

From: Craig Petrie

Sent: 25 May 2026 10:13

To: Neighbourhood Planning

Cc: Claire Merritt

Subject: Awbridge Parish Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 16 Submission)

FORMAL REPRESENTATION TO THE AWBRIDGE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION

Submitted by: Craig Petrie & Claire Merritt

To whom it may concern,

I write in respect of the Regulation 16 consultation on the submitted Awbridge Parish Neighbourhood Plan (“the Plan”).

As owner of Daneswood, I have concerns regarding elements of the proposed policy framework and supporting text that directly affect land associated with Daneswood and its surroundings.

Whilst I recognise the broad objectives of the Plan and the considerable work undertaken in its preparation, I object to aspects of the current drafting on the basis that certain policies and designations are insufficiently justified, insufficiently precise and risk imposing disproportionate constraints on established residential land and the future assessment of development proposals over the Plan period.

In particular, I object to the current drafting and application of:

- Policy A2 – Important Views and Vistas;
- Policy A6 – Setting of the Dispersed Settlements;
- associated mapping relating to “Setting 1”; and
- the cumulative effect of overlapping policy constraints affecting land around Daneswood.

1. POLICY A6 – SETTING OF THE DISPERSED SETTLEMENTS

The supporting text to Policy A6 specifically identifies:

“the land surrounding Daneswood and Linton Woods along Danes Road”

as forming part of “Setting 1”.

The policy subsequently states that development which would:

“individually or cumulatively result in the merging of settlements will not be supported.”

Objection

Whilst the intention of identifying settlement character areas is acknowledged, concerns arise regarding both the extent of the designation and the lack of precision in the policy wording.

a) Daneswood is Established Residential Land

Daneswood is an established residential property with a substantial lawful residential curtilage clearly defined within HM Land Registry title documentation (see attachment).

The property comprises an existing dwellinghouse, associated residential land, domestic access arrangements and established landscaped grounds. It therefore forms part of the existing developed pattern along Danes Road rather than undeveloped open countryside.

In this context, it appears incongruous for land already occupied and functioning as private residential land to be characterised within the Neighbourhood Plan in the same manner as undeveloped settlement separation land.

The designation does not properly reflect the physical characteristics or planning status of the land on the ground.

The current approach risks creating an artificial and insufficiently evidenced distinction between existing residential land and surrounding countryside, resulting in a policy framework that may disproportionately affect the future assessment of proposals relating to Daneswood.

b) Lack of Clear and Proportionate Evidence

There is insufficient evidence demonstrating that all land within the identified designation performs the same planning function or that development proposals within or adjoining the area would necessarily give rise to unacceptable impacts.

The mapped extent of the designation appears broad and lacks a clearly articulated methodology explaining why the entirety of the identified land is required.

c) Inconsistency with Recent Planning Decisions

It is also notable that planning permission has recently been granted for a development of five dwellings within the area associated with “Setting 2” adjacent to Danes Road.

This demonstrates that:

- the wider area is capable of accommodating development proposals;

- proposals can be assessed positively within this locality; and
- the existing pattern of development in the area is evolving over time.

The existence of recent permissions in close proximity, when considered alongside the established residential character of Daneswood itself, raises concerns regarding the consistency and robustness of the proposed settlement setting approach.

d) Ambiguity and Lack of Precision

The terminology used within Policy A6, including references to “intrusive” development and “cumulative” impacts, is subjective and lacks clear assessment criteria.

As drafted, the policy creates uncertainty for landowners, applicants and decision-makers and risks inconsistent interpretation and application.

e) Relationship with National and Strategic Planning Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework requires neighbourhood plans to provide clear and unambiguous policies and to support sustainable development.

The cumulative effect of Policy A6, together with associated landscape, biodiversity, dark skies and view protection policies, risks introducing an unnecessarily restrictive policy framework that could prejudice the balanced consideration of future development proposals on their individual planning merits.

Requested Modification

It is requested that:

- the extent of “Setting 1” be reviewed and reduced where appropriate;
- existing residential curtilages and developed land associated with Daneswood be excluded from the designation;
- clearer and more objective assessment criteria be included within Policy A6; and
- the policy be amended to ensure that future proposals are considered on a proportionate, site-specific basis having regard to their individual planning merits and the wider development plan as a whole.

The policy should avoid introducing blanket or overly restrictive constraints that could unnecessarily prejudice the appropriate consideration of future development proposals over the Plan period.

2. POLICY A2 – IMPORTANT VIEWS AND VISTAS

Policy A2 specifically identifies:

“View 2: View from PRoW alongside Daneswood.”

Objection

The description of the public right of way as being “alongside” Daneswood is inaccurate.

The public footpath in fact passes through the residential curtilage of Daneswood, which is established private residential land associated with the dwellinghouse and its grounds.

Whilst the existence and continued use of the public right of way is fully acknowledged, its primary purpose is to provide pedestrian passage across private land rather than to operate as a designated public viewpoint or protected landscape corridor.

In this context, concerns arise regarding the proportionality and evidential basis for imposing specific view protection policies affecting established private residential land.

In particular:

- the land is not public open space;
- the views are experienced only transiently whilst traversing a private residential curtilage;
- no clear methodology has been provided explaining why the views warrant specific designation; and
- the designation may unnecessarily constrain the future assessment of proposals relating to established residential land.

The concerns relating to View 2 apply equally to View 3, which appears to represent the same public right of way corridor viewed in the opposite direction.

In practice, Views 2 and 3 relate to the same transient visual experience encountered whilst traversing the footpath through the residential curtilage of Daneswood.

This raises further concerns regarding:

- the proportionality of the designation approach;
- the duplication of policy emphasis affecting the same land; and
- the absence of a clearly explained methodology supporting separate designation of both views.

The approach may place disproportionate planning weight on transient views experienced across private residential land and risks imposing an unnecessary degree of planning restraint without sufficiently clear justification.

The policy wording currently requires development proposals to demonstrate that they: “will not have an adverse impact” on identified views.

This wording is excessively broad and insufficiently precise.

Almost any form of development may alter a view to some degree, yet the policy provides no clear methodology for:

- assessing impacts;
- defining the extent of the protected view;
- identifying relevant characteristics of the view; or
- determining what degree of change may be acceptable.

The policy therefore risks operating as an imprecise and overly restrictive constraint on the assessment of future proposals.

Requested Modification

It is requested that:

- Views 2 and 3 be reviewed and reconsidered;
- the description of the route be corrected to accurately reflect that the PRoW passes through the residential curtilage of Daneswood;
- the evidence base and methodology for identifying these views be reconsidered in light of the private residential nature of the land affected;
- the policy avoid imposing unnecessary or disproportionate constraints on established residential land; and
- consideration be given to removing Views 2 and 3 entirely if sufficient evidence cannot be demonstrated to justify their designation.

If the views are retained, the policy wording should be amended to ensure that proposals are considered on a balanced and site-specific basis having regard to the overall planning merits of development proposals rather than applying an absolute or overly restrictive test.

3. CUMULATIVE POLICY EFFECT

The land associated with Daneswood appears to be affected simultaneously by:

- settlement setting designations;
- protected views;
- biodiversity and habitat policies;
- dark skies policies; and
- wider countryside protection policies.

Whilst each individual policy objective may be understandable in isolation, insufficient consideration appears to have been given to the cumulative effect of these overlapping constraints.

Collectively, these policies risk introducing a disproportionately restrictive framework affecting established residential land and may unnecessarily prejudice the balanced assessment of future proposals on their individual planning merits over the Plan period.

4. CONCLUSION

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that aspects of the Plan, as currently drafted:

- are insufficiently precise;
- lack sufficiently clear evidential justification;
- risk imposing disproportionate constraints on established residential land; and
- may unnecessarily prejudice the balanced consideration of future development proposals on their individual planning merits.

The Plan should therefore be modified to ensure that it provides a clear, proportionate and flexible framework consistent with national planning policy and the wider development plan.

I respectfully request that these representations are fully considered by the Parish Council, Test Valley Borough Council and the Independent Examiner, and that appropriate modifications are made to the Plan before adoption.

Yours faithfully,

Craig Petrie

