentary in Figure 6 of the Housing Site Selection Topic Paper in relation to land at Velmore Farm.
Reasonable alternatives	10794	Given the issues of unmet need that exist in the area and the uncertainties identified in the PfSH Statement of Common Ground and Spatial Position Statement, slightly surprised that the

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		Sustainability Appraisal did not explore the merits of Velmore Farm and Halterworth as a reasonable alternative, to establish if the scale of development generated was acceptable if a 'defined' unmet need is identified.
Market demand	10794	Would refute the assertions in paragraphs 5.23 and 5.24 of the Sustainability Appraisal that limitations in the demand for market housing would result in both the housing requirement and absolute housing need not being provided for if a higher local housing need figure was adopted. The demand is there if the sites are allocated. The Housing Implementation Strategy demonstrates that the borough has delivered significantly more than 550dpa in 9 of the past 12 years. Over the last 5 years, on average 856dpa have been delivered. Therefore, there can be no question of market saturation at the proposed levels.
SA scoring / ranking	10794	In reviewing the Sustainability Appraisal and its assessment of reasonable alternatives, the only time that scenario 1 (Velmore Farm) scores less than scenario 3 (Halterworth) is on topics relating to climate change adaptation and historic environment. Nowhere does it explain that Velmore Farm scored less favourably than other sites. Accounting for paragraph 6.41, this does not suggest a less score than other sites especially as it is acknowledged that the masterplan for the site has been designed to avoid areas of flood risk and to introduce mitigation to improve the situation. Also note paragraph 6.42, which raises the question why seek to rank them.
Heritage impacts	10794	In relation to heritage impacts of Velmore Farm, note paragraphs 6.61 and 6.65. The Council know that the masterplan for the site has been designed to maintain and make a feature of the Roman road. This is acknowledged in the Housing Site Selection Topic Paper.
Landscape sensitivity	10794	Question the references to Velmore Farm having high landscape sensitivity in a number of locations (including SA paragraphs 6.73 and 7.4), given it is judged in the Landscape Sensitivity Study as being of 'local level' landscape value.
Housing need	10794	Objective 1a refers to provision of accommodation for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople on the site. Given how policy HOU8 indicates needs will be met, assume no need to provide for the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople on this site.
Minerals	10794	Objective 4c of the assessment refers to Velmore Farm being within a consultation area for mineral resources. Having reviewed the Hampshire Minerals Plan, there is only a small incursion, which is unlikely to be of the scale to warrant further minerals specific assessment.
Flood risk	10794	In relation to Objective 6a, can confirm that land at Velmore Farm would be brought forward in a way that is capable of avoiding the areas identified as being at risk of flooding. The draft masterplan indicates the intention to ensure development is not located in flood zones 2 & 3, or in any areas at risk of surface water or groundwater flooding. Taking account of the proposed approach for flood risk, suggest the scoring for land at Velmore Farm is amended to '0' - no effect.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10814	Noted that Objective 2d) in relation to accessibility to Romsey or Andover by sustainable modes of transport is scored as 'strongly positive' due to its proximity to a bus service. Romsey is 7.5km from this site. It is considered that this scoring is misleading as the same score is given to the Land at Corner of Highwood Lane and Botley Road despite being within 3km of Romsey town centre and also served by a frequent bus service within 400m
	10814	Both sites are scored the same under Objective 8a) in terms of landscape impact and in 8c) in terms of impact on Local Gaps. The land at Velmore Farm is located within a landscape of 'high overall sensitivity' due to parts of the site being elevated and relatively remote. This is not the case for the Land at Corner of Highwood Lane and Botley Road that is largely influenced by adjacent residential areas, part used for aggregates storage, road noise and human activit
Assessment of distances to services/facilities should be Reassessed and capacity reduced.	10343	Accessibility of the whole allocation should be assessed and should not be based on the distance to services and facilities from the closest edge of the site through the SA. The quantum of development should be reduced to recognise that the further locations of development within site to the west, would be outside a comfortable walking distance to a range of facilities and services.
Flood risk	10794	Surface water run off rates for development at Velmore Farm would be restricted to greenfield rates and attenuation of surface water flows in the form of sustainable drainage system features that will be designed to take into account the predicted effects of climate change.
	10794	At Velmore Farm, sustainable drainage system features will be designed to provide water quality and biodiversity benefits in line with CIRIA guidance. Additionally, they can aid in the 10% biodiversity net gain requirement.
	10794	Indicative locations across land at Velmore Farm where sustainable drainage system features are likely to be necessary have already been allowed for in the masterplan. This includes the area close to the proposed access, where water would be stored and released at a controlled rate to prevent surface water flooding.
Landscape	10794	Objective 8a reiterates the findings of the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment. Sensitivity is a combination of landscape susceptibility and landscape value. For Velmore Farm, the susceptibility is assessed as being between high and moderate to high, but value assessed as being 'local level'. On this basis perplexed as to how Velmore Farm has been classed as being the highest level of sensitivity across much of the site, when it has the second lowest level of value. Each component of assessing sensitivity should be 50% of the equation. As a result, the site scoring needs to be re-evaluated - this requires more discussion.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Coalescence	10794	For Velmore Farm, the risk of physical and visual coalescence is not only reduced by the presence of Hut Wood but also the intervening topography between settlements (convex slope which rises between Templars Way and Hut Wood). The topography not only provides a visual barrier in and of its own but also increases the visual screening effect of Hut Wood. Additionally, policy SA6 proposes a significant area of green space, which would provide further insulation against any potential physical or visual coalescence between Chandler's Ford and Chilworth.
Archaeology	10794	Would question the scoring for objective 9b for Velmore Farm in relation to archaeology - the intention is to design the site to maintain and make a feature of the Roman road that runs through it. The negative score should be amended to '0' - no effect.
Land at Velmore Farm	10794	Objective 10a refers for the potential to affect protected sites. Would question the conclusions reached, including in the context of paragraphs 6.35 and 6.37 of the Sustainability Appraisal. Given the provisions of policy SA6 for on-site SANG and appropriate mitigation for other designations, Velmore Farm should be scored as '0' - no effect.
SA scoring / ranking	10794	It is considered that the scoring for Velmore Farm, Valley Park should be amended, as discussed, for a number of the objectives (including criteria in relation to objectives 6, 8, 9, 10).
Primary school	10794	For land at Velmore Farm, Valley Park, it is advised that where the Sustainability Appraisal refers to the provision of a 1.5FTE primary school, the intention is to deliver a 2FE primary school, subject to adjacent landowners making the appropriate contribution, to future proof the primary provision. Request that the next iteration of the Sustainability Appraisal takes this into account.
Ludgershall sites not consistent with spatial strategy.	11161	Ludgershall allocations not consistent with the Interim SA. There is no compelling reason to direct larger scale strategic housing growth to the rural area, where access to facilities and services is limited, due to poor existing infrastructure and the location of employment is distant, when there are sufficient sustainably located sites at the main settlements to accommodate a strategic scale of development needs.
Land at Manor Farm, Andover, SA site assessment	10119	Noted that at para 5.126 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2024), Manor Farm is identified as a variable site option because in the event of lower housing delivery at sites such as Land at Bere Hill Farm, there is some additional potential at Manor Farm in the region of an additional 100 dwellings (subject to masterplanning and assessments). The scoring applied at Appendix IV of the SA appears to have been applied correctly.
Land at Bere Hill Farm	10119	The main constraint areas for the Bere Hill Farm site appear to be access, the impact of road noise from the A303, landscape and heritage. It is also noted that the access options are dependent on third party land and adjoining sites coming forward. Therefore, there is uncertainty in deliverability.
Sequentially preferable sites	11161	There are flaws and inconsistencies in some aspects of the appraisal process. This has meant the outcomes of the growth scenarios are unreliable/unjustified. The constant sites in the appraisal

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
should have included parcel of land at Penton Corner.		(paras 5.122 and 5.123) should have included Penton Corner parcel. Too much weight given to a misguided understanding of the impact of the parcel on the landscape and Local Gap. The site is sustainable and should be considered a sequentially preferable site
Do not agree with SA assessment of Penton Corner and outcomes	11161	The parcel at Penton Corner is sustainable and the evidence in SA is skewed. The SA should be re-run to reflect; the sustainable location of the site; its connections to key services, facilities and public transport; it avoids significant adverse impacts on landscape, designated local gaps and ecology; it has been appraised through transport modelling; and it is deliverable.
Assessment takes into account inaccurate and uncertain future transport infrastructure improvements	11161	The assessment of growth scenarios 1 and 2 fails to recognise that accessibility at the Ludgershall allocations depends on significant transport infrastructure upgrades, within a different Highway Authority area, that cannot be controlled by the Council. Until upgrades to the ped/cycle infrastructure are achieved, sustainable access for the two Ludgershall sites is dependent on a single bus service with limited Sunday and Bank Holiday services. It is inappropriate to take future and uncertain infrastructure improvements into account for the assessment of Growth Scenarios 1 and 2 (para 6.104)
Accessibility to education is an issue with a significant negative effect for scenarios 1 and 2.	11161	Accessibility to education is an issue where there is a clear significant negative effect for scenarios 1 and 2. The Ludgershall proposals may come with a new primary school but there is no certainty about delivery or timing for secondary and tertiary education. It may be dependent on upgraded infrastructure within a different education authority. Ludgershall compares unfavourably with the position for sites on the edge of Andover, where school places can be provided with shorter travel distances. This has been inadequately assessed in the appraisal process.
Transport assessment is flawed.	11161	The transport assessment indicates that the growth scenarios will help to reduce car dependency and provide opportunities to support walking and cycling. However, the Ludgershall proposals are entirely dependent on future significant strategic transport improvements. In addition, to allow a realistic possibility of walking and cycling access, the assessment should also consider the inadequacy of Ludgershall local centre which simply has too few services and facilities to make it an attractive destination.
Reliance on bus service is not sustainable and	11161	Para 6.127 recognises that where future bus service provision is uncertain, some car use will be necessary. It is therefore unwise to rely on a single bus service, and this renders the Ludgershall proposed allocations unsustainable and may add to car dependency.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
may lead to car dependency		
Assessment is arbitrary and flawed.	11161	Assessment is arbitrary and contrived in that the mix of sites for each growth scenario is spurious and simply reflects the mix of sites chosen, resulting in a skewed outcome overall (Table 10)
Comparative housing delivery growth scenarios flawed.	11161	Growth scenarios 2, 3 and 4 may perform marginally better as they include smaller sites with shorter lead in times. The assessment does not take into account the significant uncertainties with infrastructure delivery for the Ludgershall sites (e.g. transport, education and local centre enhancements) which are dependent on action by Wiltshire County Council. It is not considered robust or accurate to assess scenarios 1 and 2 as preferable to 3 and 4.
Inaccurate assessment of growth scenario 4	11161	Growth scenario 4 is highly inaccurate and misleading and is inconsistent with the Councils own Landscape Sensitivity and Local Gaps evidence in respect of land at Penton Corner. It is not highly sensitive in landscape terms and the local gap at this location is not of such high significance, based on evidence studies.
Inaccurate assessment of landscape impacts of Ludgershall sites	11161	The assessment inexplicably and unjustifiably ignores the potential adverse impact of the Ludgershall sites on the adjacent national designated landscape when the SA notes that the land is visually prominent with an elevated susceptibility to change.
Inaccurate assessment of landscape impacts of Ludgershall sites compared to Penton Corner	11161	The potential adverse landscape impact of growth scenario 4 within the assessment, due to the inclusion of Penton Corner, is considered to be wholly unjustified. It is not near an AONB, and the Councils evidence base identifies and stresses urbanising influences and the A342 as well as the reduced openness south of the Harroway ridgeline. This is inconsistent with the approach to land east of Ludgershall. The assessment is skewed towards Growth Scenario 1 and does not objectively assess the sustainability of the different growth scenarios. They should be reassessed on a fair and consistent basis.
Insufficient basis for conclusion, objective 3.	11161	Insufficient basis to conclude that there is a negative effect under question I). Transport consultants acting for clients advise there is a safe and appropriate access arrangement possible from Weyhill Road into site. Also potential for a second access via the business park service road.
Insufficient basis for score, objective 4.	11161	<p>The site has incorrectly been assessed as not previously developed land. However, the site does contain some previously developed land and should have a 'mixed performance' score.</p> <p>Revise score for Objective 4 as site contains some PDL.</p>

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11161	<p>The site has incorrectly been assessed as 'strongly negative' resulting in the loss of best or most versatile agricultural land. However, the site does contain some previously developed land and should have a score of 'negative' as the majority of the site is best and most versatile agricultural land, as defined by NPPF.</p> <p>Revise score for Objective 4 as site contains some PDL and is not all agricultural land - amend from 'strongly negative' to 'negative'.</p>
Insufficient basis for score, objective 8.	11161	The site has incorrectly been assessed as 'strongly negative' resulting in the loss of best or most versatile agricultural land. However, the site does contain some previously developed land and should have a score of 'negative' as the majority of the site is best and most versatile agricultural land, as defined by NPPF.
	11161	<p>Assessment is incorrect in its assessment of landscape impact (negative) - the site is not immediately east of the conservation area and is 600m south east of the conservation area, below the ridgeline. The site slopes away from the ridge line. The character of the site is more influenced by the industrial development to the east and the nearby A roads.</p> <p>Amend landscape score to reflect topography and distance from conservation area (600m)</p>
	11161	Challenge the 'negative' assessment against question b) as the site sits between existing residential development to west and industrial development to the east and a sensitively designed development could be appropriate. Reference to Councils own landscape evidence.
	11161	Challenge the 'negative' assessment against question c) regarding the coalescence of settlements and reduction of separation. The site sits between existing residential development to west and industrial development to the east with degraded degree of openness, reference to Councils own local gap study evidence and a 'preliminary landscape and visual opinion' report submitted with representation.
	11161	Challenge the 'negative' assessment against question c) regarding the coalescence of settlements and reduction of separation. The site sits between existing residential development to west and industrial development to the east with degraded degree of openness, reference to Councils own local gap study evidence and a 'preliminary landscape and visual opinion' report submitted with representation.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Insufficient basis for score, objective 9.	11161	Challenge the 'negative' assessment against question a) regarding the conservation or enhancement of heritage assets, their settings and the wider historic environment. Consideration to the setting of Penton Grafton Conservation Area (600m distant) should not result in a negative score against this criterion, particularly given the intervening landscape.
Insufficient basis for score, objective 10.	11161	Challenge the 'negative' assessment against question d). No TPO trees on site but there are trees lining boundaries. No basis for negative conclusion. Evidence on trees and tree surveys can be provided, and the assessment should have concluded 'insufficient information available'.
Insufficient basis for score, objective 11.	11161	Challenge the 'negative' assessment. There are various errors in the assessment of objectives 3, 4, 5, 6, 10 and the verdict should be revised to 'mixed performance - site performed positively in relation to at least 50% of the criteria or the majority attained a mixed performance against these objectives'.
Overall summary assessment is inaccurate and not evidence based.	11161	Overall summary assessment is inaccurate and not evidence based - it is not an area of high landscape sensitivity, and should be described as having moderate sensitivity, at most. The site does not have significant issues for settlement distinction and separation and could reasonably be removed from the local gap designation, as supported by the Councils' own evidence.
Supplementary evidence provided regarding landscape assessment of alternative site	11161	Separate 'Preliminary Landscape and Visual Opinion' Report submitted with representation regarding the alternative promoted SHELAA cluster/parcel at Land at Harrow Way House, Land at Homestead Farm, Land at Croft House, Land at Short Lane, Penton Corner. Overall landscape susceptibility to change is described as moderate for southern parcels. The alternative site (Land at Homestead Farm) should have a lower overall assessment score, including in terms of its role within the designated Local Gap and with regard to the Councils evidence on Landscape Sensitivity and Local Gaps.
Support preferred growth strategy (Scenario 1) for Southern Test Valley as most sustainable.	11146	Scenario 1 represents the preferred strategy for Southern Test Valley and provides a balanced distribution between the main settlements in the south, where services, facilities and employment opportunities are concentrated, and access is available to existing transport nodes. This is the right approach will create the most sustainable form of development for the future, consistent with national policy, to tackle the housing and climate change crisis.
Consistent assessment	10661	Important that individual sites are assessed consistently, with the assessment based on the existing situation. Where mitigation is taken into account it should be clear where this is the case i.e. mitigation-off and mitigation-on approach.
Mitigation	10661	Where mitigation is applied, any uncertainty about its delivery should be assessed.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Third party information	10661	Where additional information is provided by site promoters, and it is relied upon to inform the decision making process, it should be made clear that this is the case and to make available the information being relied upon.
Judgements	10661	Judgements made and outcomes of the Sustainability Appraisal need to be based on accurate information and the subjective assessments should be ones which can be reasonably attributed to the base information.
Flawed assessment	10661	The site assessment for land south of Highwood Lane (SHELAA 370) is considered to be flawed.
Self-build	10661	The SHELAA submission for site 370 referred to the potential for inclusion of self-build and custom-build plots but this is not reflected in the performance of 'no effect'. Commentary and performance should be reviewed.
	10661	The commentary refers to the site not being actively promoted as a self-build site. This is not part of the assessment criteria as set out in the site assessment framework methodology. Therefore, the commentary on the site should be reviewed to reflect the SHELAA submission.
	10661	Sites above the thresholds set out in policy HOU7 (Self Build and Custom Build Housing) should all have the same 'score' reflecting the proposals of this policy. Policy HOU4 also makes provisions for a range of housing.
Employment land	10661	The SHELAA submission for site 370 did not include employment uses but it is close to a range of employment sites at Romsey, including the existing at Abbey Park and the proposed employment allocations (SA9 and SA10). The position should be reflected in the commentary.
Proximity to employment	10661	The site is within 1.2km of the Abbey Park Industrial Estate, therefore the commentary should be reviewed.
Proximity to bus service	10661	The site is within 400m of a bus stop, on A3057 Winchester Road, which provides a frequent bus service to Romsey and Winchester. The bus service is the same one referred to in the site assessment for Ganger Farm South, which is given a double positive score - Highwood Lane South should receive the same 'score'.
Pre-school	10661	The site is approximately 500m from the pre-school on Halterworth Lane. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
Primary school	10661	The site is approximately 500m from Halterworth Primary School. The commentary should be reviewed to more accurately record the accessibility of the site to the nearest primary school.
	10661	The site assessment has not been based on the existing position rather it has assumed that a new school would be provided resulting in a more favourable score. The on-site provision reflects the size of the site which results in an unbalanced comparison with sites which fall below the threshold for a new school.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Existing schools	10661	The benefits of a development being able to make use of existing school infrastructure rather than be dependent on new provision at some point in the future should be part of the assessment process.
Secondary school	10661	The site is within 1.5km walking distance to the nearest secondary school.
	10661	Velmore Farm is further away from the secondary school within whose catchment it is located than land south of Highwood Lane yet it receives a more favourable 'score'. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
Convenience store	10661	The site is approximately 600m from the convenience store on Saxon Way. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
Health facility	10661	The site is over 1.6km from a health facility, as is the case for Ganger Farm South. However, the 'score' for that site is more favourable as a result of taking account of the availability of a regular bus service. The availability of a bus service is not included within the methodology. If it is to be a factor then the same service is within 400m of the Highwood Lane site and it should have the same 'score'.
community facilities	10661	The site is approximately 750m from the Montfort Community Hall, the nearest community facility. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
	10661	The site assessment has not been based on the existing position rather it has assumed a new community facility would be provided resulting in a more favourable 'score'. The distance to an existing community facility is relatively similar to that for the land at Halterworth. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
	10661	The same methodology should be applied consistently and based on the relationship of sites to existing facilities. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
Bus service	10661	The site is approximately 400m from a regular bus service on Winchester Road in addition to the less frequent service on Halterworth Lane. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
Access	10661	Potential access constraints are recorded without any explanation of what they are. The site has direct access to the highway network. The impact on the highway network would need to be considered in detail as with any potential site.
	10661	The criteria have not been applied consistently. Ganger Farm South is assessed as more favourable than land south of Highwood Lane although access is via an unadopted highway which the Highway Authority has expressed concerns regarding its suitability (see HCC response of 27 July 2023). Velmore Farm is also assessed more favourably than land at Halterworth even though the position is the same i.e. the site has access to the highway.
Flood risk	10661	The whole site is in flood zone 1 and is at low/no risk of surface water flooding and groundwater flooding. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Air Quality	10661	The site for 400 dwellings is given an uncertain score, compared with a no effect score for Ganger Farm South. Given the similar scales of development and the location on the edge of Romsey one would have expected similar commentary and the same score. The commentary should be reviewed and score revised.
	10661	A significant proportion of the vehicle movements from Ganger Farm will travel west and south through Romsey, this is not reflected in the commentary. It is not clear why this site and land south of Highwood Lane have been assessed differently. The commentary should be reviewed and performance revised.
Relationship with existing settlements	10661	The commentary does not fairly reflect the relationship of the site with Romsey. The western boundary of the site adjoins the existing development at Halterworth, the northern boundary adjoins the cluster of houses and Stroud School on Highwood Lane. To the east there are some properties along Highwood Lane. The commentary should be revised.
Local Gap	10661	The assessment is that development could have an impact on the local gap. The Local Gaps Study commissioned by the Council and the recommendations made in relation to the site suggest that the separation of Romsey and North Baddesley could be maintained with a revised boundary along Highwood Lane. The commentary should be revised and the performance reviewed.
Ecology	10661	The site has the potential to conserve the existing ecological interest and provide the required net gain. The lack of elements of the local ecological network on which to build improvements should not be seen as a negative factor, rather it could be regarded positively in the context of not creating potential harm. The commentary should be revised and the performance reviewed.
	10661	The assessment of Ganger Farm South is more favourable than land south of Highwood Lane despite the presence of areas of ecological interest including ancient woodland and a SINCE. The commentary should be revised and the performance reviewed.
Green Infrastructure	10661	The Local Plan includes policy BIO4 which seeks to enhance existing provision or create new opportunities for green infrastructure. It would be reasonable to assess sites in that context which would result in a consistent approach and a more positive 'score'. The commentary should be revised and the performance reviewed.
Climate change assessment	10661	The assessment is arrived at by bringing together those of other criteria, in effect a subjective judgement based on a number of other judgements. The value of such an approach is questionable.
	10661	The negative score is based on the site performing negatively in the majority of cases. A review of the site SA suggests that this is not the case and when the SA is reviewed it is likely that a different conclusion will be arrived at. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
Reason for non-allocation	10661	The commentary / summary for land South of Highwood Lane concluded that the site is a sustainable location with reasonable accessibility to essential services and amenities and is relatively

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		unconstrained. The reason for its non-allocation is that there are better sites available in terms of accessibility to services and facilities and are better related to the settlement of Romsey. For reasons set out in detailed comments on the assessment of the site, that conclusion is not founded on a sound assessment and comparison of the merits of the site.
Growth scenarios	10661	A key part of the Sustainability Appraisal process is the assessment of reasonable alternatives. The approach taken has not enabled such an assessment to take place. The assumption that a number of sites are constant and a number are 'variables' has the effect of restricting the testing and evaluation of scenarios.
Bottom up approach	10661	The analysis of site assessments forming the bottom up approach has had the effect of ruling out sites which compare favourably with sites which form part of the preferred pool and shaped the content of the four Growth Scenarios.
Growth scenarios	10661	No scenario explores a more dispersed approach across the Tier 1 and 2 settlements, which would appear to be consistent with the strategic factors identified in paragraph 5.67. Such an option could have included a range of size of sites.
Growth options for Romsey	10661	The assessment of growth options and reasonable alternatives is further constrained by the assumption that there is an issue with the scale of development that can be accommodated at Romsey.
	10661	There is no clear justification as to why Romsey can only accommodate the scale of development proposed in the plan in addition to existing commitments. There is no evidence in the Sustainability Appraisal or the supporting published material which supports the Council's assertion that there is an issue of capacity with Romsey's existing infrastructure being unable to support development over and above that proposed in the Local Plan or that further investment via developer contributions would not address any specific issues.
Unclear site selection method	10661	The Sustainability Appraisal on which Policy SS6 is based does not form a sound basis for the justification of the proposed allocations. The methodology is unclear and should be reviewed.
Consistent assessment	10661	The criteria of the Sustainability Appraisal have not been applied consistently, the result of which is that the site appears to perform better when compared to others. For example, objective 10B has a mixed score but elsewhere a site with similar characteristics receives a strongly negative score, and objective 10D has a negative score but elsewhere a strongly negative score is given.
Access	10661	The site Sustainability Appraisal has assumed access via Ganger Farm Lane, yet the current planning application shows a vehicle access to Jermyn's Lane to which the Highway Authority has expressed concern.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Traffic	10661	The site is located on the north-east edge of Romsey which would result in traffic heading to the town centre, south or west would use Winchester Road and Southampton Road which experience congestion at peak times.
Air Quality	10661	The assessment that there are no air quality issues which is surprising needs to be justified.
Growth Options - Ganger Farm	10661	There is no justification why Ganger Farm South is placed in the 'constant' category and is included within all growth scenarios and why other very similar / same merits in terms of the spatial strategy are excluded.
Implied capacity constraint	10661	When comparisons are made reference paragraph 5.99 they are done so with sites similar in scale, and in respect of Romsey they are ruled out because of the implied capacity constraint.
Consistent assessment	10661	The selection of this site is based on a site assessment which has not been subject of the consistent application of the methodology. It has taken account of a submitted masterplan rather than the existing position which has resulted in it having a more favourable assessment than sites where a masterplan has not been submitted.
Missing site	10661	There is no site assessment for the land at Halterworth, which comprises four individual submissions. When such an assessment is undertaken and is on the basis of the relationship with existing facilities it performs much better than Velmore Farm.
Landscape	10661	The assessment in attributing a mixed 'score' regarding impact on landscape does not fully reflect the Landscape Sensitivity Study. A strongly negative 'score' would be a more accurate recording of the impacts on this criterion.
Gaps	10661	The assessment in attributing a negative 'score' on the impact on the local gap does not fully reflect the Local Gap Study. A strong negative 'score' would be a more accurate recording of the impact in respect of this criterion.
Inconsistencies	10661	There is a lack of consistency in the application of the Sustainability Appraisal methodology.
Reassess	10661	The Sustainability Appraisal has incorrectly assessed the impact of development. It should be revisited and updated with the information submitted and its performance against the criteria re-assessed.
Revised scale for assessment	10661	The Sustainability Appraisal has assessed the merits of the site identified in the SHELAA submission. That was for approximately 150 dwellings. A revised proposal for approximately 100 dwellings is submitted for assessment.
Self-build	10661	The SHELAA submission referred to the potential for the inclusion of self-build plots but this is not reflected in the performance of 'no effect'. The assessment of the objective should be consistent for all sites - comparing this site with others suggests this is not the case. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Employment land	10661	The site is not considered to be large enough to include employment opportunities but is close to a range of employment sites in Romsey, including the proposed employment allocations adjoining the Abbey Park Estate. Commentary should be revised and the performance reviewed.
Access to Romsey	10661	This site is approximately 400m from a bus stop on the A3090 Winchester Road which provides a frequent bus service. The journey times to Romsey town centre taking account of the walk to the bus stop is significantly less than 1 hour. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
Secondary school	10661	The site is 2km walking distance away from a secondary school which is within the accepted distances for older children, yet it receives a negative 'score'. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
	10661	The criteria does not appear to have been applied consistently within the SA. For example, Velmore Farm receives a more favourable score than land north of Highwood Lane even though it is further to walk and there is no direct bus service to the school within whose catchment area the site is located. Ganger Farm South receives the same score as land north of Highwood Lane yet it is 3km to the secondary school within whose catchment it is located (i.e. Romsey School, not Mountbatten). The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
	10661	It is understood that the secondary school within whose catchment this site is related is Crestwood School not Toynbee School.
Health facility	10661	In assessing the accessibility to a primary healthcare facility, no account is taken of the proximity of frequent bus services, as recorded under Objective 2D. Ganger Farm South has similar access to the same bus service as land north of Highwood Lane but is given a more favourable score. Commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
Community facility	10661	The nearest community facility is Montfort Hall which is approximately 900m away. The commentary should be revised.
Access to bus / rail service	10661	There is a regular bus service on Winchester Road, as well as the infrequent bus service on Halterworth Lane, which is accessible from the site. The score under this criterion should be consistent with that in Objective 2D.
Minerals	10661	The site is within a consultation area but given the size of the site and the location of residential properties it is considered unlikely that the extraction of any deposits, if they are commercially viable, would be environmentally acceptable.
Flood risk	10661	The area proposed for development is not at risk from flooding. The area at risk is of ecological value such that it should not and is not proposed for development. The assessment should take that into account. The commentary should be revised and the performance reviewed.
Consistency	10661	In terms of consistency within the SA process, the same approach should be applied to the site assessments in terms of following the sequential approach within a site where flood risk is an issue.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Landscape	10661	The commentary describes in some detail the landscape features of the site but does not provide an assessment of the actual impact on the landscape character by way of reference to the LCA or Landscape Sensitivity Study. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
	10661	The negative score for this site is difficult to reconcile with that of a mixed score attributed to Velmore Farm, which is considered to have a high overall sensitivity compared to Highwood Lane North having a moderate-low sensitivity.
Relationship with existing settlements	10661	The commentary does not fairly reflect the relationship of the site with Romsey. The western boundary adjoins the existing development at Hestia Close, the northern boundary adjoins development at Crampmoor beyond the railway line, to the east is Stroud School, and to the south are a number of houses along Highwood Lane. The commentary should be revised and performance reviewed.
Ecology	10661	The proposed development would include the retention and positive management of the ecologically important area adjoining the railway line, which has been identified as having potential to complement the Local Ecological Network. The commentary should be revised and the performance reviewed.
Climate change assessment	10661	The negative score is based on the site performing negatively in the majority of cases - that is not the case. The site records as negative scores in two of the five objectives based on the current assessment. An assessment based on the changes proposed as part of the representation would result in a positive score. The commentary should be revised and the performance reviewed.
Rights of way	10661	The site does not have any public rights of way crossing the site and development would not result in a change to the character of any routes close by (e.g. the public right of way through Tadburn Meadows). It is therefore difficult to understand the mixed score. The commentary should be revised, and the performance should be reviewed.
Commentary	10661	The conclusion that the site is in a sustainable location with good accessibility to essential services and amenities is considered a fair summary. The issue of flood risk has been addressed in response to comments on Objective 6 and is not considered a significant constraint.
	10661	The conclusion that is reached, i.e. that the site has strong merits for development, is welcome.
	10661	The only significant constraint for land north of Highwood Lane, part of the site is in flood zone 3, is not considered to be an issue for two reasons. 1) No development is proposed in that area, as indicated in the plan provided. 2) The Council's sequential approach applied to sites is proposing to allocate would address the issue.
Preferred Pool of Site	10661	In the context of the conclusions for land north of Highwood Lane and suggested approach to flood risk, it is difficult to understand why the site was not, at the very least, included within the preferred pool of sites. This is particularly the case when one compares the land north of Highwood Lane with Ganger Farm, which has been allocated.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Reasonable alternatives	10126	To ensure the Local Plan is positively prepared, suggest the Council ought to be testing reasonable alternatives other than the minimum local housing need figure through the SA. Assertions in the Local Plan in such regards should be revised accordingly.
	10126	Any reactionary assessments would potentially delay plan production. Contend that there are affordability and unmet need grounds to suggest an uplift in the minimum local housing needs figure should be tested as reasonable alternatives through the SA process, in accordance with the SEA regulations.
	10126	Suggest that the reasonable alternatives to both the HMA boundaries and the housing split should be revisited and tested through the SA prior to the next iteration.
Land east of Smannell Road	10126	Assessment indicates no information has been provided, however this is not the case accounting for the provided vision document. This should be amended and scored positively.
Bus stop	10126	Assessment asserts the site is not within 400m of a bus station and hence is scored negatively. This is incorrect. The site is just over 300m from a bus stop at Pasture Walk (Smannell Road).
	10126	The Assessment wrongly asserts that the site is beyond 400m of bus stops and assumes the promoter has not explored options for access, with potential access constraints asserted as a result. Neither are correct (see vision document).
Bus journey times	10126	The Ludgershall site is significantly further from Andover than land east of Smannell Road and is scored positively. On this basis, given the additional journey times for Ludgershall, the land east of Smannell Road should score higher than the Policy NA7 & NA8 sites, which regard to this sub-objective.
Cumulative impacts	10126	Reference is made to the need to consider the cumulative impacts of other potential housing sites to the south, yet these are not proposed for allocation. The assessment should consider such sites alone and in combination should there be potential for wider allocations in the area.
Minerals	10126	The assessment wrongly assumes sterilisation of mineral resources, when the submitted masterplan confirms this will be left undeveloped. This should not be a mixed or negative score as a consequence.
Incorrect assessment	10126	The assessment wrongly assumes a development of 350 homes and has not referenced the submitted masterplan. The masterplan provides justification for the and benefits of this site's release, and evidence to demonstrate it would not harm the integrity of the Andover-Enham Alamein-Smannell local gap. Nor substantially harm the setting to the listed buildings and National Landscape to the east of the site.
Gap assessment	10126	Paragraph 3.1.10 of the Local Gap Assessment confirms the detail underpinning the designation of existing local gaps, including reference to no more than is necessary. There is more land included than is needed to fulfil this purpose for the Andover-Enham Alamein-Smannell gap. Therefore, this

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		site would not comprise the integrity of this local gap and new landscaping planting and biodiversity enhancements would be provided.
Landscape impacts	10126	Paragraph 1.1.38 of the Landscape Sensitivity Study has been accounted for in the proposals for land east of Smannell Road, as set out in the vision document. As a consequence, the SA assessment, including the concluding summary, should be updated with revised scores reflecting this accordingly.
Heritage	10126	As set out within the site vision document, the proposal is designed to ensure the setting of heritage assets are respected and where needed enhanced. The assessment process should take account of the submitted masterplan proposals, with scores updated to reflect this accordingly.
Biodiversity	10126	Mixed scores are presented on the basis that 'no indicative masterplanning has been undertaken for this site'. This is incorrect and was shared with officers. The outcome is a development that respects and enhances and achieves a substantial biodiversity net gain of 56% and 161kg nitrate reduction. The score indicated should be updated to account for the significantly more positive effects of the proposed development - see vision document.
Land east of Smannell Road	10126	Reference to a lack of masterplanning is incorrect and requires updating. The proposal would retain the public right of way and provide a number of additional connections to existing and proposed public open spaces. See vision document.
Preferred pool for NTV	10126	Suggest that land east of Smannell Road qualifies as one that ought to be in the preferred pool of housing sites, taking account of the comments on the site assessment.
Scale of development	10126	The assessment assumes 350 homes, when it is around 200 homes. This was confirmed following site assessment work. See provided vision document.
Finkley Down Farm site SHELAA Ref 165	Wiltshire Council 10202	Looking at alternative growth scenario note that other largest variable site at Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165) appears to yield more positive outcomes through housing site appraisal process than site East of Ludgershall and considerably more positive outcomes than site South East of Ludgershall
	Wiltshire Council 10202	Constraints on deliver of site at Finkley Down Farm in relation to landscape and highway impacts appear to have demoted the site beneath the town Ludgershall sites in order of preference
	Wiltshire Council 10202	On basis of SA outcomes there do not appear to be any showstopper constraints against the potential for some delivery of growth at site at Finkley Down Farm
	Wiltshire Council 10202	SA indicates there are alternative strategic sites that could be brought forward that would reduce the reliance on Ludgershall within the plan period
Land South of Thruxton Aerodrome	11081	Where identified opportunity, Council has given due consideration to whether and how this might positively contribute towards overall economic growth strategy over the plan period

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
N of Oxlease Meadows site SHELAA Ref 384	10352	Objection. Process is inaccurate in places and has not been based on all the relevant information available to the Council
	10352	Objection. SA of the site has been unduly influenced by a 2023 appeal decision on the site. This was dismissed on basis of specific landscape issues and did not conclude the site was unsuitable for development. It is anticipated that the site would be acceptable for a reduced number of houses
	10352	Objection. SA does not properly consider the pattern of development around the site and the logic of development potential of the area being completed
	10352	SA concluded land N of Oxlease Meadows SHELAA site 384 is sustainable site with reasonable access to services and amenities in Romsey. As such shows better credentials for allocation that some sites selected as preferred options, such as land at Ganger Farm.
	10352	Unclear whether appraisal core data is as originally submitted by individual agents and landowners as part of SHELAA process or has been recalculated and checked by officers. Whichever the case, entirely unclear whether specifications and details about individual sites have been measured accurately or in a consistent way.
	10352	Objection. SHELAA site 384 numerous errors in site assessment. If errors in this particular site, then likely that other sites will also have been inaccurately assessed, and validity of whole assessment process must be in doubt. Would have been sensible to let landowners, developers and agents have opportunity to comment on site appraisal process before sites were selected or rejected. This would have provided opportunity to resolve discrepancies at earlier stage and would have given credibility to assessment process.
	10352	SHELAA site 384 promoted housing capacity figure incorrect. Refused appeal was for 43 units and appeal decision made clear smaller number required for suitable development. Review potential site capacity.
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 1 A type of housing is in control of Council so should be same for all sites
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 2 A no smaller site will provide direct employment so response should be same for all sites
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 3 G site does have access to existing footpaths/cycleways and incorrect that no connected to network
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 3 I incorrect that site does not have access to highway as access to both Cupernham Lane and Fishlake Meadows

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 6 A incorrect that part of site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. All of developable site is within Flood Zone 1, as shown in recent FRA for site
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 8A assumption of negative impact on landscape character incorrect as smaller development that originally planned would not impinge on landscape character of the area as largely hidden from view by existing and proposed vegetation
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 8 B site does relate will to existing settlement areas as is logical 'final piece in the jigsaw' and would have primarily beneficial impacts on existing settlement. Issue is failure of Council to recognise surrounding development as part of settlement boundary
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 10 A recent Ecological Impact Assessment prepared for site demonstrates development would not detrimentally affect protected sites
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 10 B recent Ecological Impact Assessment demonstrates development would not detrimentally affect habitats, species and/or local ecological network. Previous refused application did not have objection from Ecology officer
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 10 C recent Ecological Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Report demonstrates development would not affect local green infrastructure including trees, green space, hedgerows or woodland. Previous refused application did not have objection from Ecology officer
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 10 C recent Arboricultural Report demonstrates development would not lead to loss of trees. Previous refused application did not have objection from Trees officer.
	10352	SHELAA site 384 Objective 11 should be reviewed in light of comments on Objectives: 1 A, 2 A, 3 G, 3 I, 6 A, 8 A, 8 B, 10 A, 10 B, and 10 C
Site selection process	10352	Objection. The process of site selection in the local plan is not clearly described in the SA and cannot be justified.
SA Methodology	10091 (2nd response)	The methodology indicates that more sustainable sites have been passed over in favour of less sustainable ones.
	10091 (2nd response)	The assessment methodology for omission sites is flawed and has failed to take into consideration previously submitted documentation.
Affordable Housing	10091 (2nd response)	The document has a number of errors which include the failure to consider a higher LHN on the basis of affordable Housing Need.
Manor Farm	10091 (2nd response)	The area of the Manor Farm site in the SA is c154ha and this does not align with draft the allocation boundary which is 67ha.
	10091 (2nd response)	The manor farm allocation may have unduly benefitted in the SA from elements being included that are actually outside the extent of the allocation.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Bere Hill	10091 (2nd response)	The Bere Hill allocation was assessed as 3 separate SHELAA parcels (sites 419,167, 247) and not as a whole. This is in contrast to Sites 203, 76, 404, and 258 (all south of London Road) which have been assessed individually as well as collectively.
SHELAA site 231 (Land South of Finkley Farm)	10091 (2nd response)	The assessment of SHELAA site 231 (Land South of Finkley Farm) is flawed as it only assesses the site relative to existing facilities and services.
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA fails to assess SHELAA site 231 (Land South of Finkley Farm) correctly relative to all the terms set out in Objective 3 (especially the improvement elements and has failed to take into account the contents of the promotion document provided at the Refined Issues and Options Stage and Reg 18 Stage 1.
	10091 (2nd response)	131 ha of land within site 231 is anticipated to include a 6ha education hub and 10-15ha of community and/or new employment and/or retail opportunities, the site is the only one large enough to support a new secondary school.
	10091 (2nd response)	As the site is within 800 m of its centroid, The SA assessment for Land south of Finkley farm should be amended as follows; Objective 3 Sub Clause A; from (-) to (+/+) as the early years provision would be within 800m with direct access to footpaths and/or cycleways.
	10091 (2nd response)	As the site is within 800 m of its centroid, The SA assessment for Land south of Finkley farm should be amended as follows; Objective 3 Sub Clause B from (-) to (+/+) as the primary school would be within 800m with direct access to footpaths and /or cycleways
	10091 (2nd response)	As the site is within 800 m of its centroid, The SA assessment for Land south of Finkley farm should be amended as follows; Objective 3 Sub Clause C from (+-) to (+/+) as the secondary school would be within 800m with direct access to footpaths and /or cycleways
	10091 (2nd response)	As the site is within 800 m of its centroid, The SA assessment for Land south of Finkley farm should be amended as follows; Objective 3 Sub Clause D from (+-) to (+/+) as the convenience store and local centre would be within 800m with direct access to footpaths and /or cycleways
	10091 (2nd response)	As the site is within 800 m of its centroid, The SA assessment for Land south of Finkley farm should be amended as follows; Objective 3 Sub Clause E from (-) to (+/+) as the GP surgery within the community centre would be within 800m with direct access to footpaths and /or cycleways
	10091 (2nd response)	As the site is within 800 m of its centroid, The SA assessment for Land south of Finkley farm should be amended as follows; Objective 3 Sub Clause F from (-) to (+/+) as the community centre would be within 800m with direct access to footpaths and /or cycleways
	10091 (2nd response)	The site should be assessed the same as that for Site 165 (Land at Finkley Down Farm) as they are within the same Landscape Character Area and on the same elevation and are considered as the same, single entity in the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 8 should be amended for Sub -Clause A from (-) to +/-)
	10091(2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 8 should be amended for Sub -Clause B from (+/-) to (+/-)
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 8 should be amended for Sub -Clause C from (-) to (-)
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA has failed to take the contents of the promotion document provided under previous submission and the Heritage Assessment provided with the Reg18A submission which states that the allocation of this site would exclude direct effect on known heritage assets.
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 9 should be amended for Sub Clause A from (--) to (O)
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 9 should be amended for Sub Clause B from (--) to (O)
	10091 (2nd response)	Development of this site creates an opportunity to open the site up to the public as opposed to only private access available at present.
SHELAA Site 305-Land North of Finkley farm	10091 (2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 3 should be amended from (+/-) to (+/+) as the early years provision would be within 800m of Smannell and Enham Church of England (aided) primary school with direct access to footpaths and cycleways.
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 3 should be amended from (+/-) to (+/+) as the early years provision would be within 800m of Smannell and Enham Church of England (aided) primary school with direct access to footpaths and cycleways.
	10091 (2nd response)	This site has been inconsistently assessed relative to others and should be assessed the same as that for Site 165 (Land at Finkley Down Farm) as they are within the same Landscape Character Area and on the same elevation and are considered as the same, single entity in the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 8 should be amended for Sub -Clause A from (-) to (+/-)
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 8 should be amended for for Sub -Clause B from (-) to (+/-)
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 8 should be amended for Sub -Clause C from (- -) to (-)
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA has failed to take the contents of the promotion document provided under previous submission and the Heritage Assessment provided with the Reg18A submission which states that the allocation of this site would exclude direct effect on known heritage assets.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 9 should be amended for Sub -Clause A from (-) to (O)
	10091 (2nd response)	The SA assessments for the sub -clauses within Objective 9 should be amended for Sub -Clause B from (?) to (O)
New Forest National Park Authority - Cumulative Impacts on nature designations	New Forest National Park Authority 10696	Welcomes the consideration of cumulative effects on New Forest International Nature Conservation Designations
Growth Scenarios	11095	Four growth strategies have been tested through the SA but there is limited variation in the number of homes above the local housing need provision and none of the growth scenarios local more development adjacent to Southampton where planning logic suggests it ought to. SA should be revised and test scenarios of higher provision of homes.
Land at Manor Farm	10803	Although Objective 8(a) of the Sustainability Appraisal has referenced the presence of the National Landscape, it is not considered that this has appropriately assessed the potential landscape impact of development on the countryside or this important designation of national significance, where the NPPF and local plan policies make it clear that harm should be avoided (including harm to its setting).
	10803	it is considered that the 'mixed performance' scoring in the Sustainability Appraisal is incorrect, and this should be re-scored based on the findings of the Landscape Sensitivity Study as either 'negative' or 'strong negative', to fully acknowledge this site's location, context and level of sensitivity.
	10803	the 'mixed performance' scoring under Objective 8(b) is unreliable and fails to acknowledge the location of the site outside of the settlement policy boundary and beyond the current defined extent of Andover provided by Saxon Way and this Objective should be rescored to 'negative'.
	10803	the sustainability appraisal has also failed to equitably assess sites in terms of conserving and where possible enhance biodiversity and habitat connectivity
	10803	this site is scored 'negative' under Objective 10(a), in recognition of the site's proximity to ancient woodland and SINC, but has failed to reference the site's location within the Solent Nitrates mitigation catchment area where mitigation is required, whereas the land east of The Middleway site is scored 'strong negative' based on the same constraints and where mitigation can be provided in accordance with Natural England and Forestry Commission guidance

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10803	area where there is a lack of parity in site assessments for Objective 10(d) where similar constraints are referenced and the Manor Farm site is scored 'mixed performance' and the east of The Middleway site scored 'negative'.
	10803	consider that the Council has inequitably scored sites within the Sustainability Appraisal to accurately or fairly identify the Manor Farms site as a suitable strategic allocation
Bere Hill	10803	It is unfortunate that the Sustainability Appraisal fails to assess the draft allocation as a whole and instead compartmentalises the site into three separate entries based on SHELAA references and as such it fails to comprehensively assess or consider it as a single assessment, making detailed site understanding and justification difficult. It is considered that the comprehensive assessment should be amended and included as a single entry for the site as a whole.
Land to the East of Ludgershall	10803	It is considered that the Council's site assessment set out in the Sustainability Appraisal fails to appropriately assess the site and consider its constraints to justify this as a suitable location for development. E.g. Objective 8(a) in relation to landscape character/protected landscapes is scored as 'negative' and whilst it has referenced the site's location adjacent to the North Wessex Downs National Landscape and despite potential close relationship with nearby urbanising effects, it is set out that the relationship with the National Landscape elevates the sensitivity and this will need to be addressed through later design/landscape strategy
	10803	Given the importance of protecting National Landscapes and their setting from harm afforded in the NPPF, the lack of robust mitigation and the recognition of this landscape having a 'moderate-high landscape sensitivity to change' in the Test Valley Landscape Sensitivity Study (January 2024, Paragraph 1.1.342), it is not considered that this Objective has been scored correctly and it should be re-scored as 'strongly negative'.
	10803	It is not considered that Objective 8(b) has been appropriately scored, as whilst the site is located adjacent to development to the west, it represents a general linear style form of extension to the settlement, which isn't considered to be 'positive' as scored and should be re-scored as 'mixed performance' at best or more likely 'negative'.
	10803	Objective 2(b) in relation to accessibility to strategic employment sites by sustainable modes of transport is scored as 'positive' due to its proximity to a bus stop, however the employment area falls significantly outside of the 5km zone.
	10803	It is considered inappropriate for this site to score as 'positive' solely due to its proximity to a bus stop when it is relatively isolated from strategic employment sites, especially as accessibility by sustainable modes of travel are considered separately elsewhere under Objective 3(h).
	10803	should be amended to solely relate to proximity to strategic employment sites, which is considered to be a fairer expression of a relative sustainability of a site and where a score of 'negative' or 'strong

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		negative' should be recorded. The apparent lack of equity in this objective is apparent when compared with the same scoring for the east of The Middleway site, where a 'positive' score is similarly identified but this site falls within the 5km of a strategic employment site criterion
	10803	the site scores as 'positive' for Objective 9(b) due to the proximity to the Scheduled Monument, however it is considered that this should be re-scored as 'no effect'.
	10803	Objective 12(c) in terms of retention/enhancement of PRow is scored as 'positive', when off-site linkages are required and consequently delivery cannot be confirmed, as such it is considered that this would be more accurately marked as 'mixed performance
Land to the South East of Ludgershall	10803	the Sustainability Appraisal has scored the site as 'mixed performance' in relation to Objective 8(a) regarding development affecting landscape character and protected landscapes. There is however no reference in the commentary to the proximity to the North Wessex Downs National Landscape that is reflected at paragraph 4.99 of the draft Local Plan
	10803	does not appear therefore that appropriate regard has been had to the national landscape, the criteria set out in the NPPF and the potential for harm to this area. Consequently, it is considered that this would be more accurately scored as 'negative' at the least or possibly 'strongly negative'.
	10803	It is not considered that Objective 8(b) has been appropriately scored for this site, where a 'mixed performance' scoring has been applied but the commentary states that only a small part of the northern area could be contained but the remainder of the site could lead to urban sprawl into the countryside. As such it is considered that this Objective would be more accurately marked as 'negative' or 'strongly negative'.
	10803	the site scores as 'positive' for Objective 9(b) due to the proximity to the Scheduled Monument, however it is considered that this should be re-scored as 'no effect'.
accessibility	10803	considered that this objective is misleading as proximity to strategic employment sites and accessibility by sustainable modes of transport are separate and potentially conflicting assessment criteria
Assessment approach	10120	In the context of Southern Test Valley, do not consider that the scoring and selection of sites is robust, justified and transparent as it fundamentally does not direct growth to the most sustainable settlements and does not allocate the sites that have scored the most favourably. The plan cannot be considered sound when the evidence base is not being followed.
Infrastructure	10137	There are a number of areas related to the criteria in the SA that had the SA taken these into account could have resulted in a higher score in the performance related category. Such as defining the term regular bus service, given the proximity of bus stops within 350 metres of the site, taking into consideration the requirement for a school on site and financial contributions, where viable and

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		needed, towards healthcare community facilities. All of these could have provided an opportunity to achieve positive scores.
Access	10137	Criteria I (connection to the highway). While the main vehicular access to the site is dependent on 3rd party land this is being actively promoted for development forming part of the same strategic allocation. As such access is not considered to be a constraint to the delivery and the site should have scored positively on this criteria.
Landscape	10137	Criteria A (Landscape sensitivity). a comprehensive landscape and visual analysis has demonstrated that the development of this site is entirely acceptable from a landscape perspective subject to sensitive master planning and landscaping. Topography within the site is relatively flat and perfectly developable for residential dwellings. There are no other parcels around Andover with a lower sensitivity to change other than a parcel at Picket Piece.
Sports facilities	10137	Criteria B (access ability to sports facilities). Calculations indicate that the site is within 3.8 kilometres by road to Picket Twenty sports pitches and just 1.6 kilometres on foot or cycle so should score more positively for this criterion.
Noise pollution	10137	Criteria D (minimising the risk of exposure to inappropriate levels of noise pollution). The noise impact assessment demonstrates that suitable internal and external amenity standards can be achieved across the Peel land.
Site selection process	11121	Maurys Mount Slab Lane, Wellow (site 134) has unreasonably curtailed at Stage 4. No real justification for the reclassification has been provided.
	11121	Limited justification to demonstrate that community schemes and Neighbourhood Development Plans will deliver the necessary housing in an area where high levels of housing need are apparent. The LP should not rely on the Neighbourhood Plan to properly address the housing need in this area. Objection.
	11122	Assessment of land at Danes Road Awbridge (101) has been unreasonably curtailed at Stage 4 due to it being adjacent to a Tier 3 settlement. This is an arbitrary decision and excludes large areas of the Borough, including sustainable settlements.
	11122	Limited justification to demonstrate that community schemes and Neighbourhood Development Plans will deliver the necessary housing in an area where high levels of housing need are apparent
SA process	11123	The SA should identify reasonable alternatives and explain the preferred option and why other options have been rejected to enable the reader of the SA to understand how a local planning authority has arrived at its preferred position.
	11123	The assessment of individual sites should be done in a consistent way and should be based on the existing situation and where mitigation is taken into account and assess where there is uncertainty over delivery.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11123	Where additional information from site promoters is relied upon to inform the decision-making process, this should be made clear.
SA Stage 4	11123	In terms of testing the sites against strategic factors at Stage 4 of the SA, there is no explanation of what proportionate growth comprises and what if any are the thresholds for determining when that growth exceeds the definition of proportionate.
SA Stage 5	11123	With regard to the preferred pool of sites in Table 3 and Figure 6 of the SA, there is no content or Topic Paper to explain how the preferred pool was arrived at, i.e. why sites recommended for further assessment were excluded. There were at least two further stages in the site selection assessment which resulted in the elimination of a number of sites for which there is no published methodology. Paragraph 5.87 refers only to the overall process rather than the actual process.
SA site selection	11123	There is no explanation of how site were included in either the 'constant' or 'variable' category.
	11123	Site assessments forming the bottom up approach has had the effect of ruling out sites which compare favourably with sites which formed part of the preferred pool and shaped the content of the four growth scenarios. This has restricted the assessment of reasonable alternatives which explores a more dispersed approach across Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements which would be consistent with strategic factors identified in paragraph 5.67 of the SA.
	11123	Land at Upton Lane for 80 dwellings was not included in the growth scenarios.
SA growth scenarios	11123	with regard to the assessment of the four growth scenarios against a number of issues, there is no systematic analysis of the performance of each scenario against the issues identified. When that is done it is clear that the choice of preferred scenario is flawed. The selection of three of the issues is not accompanied by any supporting text in the SA or a Topic Paper which raises a number of questions about how sound the outcome of the SA process. is.
	11123	With reference to the appropriate growth strategy in terms of quantum and distribution for Romsey, it is unclear how the SA has assessed the issue of capacity or what if any the threshold is above which development could not be accommodated. The application of this assumptions has a significant impact on the selection of a preferred scenario. TVBC do not raise any issues of capacity of infrastructure or services in respect of other large settlements in Southern Test Valley.
	11123	Within the SA there does not appear to be any specific analysis of the performance of each scenario against the issues identified in paragraph 5.106. While Scenario 1 is preferred over Scenario 3, the differences are marginal which are seen on Table 9 bringing together the top down and bottom up approaches. The comparison is assumed to have been done without a specific single site bottom up assessment. The assessment of scenario 3 should be reviewed and be undertaken with the benefit of a single site appraisal of the land at Halterworth. This is likely to show that scenario 3 performs as well as scenario 1.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11123	There is no commentary in the Topic Paper or the SA on why an over-reliance on Romsey isn't an issue or how the scale and location of development proposed elsewhere has been arrived at. There is no explanation of how the proportionate growth strategic factor has been achieved, nor is there any evidence of what would comprise a balanced distribution which would best meet the housing needs of Southern Test Valley.
	11123	Paragraphs 7.4 - 7.6 make the case for southern Test Valley and it is expected that this section of the SA would draw together all of the preceding analysis and present the final chapter in the story of the SA and how TVBC arrived at its preferred strategy and allocations.
	11123	Table 9 shows there is little difference between scenarios 1 and 3 and if a single site assessment was carried out for Halterworth, scenario 3 would perform at least as well.
	11123	The SA identifies that Velmore Farm has some landscape sensitivity issues but that these could be overcome via the masterplanning process is relying on an outcome of a piece of critical technical work yet to be undertaken.
	11123	The SA identifies that there is an opportunity to deliver employment with scope for commercial development at Velmore Farm. TVBC doesn't seem entirely convinced that provision would be made. Scenario 1 observes that it 'may provide some marginal difference in benefits through possible employment land and community facilities at Velmore Farm.' The assessment of scenario 3 at a strategic level should take account of proposed allocation land south of Botley Road and an extension to Abbey Park Business Park, both of which are within walking distance of land at Halterworth.
	11123	Reference to more balanced distribution of development between Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements and less reliance on Romsey, there is no discussion in the SA of what is meant by a more balanced distribution of development, what the current issue is in terms of the location of development and future needs of communities in the very south of the Borough. If the objective of the Local Plan is to provide more balanced distribution of development, then the appraisal process should have included a scenario which reflected that.
	11123	Ref less pressure on infrastructure capacity in Romsey, there is no evidence in the SA or supporting evidence which supports the assertion that there is an issue of capacity with Romsey's existing infrastructure being unable to support development. The SA goes on to say that scenarios 3 and 4 would have a positive impact in terms of investment in Romsey. There is also no analysis of the impact of scenario 1 on Eastleigh's infrastructure.
SA growth scenarios (Local Gaps)	11123	With regard to the merits of a large scale mixed use strategic urban extension adjacent to the Eastleigh conurbation, it is not clear why an extension to Eastleigh within Test Valley should be

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		singled out as an issue to be considered. There is no commentary on what the benefits would be and no analysis of any adverse impact on Eastleigh.
	11123	With reference to the sensitivity of the Halterworth and Romsey/Norh Baddesley landscape gaps, the highlighting of this particular gap is not explained nor why the sensitivity of other gaps is not an issue. This puts the land at Halterworth at a distinct disadvantage.
	11123	With regard to the Romsey - North Baddesley Local Gap there is no commentary in the Local Gaps Study which suggest that it is a particularly important local gap in comparison with other local gaps in southern Test Valley. The Local Gap Study assessed that the strategic importance of the Romsey - North Baddesley Local Gap was eroded by adjacent development in contrast to the view that the Southampton - Eastleigh Local Gap has a valuable strategic function in defining the setting and individual identity of adjacent settlements. The sensitivity of the Romsey - North Baddesley Gap does not seem to be justified in the assessment of growth scenarios.
Unmet Housing Needs	11120	It is an inevitable function of the desperate plan making system in England and is not an excuse for delaying meeting unmet needs that adversely affects the affordability of housing in all areas. It is not clear how I point where a definitive unmet need is ever going to be identified without a proper process for sub regional cooperation.
Allocation benefits	11120	The Brentry Nursery allocation would provide significant benefits in terms of employment through the provision of new facilities for Hillier alongside the delivery of new homes. There are no insurmountable constraints to development at this site that would prevent the site coming forward.
Growth scenarios	11120	The promoter has some concerns over the approach taken to growth scenarios within the SA process and site analysis conclusions as set out within Appendix IV of the interim SA.
	11120	Paragraphs 5.92 onwards identify constant sites across all growth scenarios in southern test valley. It is not entirely clear from the SA what process has led to the selection of these three sites as opposed to other possible permutations from the preferred pool beyond a vague commentary on broad principles of approach.
	11120	In relation to Ganger Farm it is notable that the site is entirely Greenfield with no existing buildings or hard standings and is adjacent to SINC and ancient woodland constraints. The proposals are for 340 homes by contrast development at Brent treat would deliver significantly more on what is a previously developed brownfield site in a similar location. It seems odd that Ganger Farm was taken forward as a constant site when Brentry was not and is not clearly set out in the SA why this choice was made.
	11120	Similarly land South of the bypass is subject to surface water flood risk that doesn't appear to have been subject to any sequential test analysis and his heritage constraints and provides no employment benefits.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11120	Paragraph 5.101 of the SA identifies variable sites in sequential order with Brentry Nursery third. It is not clear how this sequential order of preference was determined and is not set out in the interim SA. Brentry should be at the top of the list as it is a site with extensive existing development upon it, is well constrained in the landscape and townscape, is not within an identified local gap, is contiguous with the settlement boundary, is on a frequent bus route and provides significant employment benefits.
	11120	The flawed outcome of the sequential order of preference has tainted the subsequent appraisal of reasonable alternative growth scenarios for southern test valley set out in Table 5 which only considers Brentry tied in with other sites under greater level of growth under scenarios 2 and 4. Brentry is an option therefore scores relatively poorly by association as a result.
Site Assessment	11120	The promoter has concerns regarding the robustness of the SA appraisal. The site appraisal is undertaken without any reference being made to employment as an important benefit. This is a fundamental flaw in the SA and should be addressed ahead of Regulation 19.
	11120	Objective 1 the inclusion of nine age restricted homes for over 55s contribute towards meeting the critical need for specialist accommodation for older people.
	11120	Employment facilities need to be given a strongly positive score to reflect the level of employment benefits the site will deliver. Scoring Brentry the same as other alternative sites is a significant flaw and distorts the outcomes of the SA process as a result
	11120	Proposals to connect two footways and cycleways directly from the site into and through the adjoining land to the West should be reviewed accordingly.
	11120	Site promoter suggests given the clear thrust of national policy and guidance to direct development to brownfield first this should be given a more appropriate strongly positive score.
	11120	The promoter strongly disagrees with the view that the site has moderate to high sensitivity to change. There is a strong argument in favour of a view that the site will benefit in terms of landscape character from development.
Site Assessment - Halterworth	11120	Halterworth sites 370, 139, 356 and 282 - it would be helpful if in Appendix IV the single appraisal and score for the cumulative site being promoted at Halterworth as a single entry should be given rather than separate parcels as currently set out.
Flood risk and sequential test	11120	The sequential test applies to all sources of flooding. This does not appear to have been done. To ensure the planned a sound at Reg 19 all current proposed allocations should be reviewed for the presence of any surface water flood risk and discounted from being allocations in the next iteration of the plan where there are reasonably suitable alternatives.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Distribution of development - object	11151	The plan or supporting evidence base give no rational, compelling or reasoned argument as to why, even in principle, no growth is proposed at Stockbridge. No plan in recent years has proposed any significant growth within Stockbridge. The impacts of this sustained failure to allow growth in Stockbridge risks the sustainability of the settlement. The contention at 5.114 of the SA that there are not significant issue in relation to Stockbridge is strongly refuted and not backed up by evidence.
Distribution of development	11151	The SA site analysis identifies that several of the strategic allocation would require new school provision due to local capacity issues; whilst Test Valley school is underutilised. Test Valley school is a critical asset to Stockbridge and the wider rural area, the loss of which would have serious negative consequences to the overall sustainability of not just Stockbridge but the wider district.
	11151	Stockbridge is heavily reliant on the visitor economy to sustain its shops and facilities and there are significant affordability issues in the area with market housing generally out of reach to all but the highest earning households. This is likely to result in unsustainable commuting patterns as people commute into Stockbridge from lower cost areas. Test Valley school has significant challenges attracting the teachers they need.
SHELAA 236 and 237	11151	Promoter disagrees with a number of the conclusions reached on the site against several objectives. The site should score strongly positive re. Housing. There is an acute need for housing in the borough specifically within rural areas. The proposal will deliver policy compliant levels of affordable housing.
	11151	Site is assessed against its accessibility to jobs in Andover but ignores the particular role Stockbridge has in serving the rural areas, as well as the many jobs available within the town which currently result in the need for substantial levels of in-commuting. The town provides good access to jobs in the rural area within agriculture and related industries. New development would increase sustainable travel patterns to local jobs and improve the pool of labour and the economic sustainability of the town therefore should be considered to perform positively against the economy objective.
	11151	The SA makes some inaccurate assumptions regarding accessibility. It only reference infrequent services to Romsey. There are also services to Winchester and Salisbury which operate regularly.
	11151	The site performs well against Objective 8. the development will inevitably result in the loss of a green field. This can be mitigated by successful strategic planting and sensitive landscape led design. Furthermore the southern part of site 236 is no longer promoted for built development meaning there will be no harmful coalescence with Houghton and the proposal provides an opportunity to protect the land from built development into perpetuity through its possible use for BNG and/or nutrient credits.
	11151	The promoter disagrees with the substantial negative conclusion reached for the heritage objective. There is no evidence presented by the Council that development of the site would result in 'substantial' harm to a heritage asset at the upper end of the spectrum. This is particularly so given

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		the supporting text to the SA assessment of site 237 confirms that some development in principle of site 237 may be acceptable and given it acknowledges for both sites that views towards the listed Marsh Court and associated assets '...should not be adversely affected.'
	11151	The site provides substantial areas for new local green infrastructure and the opportunities for enhancement mean the site should perform positively against the biodiversity and habitat connectivity objective.
	11151	The assessment mentions ancient woodland near the site. However, using DEFRA's 'Magic Maps' facility, this does not identify any Ancient Woodland within close proximity of the site. No trees will be lost from within the housing parcels, with any losses required to achieve access made up by new planting. Land also in the promoters control also provides opportunities for BNG and nutrient off-setting and should therefore perform positively against this biodiversity and habitat connectivity objective.
	11151	The proposal performs positively against the climate change and mitigation objective. The promoter is committed to delivering zero carbon standard housing that is sustainably located with good access to facilities and services helping prevent the need to travel by car.
	11151	Opportunities to substantially improve health and wellbeing by providing access to safe, high quality homes and delivering housing in an area with acute affordability issues. It will also enable significant improvements to recreational provision for Test Valley School which could potentially be open to the public. The SA also fails to recognise the ability of the site to provide access to the countryside for residents including to local public rights of way and national cycle network (NCN 246).
Employment land requirement	11119	SA takes forward premise of no requirement for employment land allocations in north of plan area and does not appraise any employment options resulting in only one employment allocation. This conflicts with the Plan's vision and spatial strategy to grow a sustainable economy, support growth at Tier 1 settlements in acknowledgement that much of the Borough is rural.
SA	11117	Scenarios 2 and 4 should be explored further
SA - Site assessment process	10905	The site assessment process is unsound. There are inconsistencies between the spatial strategy (which support development in tier 1 and 2 settlements) and the assessment (discounting sites in areas with made NPDs) resulting in a flawed assessment and sites being discounted without justification. The plan therefore does not demonstrate that the proposed site allocations represent the most appropriate strategy for meeting needs, when considered against reasonable alternatives.
	10905	Tier 1 and 2 sites should progress to stage 5 and be assessed on their merits irrespective of whether they fall within a NDP area.
SA - housing requirement	10978	The SA should test higher annual requirement figures. It should test an annual requirement of 730 to address affordable housing need.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
SA - Site assessment process (Manor Farm)	10978	The site area of Manor Farm in the SA (c154ha) does not align with the site area in the Plan - 67ha. The SA assessment may have therefore benefitted from elements that are outside the boundary
SA - Site assessment process (Bere Hill)	10978	The Bere Hill allocation was assessed as 3 parcels and not as a whole, which is not consistent with how other sites have been assessed.
SA - Site assessment process	10978	The SA doesn't include a summary of the site specific assessments.
SA - Site assessment process (Finkley Down Farm)	10978	Finkley Down Farm scores better than Manor Farm in the SA yet is not allocated
Site assessment	11115	TPO trees and BAP Priority Habitats, as identified on north of Sandy Lane, are generally issues which can be managed, and if necessary mitigated, through the DM process; they should not be seen as a 'strategic' or headline reason to rule out a site.
Public Transport	Kimpton Parish Council 11001	Assigns a positive or strongly positive rating to 2B, 2D & 3H based on the site being within 400m of a frequent bus route. While the entrance may be within 400m the furthest part of the site is much further away. The rating must be assessed against the furthest someone will have to walk; we therefore believe that these items should be reassessed and regarded accordingly
Growth Scenarios	10777	Interim Sustainability Appraisal assesses each site and proposes 4 different 'reasonable growth scenarios' in 3 of the 4 scenarios land at Forest Lane is included as a proposed site to deliver housing
	10777	Sustainability Appraisal ranks 'variable sites' in order of preference. Identifies land south of Forest Lane as ranking 6 out of 7 sites despite it being a suitable, sustainable, and logical location for growth and being considered in 3 of the 4 growth scenarios
	10777	Not clear where this ranking has come from given that the site scored well in the sustainability appraisal and no significant negative impacts were identified
	10777	Findings not supported as the site adjoins the existing Picket Twenty development which was a previous Local Plan allocation and offers a wide range of facilities and services
Development at Ludgershall	10777	Sustainability Appraisal para 7.2 is not supported as the delivery of over 1,500 dwellings at Ludgershall will require significant infrastructure including new education and healthcare facilities,

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		shopping facilities and leisure and recreation as well as significantly improved public transport, walking, and cycling links
Sustainability	10374	The purpose of the ISA is to summarise the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment and evidence base studies, however the conclusions drawn are not justified or supported by evidence
Infrastructure - Roads	10374	No evidence to have guided the LPA in concluding that Ox Drove does not have capacity to support the development of SHELAA. The Stage 5 Assessment is flawed as it does not establish, based on evidence, the capacity of Ox Drove to determine whether a lower amount of development can be supported
	10374	Important for the highway impacts to be properly understood if this directly leads to a conclusion to exclude a site from further assessment. Significant development should be focused on locations which are, or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes
Sustainable Development	10374	Given the demonstrably sustainable location of SHELAA 202 in relation to the Major Centre of Andover and local services and facilities in accessible locations that promote active travel, it is vitally important that the Local Plan thoroughly understands and evidences these issues. A significant proportion of land is already within the Settlement Boundary, so opportunities to optimise the development of land for residential development at Andover should not be so easily discounted without due consideration
Site Assessment	10813	When assessing individual sites, it is important that it is done in a consistent way, that the assessment should be based on the existing situation and where mitigation is taken into account it should be clear where that is the case i.e. mitigation-off and a mitigation-on approach. Where mitigation is applied an uncertainty about its delivery should be assessed
	10813	In circumstances where additional information provided by the promoters of sites is relied upon to inform the decision-making process it should be made clear that is the case and to information is being relied upon. It would assist the understanding of the process if the information relied upon is published as part of the evidence base
Housing Need	10813	The small-scale nature of the site limits the scope to meet a range of housing needs. Policies HOU4 and HOU7 make provision for a range of housing with the later setting a threshold of 100 dwellings for self and custom build homes. All sites should have the same assessment outcome based on these policies. The commentary should be revised, and the performance should be reviewed
Efficient Use of Land	10813	The site includes the car park and the garden for use by customers of The Four Horseshoes PH, which covers approximately half of the area. The commentary should be revised, and the performance should be reviewed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10813	The SA records the site as being in a mineral's consultation area. Given the size of the site and proximity of residential properties it is highly unlikely that if there are deposits that extraction would be commercially viable and would have a significant environmental impact. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
Flood Risk	10813	The Lead Local Flood Authority raised no objections with respect to planning application 23/01372/FULLS. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment commissioned by TVBC would suggest that the site is at a low risk of flooding from surface water and ground water. The commentary should be revised, and the performance should be reviewed
Air Quality	10813	The assessment attributed to the proposed development comprising approximately 30 dwellings is difficult to understand when compared with the local plan proposal at Upton for 80 dwellings receives a more favourable 'score' with virtually the same assessment. The commentary should be revised, and the performance should be reviewed
Biodiversity	10813	The site is of very limited ecological interest ref Preliminary Ecological Appraisal May 2023 submitted in support of planning application 23/01372/FULLS. There was no objection from the Council's ecological consultant to the current application. Those areas of interest which do exist can be retained as part of the site's development. The commentary should be revised, and the performance should be reviewed
Pollution - Noise	10813	The site is categorised as one where any part of the site is likely to be exposed to night time road traffic. It is not clear on what basis TVBC has formed the judgement. On land immediately to the east, planning permission was granted for four dwellings in 2023 ref 21/03246/FULLS where the issue of noise was addressed through use of mitigation conditions
	10813	The same commentary and 'score' is attributed to land at Velmore Farm and land at Upton which have both been proposed for development. A consistent approach should be applied to all sites with the same assessment in respect of noise. The commentary should be revised, and the performance should be reviewed
	10813	The issue of noise is a key factor in the conclusion that the site is 'inappropriate for development'. If that is the case then it should be justified with the appropriate evidence along with the reasons why the same conclusion was not reached with respect to other sites assessed to have the same issue. It is clear that noise can be mitigated through conditions as on the adjoining site and therefore this site is appropriate
	10813	When compared with other sites the land north of Nursling Street compares favourably with those that have been proposed for allocations. The issue of noise is not considered to be the determining factor in respect of the principle of development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Site Assessment	10813	There is no content within the ISAR or the Site Selection Topic Paper to explain how the preferred pool was arrived at i.e., why sites such as the one north of Nursling Street which made it to stage 5 were not included
	10813	There is no reference to any selection process or criteria for what is a key stage in the decision-making process as it is from this preferred pool that the proposed site allocations are drawn. Paragraph 5.87 refers only to the process which led to the stage at which the selection of preferred pool of sites was undertaken
	10813	It would be fair to conclude that there were at least two further stages in the site selection assessment after stage 5 which resulted in the elimination of a number of sites such as the one north of Nursling Street and the creation of the two-tier category of 'constants and variables. First a pool of preferred sites is created which is then further distilled into 'constant' sites and 'variables' sites
	10813	The selection process is concluded for southern Test Valley in Figure 6 of the Site Selection Paper. It includes the sites proposed for development for housing in the Regulation 18 Part 2 local plan including land at Upton for 80 dwellings. A site which was not in the list of preferred pool and was not included in the Growth Scenario Testing
	10813	A key part of the SA process is the assessment of reasonable alternatives. The approach taken by TVBC has not enabled such an assessment to take place. At a relatively early stage sites were discarded which in turn restricted the scope and choice of growth scenarios
	10813	The flawed analysis of site assessments forming the bottom up approach has had the effect of ruling out sites which when compared with sites which formed part of the preferred pool has shaped the content of the four Growth Scenarios
	10813	This approach adopted by TVBC restricted the assessment of reasonable alternatives as there is no scenario which explores a more dispersed approach across the Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements which would be consistent with the strategic factors identified in paragraph 5.67 of the ISAR. Such an option could have included a range of size of sites
	10813	The SA and site selection process is not supported by a sound methodology and evidence base or the consistent application of the SA objectives
	10342	Object to the Sustainability Appraisal of land at Roundabouts Copse which has not been based on all the relevant information available to TVBC
	10342	When assessing individual sites, it is important that it is done in a consistent way. The assessment should be based on the existing situation and where mitigation is taken into account it should be clear where that is the case i.e. a mitigation-off and a mitigation-on approach
	10342	Where mitigation is applied any uncertainty about its delivery should be assessed. In circumstances where additional information provided by the promoters of sites is relied upon to inform the decision-

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		making process it should be made clear that is the case and to make available the information is being relied upon
	10342	The site assessment for Roundabouts Copse includes a number of inaccurate assumptions. There is an existing site access to the A27, which the Highway Authority raised no objections to it being the location of the vehicle access in respect of the 2016 planning application
	10342	Noise was not raised as a significant issue by TVBC when it considered the application and the areas proposed for development would not result in the loss of ancient woodland, The SA site appraisal of Roundabouts Copse is considered to be flawed in a number of specific respects, which are set out below
	10342	The SA has assessed the merits of the site as a whole rather than the area put forward for development, i.e. land for 30 dwellings ref SHELAA 406. It is considered that the assessment should be undertaken for the area proposed for development to provide a more robust analysis of the merits of the site. This would more closely align the assessment with the 2015 proposals which is a relevant source of information
Housing Need	10342	The small-scale nature of the site limits the scope to meet a range of housing needs. Policies HOU4 and HOU7 make provision for a range of housing with the later setting a threshold of 100 dwellings for self and custom build homes. All sites should have the same assessment outcome based on these policies. Typographical error the site capacity is estimated as 30 dwellings. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
Local Economy	10342	The site is too small to include employment opportunities but is close to existing employment sites and the proposed employment allocation at the Test Valley Business Park, North Baddesley. That position should be reflected in the commentary. The commentary should be revised to reflect the size of the proposed development
	10342	The site is approximately 1 Km from the Test Valley Business Park. The commentary should be amended to reflect the distance. It is also connected to the Business Park via public transport, the nearest bus stop is within approximately 300m. the commentary should either include text from Objective 3 H) or cross refer to it. The commentary should be revised
Community Services and Facilities	10342	The promoters of Roundabouts Copse are owners of the site and their land ownership extend to the boundary with Norton Welch Close. A pedestrian/cycle link can be provided which would mean that the distance to the pre-school facility is approximately 300m. The commentary should be revised
	10342	The distance to the infant and junior school is approximately 500m via Norton Welch Close. The commentary should be revised
	10342	There is a frequent bus service accessible from the site within 400m as described out in Objective 2D). The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10342	The distance to a convenience store at Fleming Avenue is approximately 500m via Norton Welch Close. The commentary should be revised.
	10342	The distance to the health centre is approximately 200m via Norton Welch Close. The commentary should be revised.
	10342	The distance to the North Baddesley Community Association building on Fleming Avenue is 400m, via Norton Welch Close. The commentary should be revised.
	10342	There is an existing vehicle access to the A27 in the north east-corner of the site. It is the proposed location for a vehicle access as presented in the planning application 15/00800/OUTS. Although the application was dismissed at appeal there was no objection from the Highway Authority to the proposed vehicular access in this location. A pedestrian/cycle link can be provided to Norton Welch Close. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
Efficient Use of Land	10342	The area proposed for development was used for the extraction of material for brick manufacture on-site. It is highly unlikely that there are any mineral resources of value remaining on the site. The size of the remaining area of land, its proximity to residential development and its ecological importance would suggest that it is not an appropriate location for mineral extraction. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
	10342	The site includes a former landfill site which has been the subject of investigation. TVBC's Environment and Health officer's advice in 2015 was that any issues arising could be addressed via the use of planning conditions. The commentary should be revised
Flood Risk	10342	The text, it is assumed, is based on an assessment of the whole site rather than the area which is proposed for development. The areas at risk from surface water flooding are primarily located outside of the area proposed to be considered for development ref EA Flood Risk mapping January 2024. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
Protected Landscape	10342	The criteria includes landscape character and protected landscapes which should be assessed independently of each other to achieve a more accurate assessment
	10342	Landscape character the proposed development site is located in LCA2B North Baddesley to Chilworth Woodland Mosaic, the same LCA within which Velmore Farm is located. Both sites have been assessed in the SA as having a 'mixed performance' which is difficult to understand given the commentary for Velmore Farm in the Landscape Sensitivity Study which describes its location as being in 'a landscape of high overall sensitivity'
	10342	The Study in assessing Roundabouts Copse's overall landscape sensitivity to change came to a conclusion based on a large scale residential and mixed use development which clearly is not what is being proposed ref para 1.1.361 page 88. The assessment of the site should be revisited and a separate analysis undertaken rather than to be combined with land at Packridge Lane

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10342	There is a significant inconsistency in the commentaries for both sites in that there is a reference to the local gap in respect of Roundabouts Copse but no reference as far as Velmore Farm is concerned. The reference to the local gap should be deleted as it is not a relevant factor in assessing landscape character and is not a protected landscape. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
Settlement Context	10342	The criteria refers to how well a site relates to an existing settlement and surrounding area. Roundabouts Copse and Velmore Farm are assessed as having the same impact. It is difficult to see how that conclusion has been arrived at. Roundabouts Copse adjoins North Baddesley Infant and Junior Schools, the residential development at Norton Welch Close and the house which front the A27 Botley Rd
	10342	It can deliver a convenient pedestrian/cycleway link to local facilities without the need to cross a well-trafficked road (Templars Way). It is well screened by existing landscape features and between it and the open countryside to the south east is the Chilworth Golf Course and driving range. In comparison Velmore Farm is a proposal for 1000 plus homes on elevated land south of Templars Way. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
Settlement Coalescence	10342	Roundabouts Copse is assessed as having the same impact on the separation of settlements as Velmore Farm. Roundabouts Copse would result in a modest reduction in the extent of the proposed local gap between North Baddesley and Chilworth of approximately 80 metres, if the existing and proposed landscaping was included within the boundary of the Gap
	10342	In terms of the visual separation the development of 30 dwellings would be viewed in the context of the existing extensive on-site and off-site landscaping and any new landscape planting, the existing development of at the Golf Course. Any assessment should also take account of the proposed battery storage facility the subject of a current application on land on the east side of the A27
	10342	This impact compares with that at Velmore Farm which would extend approximately 1.3km along the boundary with Templars Way and Castle Lane. The elevated nature of the site would mean that development would have a significant visual impact
	10342	Given the scale of development proposed at Velmore Farm compared with that at Roundabouts Copse and the scope to soften the impact by retaining and enhancing existing landscape features there should be a significant difference in the 'scoring' of the two sites
	10342	The Local Gaps Assessment recommended that "Consideration could also be given to reviewing the extent of the gap in the north-west, in relation to the small, contained area of land between North Baddesley and the woodland north of the golf course." Ref page 47. This would suggest that excluding the area proposed for development would not undermine the purpose and function of the gap. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Biodiversity	10342	The area of Ancient Woodland is outside of the area proposed for development. A buffer zone can be established between ancient woodland and the area of proposed housing protecting special areas of ancient woodland with public access
	10342	The issue of impact on the Ancient Woodland was considered as part of planning application 15/00800/OUTS. Natural England and Hampshire County Council raised no objection to the development in respect of its impact on the Ancient Woodland. This has a significant impact on the assessment of the site
	10342	The site at Ganger Farm South includes an area of Ancient Woodland but the assessment under that criteria has come to a different conclusion in terms of performance. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
	10342	The development of the open areas would not result in 'the loss of existing areas of established trees and woodland' as described in the commentary. TVBC's arboriculture officer did not object to the proposal for 33 dwellings, ref 15/00800/OUTS having regard to the existing TPO's. They did have some concerns regarding the implementation of any permission but advised that they could be addressed at the detailed planning stage
	10342	There is potential for a small nature reserve within the ancient woodland with public walking routes, as well as safeguarding the SINC habitat and TPOs. An actively managed woodland being included within the site will remove the antisocial nuisance currently being caused by the unlawful access of cars and motorbikes
	10342	The criteria against which the merits of the site are being assessed is referring to the impact of development on local green infrastructure provision. There is no discussion in the text of the potential for the positive management of the area of ecological importance, the SINC or the Ancient Woodland, as proposed and accepted by Natural England in respect of the planning application. The potential for approximately 4Ha of land to be managed for its ecological interest should be recognised under this criterion. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
	10342	The area of Ancient Woodland is outside of the area proposed for development. A buffer zone can be established between ancient woodland and the area of proposed housing protecting special areas of ancient woodland with public access. The issue of impact on the Ancient Woodland was considered as part of planning application 15/00800/OUTS. Natural England and Hampshire County Council raised no objection to the development in respect of its impact on the Ancient Woodland
	10342	TVBC's arboriculture officer did not object to the proposal for 33 dwellings, ref 15/00800/OUTS having regard to the existing TPO's. They did have some concerns regarding the implementation of any permission but advised that they could be addressed at the detailed planning stage. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Climate Emergency	10342	The commentary and performance under this criteria should be reviewed in the context of the information now provided in respect of the objectives 3,4,5,6 and 10. In particular the reference to the site being heavily constrained is inaccurate. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
Access to the Countryside	10342	There are no Public Rights of Way through the site whose character would be altered if development were to take place. However, the development of the site would enable public access to the area to the south and that should be reflected in the commentary. The opportunity to enhance the Southern Ancient Woodland area bringing value to the local community with walking routes and dog walkers will be of great benefit, particularly for residents on the west of the A27 who would not need to cross the A27 to access public open spaces
	10342	Development at Velmore Farm will have significant impact on a PROW and have a fundamental impact on their setting, becoming urban in character. However, in terms of the assessment of Roundabouts Copse it is given the same 'score' which is difficult to understand. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
Pollution - Noise	10342	Noise was not raised as an issue in respect of the 2015 planning application. It is not clear what evidence TVBC is relying upon in reaching its assessment. The owners have instructed a noise report by Venta Acoustics, as is submitted, that shows that the development is within acceptable ranges especially with the houses being set back from the road to create a noise buffer zone. The commentary should be revised and the performance should be reviewed
Local Gap	10342	Summary that the site is heavily constrained is not justified given the available evidence and an assessment based on the area proposed for development. TVBC's own local gaps study concluded that the boundary which included the site was worthy of review. The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and relates well to the settlement edge
Site Assessment	10342	Following stage 5 a preferred pool of sites was identified ref paragraph 5.70 of the ISAR. There is no content within the ISAR or the Site Selection Topic Paper to explain how the preferred pool was arrived at i.e., why sites such as the Roundabouts Copse which made it to stage 5 was not included
	10342	There is no reference to any selection process or criteria for what is a key stage in the decision-making process as it is from this preferred pool that the proposed site allocations are drawn. Paragraph 5.87 refers only to the previous stages of the process. It is not clear why sites were considered for inclusion
	10342	It would be fair to conclude that there were at least two further stages in the site selection assessment which resulted in the elimination of a number of sites such as Roundabouts Copse and the creation of the two-tier category of constants and variables

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10342	The selection process is concluded for southern Test Valley in Figure 6 of the Site Selection Paper. It includes the sites proposed for development for housing in the Regulation 18 Part 2 local plan including land at Upton for 80 dwellings. A site which was not in the list of preferred pool and was not included in the Growth Scenario Testing
	10342	A key part of the SA process is the assessment of reasonable alternatives. The approach taken by TVBC has not enabled such an assessment to take place. The assumption that a number of sites are 'constant' i.e., included within all the growth options and a number of sites are 'variables' has the effect of restricting the testing and evaluation of scenarios
	10342	The flawed analysis of site assessments forming the bottom up approach has had the effect of ruling out sites which compare favourably with sites which formed part of the preferred pool and shaped the content of the four Growth Scenarios. This approach adopted by TVBC restricted the assessment of reasonable alternatives as there is no scenario which explores a more dispersed approach across the Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements which would be consistent with the strategic factors identified in paragraph 5.67 of the ISAR. Such an option could have included a range of size of sites
	10342	The SA and the process of site selection on which Policy SS6 does form a sound basis for the justification for the proposed allocations. The methodology is unclear and both should be reviewed
Affordable Housing	11096	The Site has been promoted to include a mix of housing types and tenures on the Site to meet the Borough's housing need. This includes homes for older people, affordable housing and custom-build / self-build homes. This objective should have been scored positively within the criteria
Settlement Context	11096	The site abuts residential development to its western and northern boundaries and effectively 'rounds off' this part of Rownhams. The site is well related to the existing settlement and should have been scored positively for this objective
Archaeology	11096	The site may encounter archaeological remains on the site. However, prior to the commencement of development a full programme of archaeological investigation will be completed to assess and remove the risk of harm to potential assets. The Site is not expected to identify anything of national significant importance. Therefore, the site should have scored positively within the criteria
Biodiversity	11096	The proposed landscape-led concept plan demonstrates to conserve and enhance biodiversity on site, ensure buffers are provided to on-site and off-site trees and the ancient woodland. The SINC will be enhanced and managed to improve its biodiversity. It is acknowledged that a small number of trees may need to be removed to form the site entrance, but additional trees will be planted within the scheme. However, the site should have scored positively in meeting this objective
Climate Emergency	11096	The energy and sustainability matters that the scheme will deliver, ensuring new homes are zero-carbon ready, in line with an electric only strategy and supporting measures to increase water efficiency and reduce consumption. This site should have scored positively in meeting this objective

Evidence-Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Site Assessment	11096	If the Sustainability Appraisal had been prepared accurately the Fields Farm Site would have scored more favourably than three of the four residential site allocations identified. As such we request that the evidence base is reassessed to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the Site, and the conclusions and residential site selections are reassessed
Identification of preferred pool of sites	10661	There is no content within the Sustainability Appraisal or Site Selection Topic Paper to explain how the preferred pool was arrived at out, i.e. why sites such as land south of Highwood Lane and land north of Highwood Lane, which made it to Stage 5, were not included. There is no explanation why land which had very similar site assessments were included.
Site selection method	10661	There is no reference to any selection process or criteria for what is a key stage in the decision making process as it is from the preferred pool that the site allocations are drawn. Paragraph 5.87 in the Sustainability Appraisal refers only to the overall process rather than the actual process for the selection of the preferred pool of sites.
Site selection method	10661	It would be fair to conclude that there were at least two further stages in the site selection assessment which resulted in the elimination of a number of sites and the creation of two-tier category of constant and variable sites for which there is no published methodology.
SA - Rownhams		A detailed alternative SA scoring assessment is provided (Appendix C) for the Rownhams site, scoring much higher than the council's SA assessment.
		Strongly object to SA conclusion about the site regarding habitats, ecology and flood risk
		Inconsistencies between how Rownhams and the adj. site Fields Farm (ref 253) are scored, meaning the SA cannot be relied upon.
Site selection	10133	Distribution of growth within NTV HMA and site selection process pertaining to Land at Finkley Down Farm and other sites listed with Preferred Pool of sites, raises concerns regarding consistency and robustness of process
Transport objectives	10133	In transport submission site scores much lower on SA Transport objectives compared to Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165)
	10133	In transport submission site scores much lower on SA Transport objectives compared to Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA Ref 165)
Development at Ludgershall	10133	Interim SA concludes that preferred growth scenario for NTV sub area is Scenario 1, which includes significant development directed away from Andover to Ludgershall. Consequence that almost 40% of total planned strategic development in NTV sub area directed to edge of Ludgershall and away from Andover. Do not support this approach
	10133	Site options at Ludgershall identified within the SA growth scenarios (growth combinations) are based on Council's conclusions that such sites are capable of delivering the identified housing requirement

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		in a manner which aligns with the spatial strategy and objectives of the plan. Do not agree that this is the case.
Comparison of growth scenarios	10133	Preferred growth scenarios for NTV is Scenario 1 which performs well in terms of housing delivery and providing for LHM and a 10% supply buffer and in terms of transport impact. Scenario 1 also performs best in terms of landscape impact. In terms of accessibility to community infrastructure and health, Scenario 1 perform slightly less well than scenarios 3 and 4 which have a greater Andover focus
	10133	Concludes that Andover focused scenarios 3 and 4 are the best performing growth options due to better access to community infrastructure than scenarios 1 and 2 with positive effects, and with infrastructure improvements taken into account positive effects would be enhanced
Active and sustainable travel objective and Ludgershall allocations	10133	Relative performance of Andover focused growth scenarios in terms of accessibility important consideration in context of objectives of local plan and spatial strategy. Objective to encourage active and sustainable modes of travel as in para.2.68 to focus development in most sustainable locations, in order to reduce private car travel. Allocations at Ludgershall inconsistent with evidence and spatial strategy objectives
Ludgershall allocations NA7 and NA8	10133	Based on transport and accessibility objectives clear from Council's own assessment that proposed Ludgershall allocation perform the least positively out of all the options considered
	10133	Both Ludgershall allocations (NA7 and NA8) are preferred options in SA despite scoring lower on transport objectives and having much lower potential to encourage uptake of sustainable and active travel modes. This brings into question ranking of sites within SA
Growth scenarios 1 and 2 transport	10133	Relative performance of Andover sites, including Finkley Down Farm (SHLAA Ref 165) reinforces conclusions of SA that in accessibility terms, Andover focused growth scenarios are best performing option. To seek to implement spatial strategy inconsistent with these findings raises serious concerns regarding the justification for approach. In transport terms SA concludes scenarios 1 and 2 are best performing growth scenarios, including significant development directed towards Ludgershall. Do not agree with this assessment
Traffic volumes, vehicle movements and capacity	10133	SA Para.6.1.69 states that traffic volumes on A342 show an increased in additional vehicle movements associated with growth scenarios 1, 2 and 3. This acknowledges that vehicle movements and traffic volumes on A342 will occur from development options at Ludgershall but then states that no issues with capacity on network to cope with additional movements. Shows Council content to include less sustainable sites which generate higher levels of traffic as long as no capacity issues. This is flawed approach.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10133	Approach that content to include less sustainable sites which generate higher levels of traffic as long as no capacity issues is contradictory to 'Decide and Provide' approach and environmental policies which would favour alternative site options at Andover such as Finkley Down Farm, with greater potential to increase uptake of sustainable and active travel modes and lower dependence on private car
Growth options 1 and 2	10133	Evidence base does not support conclusions that scenarios 1 and 2 out perform Andover focused growth scenarios. Lacks justification and reliant on conclusion that pinch points at Enham Arch and local network which strategic modelling concludes would still operate within capacity
Growth scenarios Housing delivery quantum	10133	Housing delivery' is based purely on overall quantum of development and extent to which growth scenarios will deliver local housing need and required buffer. Site selection process and SA artificially reduces quantum at Finkley Down Farm (SHELAA 165) evident that capacity of individual sites subject to some variance. Overall quantum of four growth scenarios closely aligned and therefore little value can be taken against criteria, regarding providing definitive basis to make conclusions as to most appropriate growth scenario
Growth scenario 1 landscape assessment	10133	Spatial distribution of growth reliant upon conclusions relating to landscape sensitivities, which analysis suggests does not accurately reflect true landscape context of proposed allocations. Brings into question conclusions in SA (Para.7.2) that growth scenario 1 performs best in terms of landscape impact
Ludgershall allocations NA7 and NA8	10133	SA does not demonstrate that directing development to Ludgershall is most appropriate option, particularly when this in favour of development options at Andover, specifically Finkley Down Farm
Finkley Down Farm housing capacity	10133	<p>Inclusion of Finkley Down Farm is supported as matter of principle however 'officer assessed capacity' of 900 dwellings is not supported. Clear that this is significantly higher than assessed capacity at c.1,500 dwellings with development in south western part of the site, in a manner Council's evidence has assessed as moderate landscape sensitivity</p> <p>Consideration of Finkley Down Farm for growth scenarios and through site selection process should be based on 1,500 dwellings consistent with that which has consistently been promoted</p>
Site held as constant in all scenarios	10133	In growth scenarios (site combinations) two site are held constant forming part of every reasonable growth scenario as fixed component of supply South of London Road (NA4) and Bere Hill (NA6). Misrepresentation to state only these two site are held 'constant', Manor Farm and Bere Hill are 'constant' options as they feature across all growth scenarios, albeit at varying levels of development

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Highways congestion	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	This is acknowledged but gives no comfort to bus operators that services do not risk becoming slower, less reliable and less attractive. There is a material risk that deterioration in highways congestion will make marginal services unviable, the plan needs to take clear steps with the County Council to protect services from congestion to meet wider national and local transport policy.
HMA Support	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The SA report examines the housing growth separately for the Northern and Southern Test Valley areas, which is rational and supported.
High quality bus service definition	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	We have some major concerns with the definition of a sufficiently high-quality bus service in the methodology.
Transport and Connectivity Criteria	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The SA scoring system looks broadly comprehensive and appropriate, we are pleased to see that transport and connectivity criteria (reflected in objectives 2) and 3) in particular) see emphasis in the methodology at the later site selection stages. We agree this focus is the correct one at this stage, alongside other more local factors.
Criteria B Thresholds	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	With the need to secure mode shift, the criteria 'B' thresholds look extremely weak and do not represent a bus service offer that would have relevance to any other than the disabled or those working part time and excludes the post-pandemic travel behaviours which see greatest rates of growth at peak times.
Frequent service	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	A frequent service should include a half-hourly service operating between 0700-1900 as an essential minimum to present a sufficient choice of departure and arrival times
Bus stop thresholds	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited	Where truly frequent services are on offer, there is evidence people will walk or cycle further to reach it depending on the destination, directness and other factors. An upper threshold of 800m is more appropriate for longer-distance inter-urban services and 600m in urban areas.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10243	
Chosen thresholds	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Criterion H looks better where thresholds are chosen. We would argue that being within 800m of a better than half-hourly service should score more highly especially in Tier 2 settlements, which would help to positively justify sites taken forward in the plan. Achieving a 400m standard for all development is practically impossible, not even Greater London offers a bus network that dense in most outer areas.
Distance to employment site	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	There are references where sites are within 1600m of an employment site but are discounted as no regular bus service is provided, within these distances no service will be competitive with cycling or even walking, this is a spurious basis on which to discount sites.
Distance to secondary school	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	We find it problematic that sites are discounted if they are more than 800m from a secondary school, where safe walking and cycling routes are less than 2km these should be considered highly accessible sustainable modes. 3km is well within DFES and DfT parameters for active travel, we cannot comprehend why the SA methodology chooses to use such an unreasonably tight parameter as 1600m.
Distance to primary care facilities	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Most of the population in the largest settlements are not within 800m of primary care facilities, the vast majority don't need to use these facilities regularly, even a 1600m distance seems strict in this light
Reinforcement of bus services through development	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The methodology fails to consider the evidence that the developments would be able to address a wide range of current deficiencies when accessibility to key services and facilities by sustainable means is concerned. This exists despite the fact the five stage process is said to have drawn on technical evidence submitted by site promoters.
Engagement	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	A more detailed appraisal to inform Regulation 19 is something that warrants more in-depth discussion with each of the major operators, and Hampshire County Council, that reflects the expectations set out at NPPF paragraph 15 c). A consistent approach to evaluating development opportunities including across multiple adjacent sites in separate control forming part of a logical unified allocation, is essential.
Site Selection	Stagecoach South and Go	We find the way in which the assessment results have been applied to selecting sites hard to follow at times, the methodology essentially screens out all sites with significant constraints at earlier stages

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	South Coast Limited 10243	thus, assessing those remaining starts to focus on a more limited number of opportunities and constraints.
Omission of Finkley Down Farm	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Looking at the transport and accessibility criteria, difficulty surrounds the omission of Finkley Down Farm as the site is in strong conformity with the spatial strategy and would not struggle to integrate with the existing built up area and facilities. Its scoring performs negligibly different to Land at Bere Hill and Ganger Farm and greatly better than South East of Ludgershall where the largest quantum of development is allocated.
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The promoters for Finkley Down Farm have had early discussions with Stagecoach and Service 6 could be readily extended into the site, it is earmarked for further investment under the County Councils 2024-26 Bus Service Improvement Plan 2 funding scheme and is one of the most secure and frequent town services. Development would also benefit from immediate proximity and priority access by sustainable modes to one of the largest employment areas in the town. Whereas a strong commercial bus route is much harder to identify for Bere Hill.
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	A more accurate assessment would place Finkley Down Farm at, or ahead, of all other opportunities in the preferred sites pool adjacent to Andover. It is very hard to see the basis on which a site that the Council considers highly sustainable in transport and connectivity terms has been entirely set aside. This looks likely to be hard for the Council to defend at Examination in public and to justify in subsequent stages of plan development. We invite the Council to seriously reconsider this opportunity.
Omission of Halterworth	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	The treatment of Halterworth is hard to grasp as the sites have been assessed discretely which unreasonably and illogically skews the results whereas, development across a clearly defined area looks rational as an assessable option. We are concerned the scoring seems inconsistent and at times shows evidence of errors with the effect to systematically further under-represent the credentials of this site. We invite the Council to very strongly reconsider this opportunity as it is superior to Ganger Farm Phase 2 and any other option adjoining Romsey apart from south of the Bypass.
	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Halterworth lies near a primary school, Mountbatten School, Abbey Park Industrial Estate and north of the most frequent public transport corridor on Botley Road. Service 4 and 5 both use this corridor with direct connectivity to Southampton, Chandlers Ford and Eastleigh via multiple intermediate points within a highly competitive bus journey time. Due to the scale of the site, any immediate lack of connectivity to convenience retail and day-to-day facilities would likely be addressable on-site.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
Lodge Farm (SHELAA 139) scoring	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Land at Lodge Farm (SHELAA 139): 3B) the nearest strategic employment site is Abbey Park within 1000m. 3H) the proximity of Bluestar 4 and 5 ought to credit the site with ++, these are within 400m. 3I) no access constraints are demonstrable on an extensive frontage.
Land at the corner of Highwood Lane and Botley Road (SHELAA 282) scoring	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Land at the corner of Highwood Lane and Botley Road (SHELAA 282): 3A) within 700m of a nursery ought to credit the site with + which is likely to be closer with internal connectivity as part of comprehensive development. 3B) within 700m of a primary school ought to credit the site with + which is likely to be closer with internal connectivity as part of comprehensive development. 3C) within m of a Spar
Upton Lane allocations	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	It is difficult to follow how the allocation at Upton (SHELAA 394) has been made when the SA indicates it was ruled out and there is no mention of its inclusion in the preferred pool. A larger site adjacent (SHELAA 385) scores very differently on transport and connectivity criteria, for reasons that are impossible to follow.
Fields Farm scoring	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Fields Farm: Criterion H) Bluestar 4 is well accessible within a short distance which has been entirely discounted. St Johns Church is within a walking route of 350m. This should score strongly positively.
Parkers Farm (SHELAA 201) scoring	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	Parkers Farm (SHELAA 201): the nearest stop 680m away is further than desirable but the service offered by Bluestar 4 is one of the most frequent in the Borough and journey times to multiple key employment destinations have been entirely and justifiably discounted.
Car trip generation rate	Stagecoach South and Go South Coast Limited 10243	This statement makes no attempt to establish which sites or groups of sites can be expected to minimise car-borne journeys but applies a car trip generation rate quite broadly across the options and the specific sites that have been determined to warrant modelling together as part of a spatial strategy
Preferred Pool of sites	10133	Finkley Down Farm well located to existing employment including Walworth Business Park. Site can provide employment opportunities on site and access to existing employment locations. To conclude will have 'no effect' lacks credibility

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10133	Not clear why Finkley Down Farm scores more negatively than Manor Farm against objective. SA accepts impact on trees will be determined by tree surveys. SA ignores fact that scale of site can provide opportunities to avoid harm to existing trees. However, Manor Farm and proximity to ancient woodland SA adopts a less stringent approach. No rational basis to justify more negative score for Finkley Down Farm against this objective.
	10133	Unclear wht SA specifically references and quantifies loss of Grade 3a in context of Finkley Down Farm, but not Manor Farm. Finkley Down Farm also outperforms Manor Farm against objective 3 Accessibility and therefore provides greater opportunities for reducing car dependency as key component of climate change strategy.
	10133	PROW also feature of Manor Farm site, yet SA approaches these in different ways treating more negatively from Finkley Down Farm but recognising opportunities for enhancement for Manor Farm. Inconsistent approach which raises concerns over fairness of consideration of site options.
	10133	SA recognises sources of noise need to be considered and development supported by noise assessments. Therefore, no rational basis for SA to consider noise conditions as negative for Finkley Down Farm and need for noise assessment but concluding Manor Farm scores positively against SA objectives. Inconsistent and flawed approach.
NA8 Land South East of Ludgershall	10133	Connection is reliant on third party land but downplays or ignores significant challenges faced in deliver access. Negative score in SA does not accurately reflect significant of constraint and challenges of delivery
	10133	Site scores strongly positive on accessibility to bus stop and positive on accessibility to Andover. This is on basis of site is within 400m of bus stop. This does not accurately reflect site is severed from A342 Andover Road by railway line, with single underpass ped/cycle route via Shoddesden Lane. Significant proportion of allocation lies beyond 400m of existing bus service, even as crow flies.
	10133	Crossing railway line remains significant constraint which directly impacts on connectivity of site to public transport routes, not accurately acknowledged in SA. Wiltshire Reg19 SA state Active8 bus service is currently only accessible from A342 and majority of site not within 400m walking distance
	10133	SA misrepresents site scores strongly positive on accessibility to bus stop and positive on accessibility to Andover. Wiltshire SA is correct. LP should recognise that without appropriate public transport connections, dependent on infrastructure being addressed, Ludgershall allocations does not provide for sustainable patterns of development Accessibility misrepresented

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10133	Extent to which railway line is constraints and impacts on sustainability and connectivity of land to south of railway line is accurately assessed in Wiltshire SA as a significant barrier to sustainability of the site.
Land at Finkley Down Farm vs Land South East of Ludgershall	10133	Not clear why Finkley Down Farm scores 'uncertain' against Objective 1, whereas land south east of Ludgershall scores 'positive'. All development proposals required to provide appropriate mix of house types, sizes and tenures, therefore 'positive' scores should be recorded across all site options SA scoring
Preferred Pool of sites	10133	Inclusion of Finkley Down Farm within preferred pool of sites is supported in principle
Growth scenarios	10133	Consideration of Finkley Down Farm should be based upon on quantum consistent with that consistently promoted i.e. c.1,500 dwellings
SA process	11124	The SA should identify reasonable alternatives and explain the preferred option and why other options have been rejected to enable the reader of the SA to understand how a local planning authority has arrived at its preferred position.
	11124	The assessment of individual sites should be done in a consistent way and should be based on the existing situation and where mitigation is taken into account and assess where there is uncertainty over delivery.
	11124	Where additional information from site promoters is relied upon to inform the decision-making process, this should be made clear.
SA Stage 4	11124	In terms of testing the sites against strategic factors at Stage 4 of the SA, there is no explanation of what proportionate growth comprises and what if any are the thresholds for determining when that growth exceeds the definition of proportionate.
SA Stage 5	11124	With regard to the preferred pool of sites in Table 3 and Figure 6 of the SA, there is no content or Topic Paper to explain how the preferred pool was arrived at, i.e. why sites recommended for further assessment were excluded. There were at least two further stages in the site selection assessment which resulted in the elimination of a number of sites for which there is no published methodology. Paragraph 5.87 refers only to the overall process rather than the actual process.
SA site selection	11124	There is no explanation of how site were included in either the 'constant' or 'variable' category.
	11124	Site assessments forming the bottom up approach has had the effect of ruling out sites which compare favourably with sites which formed part of the preferred pool and shaped the content of the four growth scenarios. This has restricted the assessment of reasonable alternatives which explores

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
		a more dispersed approach across Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements which would be consistent with strategic factors identified in paragraph 5.67 of the SA.
	11124	Land at Upton Lane for 80 dwellings was not included in the growth scenarios.
SA growth scenarios	11124	with regard to the assessment of the four growth scenarios against a number of issues, there is no systematic analysis of the performance of each scenario against the issues identified. When that is done it is clear that the choice of preferred scenario is flawed. The selection of three of the issues is not accompanied by any supporting text in the SA or a Topic Paper which raises a number of questions about how sound the outcome of the SA process. is.
	11124	With reference to the appropriate growth strategy in terms of quantum and distribution for Romsey, it is unclear how the SA has assessed the issue of capacity or what if any the threshold is above which development could not be accommodated. The application of this assumptions has a significant impact on the selection of a preferred scenario. TVBC do not raise any issues of capacity of infrastructure or services in respect of other large settlements in Southern Test Valley.
	11124	Within the SA there does not appear to be any specific analysis of the performance of each scenario against the issues identified in paragraph 5.106. While Scenario 1 is preferred over Scenario 3, the differences are marginal which are seen on Table 9 bringing together the top down and bottom up approaches. The comparison is assumed to have been done without a specific single site bottom up assessment. The assessment of scenario 3 should be reviewed and be undertaken with the benefit of a single site appraisal of the land at Halterworth. This is likely to show that scenario 3 performs as well as scenario 1.
	11124	There is no commentary in the Topic Paper or the SA on why an over-reliance on Romsey isn't an issue or how the scale and location of development proposed elsewhere has been arrived at. There is no explanation of how the proportionate growth strategic factor has been achieved, nor is there any evidence of what would comprise a balanced distribution which would best meet the housing needs of Southern Test Valley.
	11124	Paragraphs 7.4 - 7.6 make the case for southern Test Valley and it is expected that this section of the SA would draw together all of the preceding analysis and present the final chapter in the story of the SA and how TVBC arrived at its preferred strategy and allocations.
	11124	Table 9 shows there is little difference between scenarios 1 and 3 and if a single site assessment was carried out for Halterworth, scenario 3 would perform at least as well.
	11124	The SA identifies that Velmore Farm has some landscape sensitivity issues but that these could be overcome via the masterplanning process is relying on an outcome of a piece of critical technical work yet to be undertaken.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11124	The SA identifies that there is an opportunity to deliver employment with scope for commercial development at Velmore Farm. TVBC doesn't seem entirely convinced that provision would be made. Scenario 1 observes that it 'may provide some marginal difference in benefits through possible employment land and community facilities at Velmore Farm.' The assessment of scenario 3 at a strategic level should take account of proposed allocation land south of Botley Road and an extension to Abbey Park Business Park, both of which are within walking distance of land at Halterworth.
	11124	Reference to more balanced distribution of development between Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements and less reliance on Romsey, there is no discussion in the SA of what is meant by a more balanced distribution of development, what the current issue is in terms of the location of development and future needs of communities in the very south of the Borough. If the objective of the Local Plan is to provide more balanced distribution of development, then the appraisal process should have included a scenario which reflected that.
	11124	Ref less pressure on infrastructure capacity in Romsey, there is no evidence in the SA or supporting evidence which supports the assertion that there is an issue of capacity with Romsey's existing infrastructure being unable to support development. The SA goes on to say that scenarios 3 and 4 would have a positive impact in terms of investment in Romsey. There is also no analysis of the impact of scenario 1 on Eastleigh's infrastructure.
SA growth scenarios (Local Gaps)	11124	With regard to the merits of a large scale mixed use strategic urban extension adjacent to the Eastleigh conurbation, it is not clear why an extension to Eastleigh within Test Valley should be singled out as an issue to be considered. There is no commentary on what the benefits would be and no analysis of any adverse impact on Eastleigh.
	11124	With reference to the sensitivity of the Halterworth and Romsey/Norh Baddesley landscape gaps, the highlighting of this particular gap is not explained nor why the sensitivity of other gaps is not an issue. This puts the land at Halterworth at a distinct disadvantage.
	11124	With regard to the Romsey - North Baddesley Local Gap there is no commentary in the Local Gaps Study which suggest that it is a particularly important local gap in comparison with other local gaps in southern Test Valley. The Local Gap Study assessed that the strategic importance of the Romsey - North Baddesley Local Gap was eroded by adjacent development in contrast to the view that the Southampton - Eastleigh Local Gap has a valuable strategic function in defining the setting and individual identity of adjacent settlements. The sensitivity of the Romsey - North Baddesley Gap does not seem to be justified in the assessment of growth scenarios.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
SA process	10323	The SA should identify reasonable alternatives and explain the preferred option and why other options have been rejected to enable the reader of the SA to understand how a local planning authority has arrived at its preferred position.
	10323	the assessment of individual sites should be done in a consistent way and should be based on the existing situation and where mitigation is taken into account and assess where there is uncertainty over delivery.
	10323	Where additional information from site promoters is relied upon to inform the decision-making process, this should be made clear.
SA Stage 4	10323	In terms of testing the sites against strategic factors at Stage 4 of the SA, there is no explanation of what proportionate growth comprises and what if any are the thresholds for determining when that growth exceeds the definition of proportionate.
SA Stage 5	10323	With regard to the preferred pool of sites in Table 3 and Figure 6 of the SA, there is no content or Topic Paper to explain how the preferred pool was arrived at, i.e. why sites recommended for further assessment were excluded. There were at least two further stages in the site selection assessment which resulted in the elimination of a number of sites for which there is no published methodology. Paragraph 5.87 refers only to the overall process rather than the actual process.
SA site selection	10323	There is no explanation of how site were included in either the 'constant' or 'variable' category.
	10323	Site assessments forming the bottom up approach has had the effect of ruling out sites which compare favourably with sites which formed part of the preferred pool and shaped the content of the four growth scenarios. This has restricted the assessment of reasonable alternatives which explores a more dispersed approach across Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements which would be consistent with strategic factors identified in paragraph 5.67 of the SA.
	10323	Land at Upton Lane for 80 dwellings was not included in the growth scenarios.
SA growth scenarios	10323	with regard to the assessment of the four growth scenarios against a number of issues, there is no systematic analysis of the performance of each scenario against the issues identified. When that is done it is clear that the choice of preferred scenario is flawed. The selection of three of the issues is not accompanied by any supporting text in the SA or a Topic Paper which raises a number of questions about how sound the outcome of the SA process. is.
	10323	With reference to the appropriate growth strategy in terms of quantum and distribution for Romsey, it is unclear how the SA has assessed the issue of capacity or what if any the threshold is above which development could not be accommodated. The application of this assumptions has a significant impact on the selection of a preferred scenario. TVBC do not raise any issues of capacity of infrastructure or services in respect of other large settlements in Southern Test Valley.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
SA growth scenarios (Local Gaps)	10323	With regard to the merits of a large scale mixed use strategic urban extension adjacent to the Eastleigh conurbation, it is not clear why an extension to Eastleigh within Test Valley should be singled out as an issue to be considered. There is no commentary on what the benefits would be and no analysis of any adverse impact on Eastleigh.
	10323	With reference to the sensitivity of the Halterworth and Romsey/Norh Baddesley landscape gaps, the highlighting of this particular gap is not explained nor why the sensitivity of other gaps is not an issue. This puts the land at Halterworth at a distinct disadvantage.
	10323	With regard to the Romsey - North Baddesley Local Gap there is no commentary in the Local Gaps Study which suggest that it is a particularly important local gap in comparison with other local gaps in southern Test Valley. The Local Gap Study assessed that the strategic importance of the Romsey - North Baddesley Local Gap was eroded by adjacent development in contrast to the view that the Southampton - Eastleigh Local Gap has a valuable strategic function in defining the setting and individual identity of adjacent settlements. The sensitivity of the Romsey - North Baddesley Gap does not seem to be justified in the assessment of growth scenarios.
SA growth scenarios	10323	Within the SA there does not appear to be any specific analysis of the performance of each scenario against the issues identified in paragraph 5.106. While Scenario 1 is preferred over Scenario 3, the differences are marginal which are seen on Table 9 bringing together the top down and bottom up approaches. The comparison is assumed to have been done without a specific single site bottom up assessment. The assessment of scenario 3 should be reviewed and be undertaken with the benefit of a single site appraisal of the land at Halterworth. This is likely to show that scenario 3 performs as well as scenario 1.
	10323	There is no commentary in the Topic Paper or the SA on why an over-reliance on Romsey isn't an issue or how the scale and location of development proposed elsewhere has been arrived at. There is no explanation of how the proportionate growth strategic factor has been achieved, nor is there any evidence of what would comprise a balanced distribution which would best meet the housing needs of Southern Test Valley.
	10323	Paragraphs 7.4 - 7.6 make the case for southern Test Valley and it is expected that this section of the SA would draw together all of the preceding analysis and present the final chapter in the story of the SA and how TVBC arrived at its preferred strategy and allocations.
	10323	Table 9 shows there is little difference between scenarios 1 and 3 and if a single site assessment was carried out for Halterworth, scenario 3 would perform at least as well.
	10323	The SA identifies that Velmore Farm has some landscape sensitivity issues but that these could be overcome via the masterplanning process is relying on an outcome of a piece of critical technical work yet to be undertaken.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10323	The SA identifies that there is an opportunity to deliver employment with scope for commercial development at Velmore Farm. TVBC doesn't seem entirely convinced that provision would be made. Scenario 1 observes that it 'may provide some marginal difference in benefits through possible employment land and community facilities at Velmore Farm.' The assessment of scenario 3 at a strategic level should take account of proposed allocation land south of Botley Road and an extension to Abbey Park Business Park, both of which are within walking distance of land at Halterworth.
	10323	Reference to more balanced distribution of development between Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements and less reliance on Romsey, there is no discussion in the SA of what is meant by a more balanced distribution of development, what the current issue is in terms of the location of development and future needs of communities in the very south of the Borough. If the objective of the Local Plan is to provide more balanced distribution of development, then the appraisal process should have included a scenario which reflected that.
	10323	Ref less pressure on infrastructure capacity in Romsey, there is no evidence in the SA or supporting evidence which supports the assertion that there is an issue of capacity with Romsey's existing infrastructure being unable to support development. The SA goes on to say that scenarios 3 and 4 would have a positive impact in terms of investment in Romsey. There is also no analysis of the impact of scenario 1 on Eastleigh's infrastructure.
Landscape sensitivity	11123	The assessment regarding landscape does not fully reflect the Landscape Sensitivity Study or the Local Gap Study. A strongly negative score would be a more accurate recording of the impact in respect of both criteria as this site's landscape is of high overall sensitivity.
	11124	The assessment regarding landscape does not fully reflect the Landscape Sensitivity Study or the Local Gap Study. A strongly negative score would be a more accurate recording of the impact in respect of both criteria as this site's landscape is of high overall sensitivity.
	10323	The assessment regarding landscape does not fully reflect the Landscape Sensitivity Study or the Local Gap Study. A strongly negative score would be a more accurate recording of the impact in respect of both criteria as this site's landscape is of high overall sensitivity.
Growth Scenarios	10133	Finkley Down Farm only considered in Scenarios 3 and 4. Concern over how artificially excluded from consideration in growth scenarios and inconsistency of approach compared to other sites, such as Manor Farm. Para.5.127 sets out in sequential order preference of variable sites.
Growth Scenarios - ranking of sites	10133	Finkley Down Farm is ranked 5th as capacity is limited by landscape impact and transport modelling outputs identify constraints if site came forward in conjunction with Manor Farm. Assessment recognises Finkley Down Farm is well located to access wide range of services and facilities at Andover.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10133	On Andover site options, particular concerns regarding Council's approach to land at Manor Farm
Growth scenarios - transport	10133	Contrary to SA Para.5.122, which refers to two sites which are held constant, this states that Manor Farm is constant across all scenarios
	10133	Reference to Manor Farm as a constant is not supported by any specific evidence and directly contradicts with how SA and site selection process refers to Manor Farm
	10133	Manor Farm as constant across all four growth scenarios directly impact on Finkley Down Farm
	10133	Even if based on evidence on transport issues, as applied to Finkley Down Farm and ignored for Manor Farm, is significant failing of site selection process
	10133	No reference within SA summary as it relates to Manor Farm, regarding transport impacts and specifically local network at Enham Arch Enham Arch in relation to Manor Farm
	10133	Site selection process appears to ignore, or not understand, traffic from Manor Farm would use same highway network around Enham Arch as Finkley Down Farm. Concerns related to potential impact on local road network not applied to Manor Farm Enham Arch in relation to Manor Farm
	10133	None of four growth scenarios include option whereby Finkley Down Farm is considered as alternative to Manor Farm, only additional. Does not appear to any logical reasons for not considering reasonable alternative scenario with exclusion of Manor Farm.
Preferred Pool of sites	10133	Finkley Down Farm is unfairly considered across the growth scenarios as being in addition to Manor Farm
	10133	Manor Farm described as variable option for potential 800-900 homes and carried forward as constant with minimum 800 homes capacity. It has same status across for scenarios as Bere Hill and South of London Road yet not listed as constant in SA para.5.122
	10133	Manor Farm identified as top site in sequential order of preference. However, evidence base specifically SA does not support this conclusion. When SA is reviewed, does not support significant divergence in ranking of Manor Farm 1st and Finkley Down 5th.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10133	Reviewing SA scoring for Manor Farm and Finkley Down Farm evident that Finkley Down Farm scores more positively against 10 SA objectives criteria than Manor Farm, with Manor Farm scoring better against 5 SA criteria
	10133	Where Manor Farm performs better against SA objective criteria, differences are marginal and, in some cases, the approach taken in the SA appears inconsistent.
	10133	Finkley Down Farm performs better overall against SA objectives when compared to Manor Farm
	10133	Where SA scores Manor Farm more positively against specific objectives there is inconsistency in how SA approaches each site
	10133	Comparison between Finkley Down Farm's and Manor Farm's performance against SA objectives, does not result in such divergence to support Council's ranking of Finkley Down Farm 5th, compared to top ranking of Manor Farm in sequential preference of sites.
	10133	Site selection process and assessment of reasonable growth scenarios includes Manor Farm under every scenario, whilst excluding Finkley Down Farm and Andover/Ludgershall scenarios (scenarios 1 and 2).
Bus service frequency	10243	Early morning, late evening and Sunday services are crucial for employment and other trips, the service economy is 7 days per week and the evidence base must reflect realities of society as it currently exists.
Frequency test	10243	The application of the 'frequency test' unjustifiably promotes several sites, especially around Andover which are dependent on HCC subsidy including Bere Hill, Ganger Farm and Manor Farm.
Enham Arch	10133	Concerns raised regarding local highway capacity and pinchpoints (Enham Arch) not supported by Council's own transport modelling and are applied as constraints to Finkley Down Farm, but not Manor Farm which would use the same local road network
Assessed capacity	10133	Finkley Down Farm assessed on reduced capacity of 900 homes. Has consistently been promoted for 1,500 homes, informed by site specific circumstances, including landscape sensitivity
	10133	Reduction in capacity of Finkley Down Farm appear artificial and not based upon detailed understanding of site specific circumstances. Quantum of development assessed should reflect submission made to previous consultations and SHELAA
Growth option 2	10133	No valid reason why Finkley Down Farm has been omitted from Growth Option 2 (transport modelling) in place of sites with lower levels of transport accessibility by sustainable and active travel modes, which results in fundamental oversight in fair and comprehensive assessment of growth options.
Growth options	10133	Variations of growth options strongly recommended which information for transport options is undertaken to include Growth Option 1 but with Finkley Down Farm (full development). Without this additional option Finkley Down Farm has not been fairly assessed

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	10133	Variations of growth options strongly recommended which information for transport options is undertaken to include Growth Option 2 but with Finkley Down Farm (full development) in place of Manor Farm. Without this additional option Finkley Down Farm has not been fairly assessed
	10133	Variations of growth options strongly recommended which information for transport options is undertaken to include Growth Option 2 (full development) but no land south of A342 and east of Shoddesden Lane, Ludgershall. Without this additional option Finkley Down Farm has not been fairly assessed
Reasonable growth scenario	10133	Within the reasonable growth scenarios, inclusion of Manor Farm as a constant is not justified and growth scenarios should include alternative option with Finkley Down Farm (full quantum) without being regarded as additional option to Manor Farm
Site appraisal	10133	Allocations at Ludgershall identified in SA as being sequentially preferable to Finkley Down Farm. However, this is not supported by Council's own evidence.
Scoring	10133	Site selection process and SA conclusions on Finkley Down Farm are inconsistent with Council's own evidence. SA for Finkley Down Farm out performs alternative options at Manor Farm, and in accessibility terms is a top performing development option.
Growth scenarios	10133	Site selection process artificially considers Finkley Down Farm only as a development option in addition to Manor Farm. No sound rationale why the case. Inconsistent with clear outputs from SA which demonstrate Finkley Down Farm performs better against SA objectives than Manor Farm
Scoring	11123	With regard to access to community facilities and infrastructure by sustainable modes, Halterworth is well-related and out-performs Velmore Farm, with the exception of access to health facilities.
Sustainability (SA)	11123	Ganger Farm is in a less sustainable location than the land at Halterworth. The criteria of the SA have not been applied consistently, the result of which is that the site appears to perform better when compared to other sites.
	11123	Ganger Farm is in a less sustainable location than land at Halterworth. The selection is based on the inconsistent application of the methodology. It has taken account of a masterplan which has resulted in it having a more favourable assessment than sites where a masterplan has not been submitted.
SA growth scenarios	11124	With regard to access to community facilities and infrastructure by sustainable modes, Halterworth is well-related and out-performs Velmore Farm, with the exception of access to health facilities.
	10323	With regard to access to community facilities and infrastructure by sustainable modes, Halterworth is well-related and out-performs Velmore Farm, with the exception of access to health facilities.
Sustainability (SA)	11124	Ganger Farm is in a less sustainable location than the land at Halterworth. The criteria of the SA have not been applied consistently, the result of which is that the site appears to perform better when compared to other sites.

Matter	Respondent ID	Comment
	11124	Ganger Farm is in a less sustainable location than land at Halterworth. The selection is based on the inconsistent application of the methodology. It has taken account of a masterplan which has resulted in it having a more favourable assessment than sites where a masterplan has not been submitted.
	10323	Ganger Farm is in a less sustainable location than the land at Halterworth. The criteria of the SA have not been applied consistently, the result of which is that the site appears to perform better when compared to other sites.
	10323	Ganger Farm is in a less sustainable location than land at Halterworth. The selection is based on the inconsistent application of the methodology. It has taken account of a masterplan which has resulted in it having a more favourable assessment than sites where a masterplan has not been submitted.
Sustainable transport	10243	We find it concerning there is not a more rigorous consideration of the potential development opportunities against sustainable transport and mobility criteria given the plan area and the acknowledgement that addressing sustainable mobility imperatives will present a challenge to the plan

Evidence – Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

Key Issue	Officer Response
Further evidence to demonstrate no adverse effects	Work is continuing as we prepare the draft local plan, including in relation to demonstrating no adverse effects. It is an iterative process.
Nutrient neutrality calculations for site allocations	Calculations have been undertaken in line with the relevant guidance and best available information. These will be refined as the draft local plan progresses.
Water efficiency – 100 litres per person per day	A water efficiency standard of 100l/p/d was proposed in Reg18 Stage 2. This will be reviewed for Regulation 19.
River Itchen SAC Compensatory Measures – Consider treating River Test as if it was a SAC	Noted, we are considering this matter through HRA based on available information. Further guidance from Natural England is still awaited, so the Council will continue to update our approach as additional resources / guidance becomes available.
Details of mitigation Salisbury Plain SAC and SPA	We are continuing to explore opportunities for appropriate mitigation in relation to these designations, including the Wiltshire Council mitigation scheme.
Additional measure for monitoring – Emer Bog SAC	This will need to be further discussed, including how best this could be undertaken and by whom. The potential significant effects on Emer Bog will be considered through the HRA/AA
Incomplete Assessment – not explicitly acknowledging 13.8km zone of influence, or wider 15km zone of influence for New Forest	The zones of influence have been used to inform the assessment of impact pathways for the New Forest, as set out in the impact pathways section and screening, to inform what needs to be considered in the AA
Clarity on interim approach to mitigation for recreational impacts on New Forest	The position on this matter is evolving, as work continues on a strategic solution. This will be updated for Regulation 19.

Additional detail – Solent SPA to conclude no adverse effect from recreational pressure, detail within Policy BIO2 must provide clarity on what is required for new housing to mitigate in line with Bird Aware Solent.	The approach to this policy will be reviewed, including in relation to the level of detail provided and the signposting to the latest mitigation strategy. This will be completed for Regulation 19.
Further detail – Mottisfont Bats SA. Further detail needs to be included in Policy BIO2 to make clear requirements for development within the 7.5km zone of influence	The approach to this policy will be reviewed, including in relation to the level of detail provided and the signposting to the latest mitigation strategy. This will be completed for Regulation 19.
Further detail – mitigation measures for Mottisfont Bats as limited detail in Policy BIO2 on what specific mitigation measures	The draft Local Plan seeks to strike a balance on the level of information provided, versus what is available in other documents, this will continue to be reviewed as the draft local plan moves forward.

