

In the Chair: Cllr J Critchley

ATTENDANCE:

P	Cllr A Goddard	P	Cllr J Critchley
P	Cllr C Burgess	P	Cllr I Culley
P	Cllr M G Cooper	A	Cllr S Gidley
P	Cllr J Parker	A	Cllr J Ray
A	Cllr R Theron		

In attendance: Nicqui Chatterley – Planning Clerk

132. Apologies

Cllrs J Ray, R Theron and S Gidley

133. Declarations of Interest

None

134. Public Participation

Michael Conway and David Conway

135. Planning Applications

To consider Test Valley Borough Council Local Plan 2040

Future housing development - Spacial Strategy - SHELAA

Firstly, dealing with land north of Oxlease, otherwise known as the horse field: this proposition in the SHELAA has now been placed outside the Romsey settlement boundary.

This should mean that it will not come up for development but that cannot actually be guaranteed. A lot depends on the five year land availability. RTC could ask TVBC if any special status could be given to the land given its proximity to Fishlake Meadow nature reserve.

Cannot dispute the housing need figure.

Romsey has to take an allocation somewhere so if not the suggested sites, then where?

The committee generally conceded that the proposal to develop land south of Romsey bypass was going to have to be accepted in order that we meet our housing requirement. It would almost certainly lead to the football ground being developed.

The other area marked for development is the land south of Kings Chase, Ganger Farm.

Romsey planning committee has so far objected to this proposal due to it currently being 'in the countryside' and the extremely poor access which would only be from the existing Kings Chase development and that is most and satisfactory.

It is recognised that there are other areas that could be proposed in the future, like Benrty Nursery, Highwood and Halterworth, although at the present time these are not proposed in the plan to 2040.

Caution!

Bigger sites may not come through in a timely manner which could affect the whole plan, including Whitenap and the Brewery site. Potential impact if developments such as these do not go ahead.

There is still the matter of the Brewery brownfield site, which Romsey is desperate to have developed. Spatial policy contradicts current actions.

Business/Industrial allocation

We disagree with the BLP Plan2040 allocation next to Abbey Business Park because this breaches the local gap.

This brings this on to the local gap. The local gap between Romsey and Baddesley is sacrosanct in the view of the committee. This has to remain so.

This would mean there would be no development between Highwood Lane and Halterworth, and also the extension to Abbey Park Industrial estate could not go ahead. A proposal for an extension to the latter has already been objected to by RTC.

It is recognised that because of this some land should be ear marked as **reserved housing allocations**. We should ask TVBC to make such an allocation.

Future development is of great concern to both RTC and local residents, but developers seem to be able to exercise pressure to build outside settlement boundaries.

The **new Romsey settlement boundary** was generally agreed with the exception of Mountbatten playing school field and the Braishfield Road Cemetery. Excluding Mountbatten playing field could affect any proposal to extend the school buildings.

We propose that these should remain in the settlement area.

Why is Crampmoor not ALL within the settlement boundary? At the moment it is half in and half out.

The Romsey town centre boundary changes were generally accepted. Concern about class E businesses conversion to retail in the town centre, especially ground floor.

Now, turning to settlement hierarchy:

There was concern about the methodology used for arriving at tiers 1, 2 & 3. One example: no one understood why Wellow was in tier 3 when it seemed to meet the criteria of tier 2.

Also, no one understood why T3 settlements would not be asked to or even allowed to have small future developments. This just adds to the pressure on tiers 1&2. **It was considered reasonable for tier 3 settlements to have low hectare housing development**, in fact, in some cases thought to be advantageous to the communities.

Also, there is nothing in the report about truly affordable housing. The prices of housing in Test Valley are known to be extremely high and unaffordable for most younger people.

This is completely unsatisfactory and shows the need for a look at building council housing or equivalent.

So far, the BLP 2040 is not adventurous enough.

Infrastructure

There was a discussion about infrastructure, roads, water, storage, et cetera, all of which are poor and of which there are no real proposals to improve.

There was also a discussion about access roads to the newer developments; there were mixed feelings about whether new road provision or 'bypass' provision should be placed in advance of developments. Little or no overall strategic planning of roads etc for development sites.

Concern about lack of GP primary care provision was discussed. It seems that only the existing primary care facilities (nearer the centre of town) would be retained and extended.

If this is the case, they are all near the centre of Romsey and many people will have to travel in an out of town for primary care appointments and treatment. **The committee thought this to be unacceptable.**

There was also a discussion about local transport and whether bus provision to/from the outer housing developments could be improved, even if that meant a subsidy being applied.

FARM BUILDINGS

With class 2 – reinforced policies with redundant farm buildings

John C with thanks to Nicqui for notes taken.

Meeting ended at: 9 pm Next meeting: Thursday **7 March 2024** at 7.30 pm