

## **Twyford Neighbourhood Plan Consultation on Housing Site Options – April 2016**

A consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan was held in the Twyford Social Club in February. This was primarily concerned with the selection of sites for housing development.

A presentation was made by Terra Firma, the landscape architects, who had carried out a landscape survey of the Parish and landscape assessment of sites that might be considered for development. They had also reviewed the settlement boundary in the light of South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) guidance and suggested a few changes.

This was followed by a presentation from Chris Corcoran (chairman of the volunteer Technical Committee responsible for developing the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan) on the process of consideration and analysis of housing site options for 20 new houses to be built in locations outside but adjoining the village Settlement Boundary over the next 20 years.

On display was background information about the planning process and progress to date including a Character Assessment of the buildings in the village which was a village effort coordinated by Pablo Newberry.

Subsequent to the meeting, full details of the process and details of evaluation of housing site options, as summarized in Chris Corcoran's presentation, were posted on the Parish Council website in April and feedback requested.

Feedback from the meeting and the website information was requested in the form of 6 questions. 30 responses were received and what follows is an analysis of these. These have been grouped into themes and the Technical Team has responded to each showing how these comments have been incorporated into the Draft Neighbourhood Plan Policies.

Of the 30 responses, 18 returned Feedback Forms or followed the layout of the form and 12 returned more focused comments. All respondents gave their name and 26 were village residents.

Most of the responses were short and are included in the summary but the response from the developer of Site 26 and a very detailed response regarding the landscape assessment relating to site 26 have been summarized.

**Twyford Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation on Housing Site Options – April 2016**

Question	Yes/No	Individual Comments	Technical Committee Responses
1. Are there any other sites we have not shown on the Site selection Map and which you think we should consider?	<b>Yes:</b> 4 <b>No:</b> 19 <b>Unsure:</b> 1	1) Land for sale On Hare lane does not appear to have been considered and looks highly suitable for 20 houses. 2) Fields far side Hunter’s Park would be ideal for building	1) Not considered suitable as separated from village 2) These fields are located in the gap between Colden Common and Twyford. They were put forward in SHLAA and rejected by SDNPA.
2. We have identified Site S1 and part of Site 26 for housing; do you agree that they both should be considered further?	<b>Yes:</b> 13, 26 only:1, S1 only:2, <b>No:</b> 5, Not S1:1, <b>Reservations:</b> 26:1	<b>Site 26</b> 1) If site 26 was chosen there would need to be adequate drainage to ensure extra housing would not create a flood. 2) Housing is shown located on land at rear of the Surgery. This is higher and avoids the lower land next to Hazeley Road which can be prone to flood. 3) An access road will be required from Hazeley Road to the new properties. 4) The existing Parish Hall car park desperately needs to be larger to cater for Parish hall users and users of the Surgery and Pharmacy. 5) A new exit to the car park could join the new access road which would then join the Hazeley road. 6) Further discussion is needed to establish funding, ownership and maintenance for an additional car park. Would the access road be funded by the builders of the houses?  7) The above comments (2 to 6) are supported by the Twyford Parish Hall Trustees. 8) Site 26 should be considered not only for housing but also for a new community building (with outdoor recreation area) and for a new village car park. This building is primarily for youth groups to replace the Cecil Hut. To include all this on site 26 may require a greater part of the site than is currently allocated.	1 and 2) Agreed and addressed in Policies WE1, DE1 and DB1.  3) Addressed in Policy DB1 4) Addressed in Policy MA2  5) Addressed in Policy DB1  6) All these matters are important and will need further discussion.  7) Noted.  8) Agreed that the site design has potential for enhancing the village centre. Its development should consider the village hall, surgery, Cecil Hut and car park and these

**Twyford Neighbourhood Plan  
 Consultation on Housing Site Options – April 2016**

		<p>9) The bottom part of the field is the flood plain for the winterbourne. Dispersal of surface water is a cardinal principle of flood alleviation. The field is used as a holding/containment site to help prevent water from pouring onto the road or into the Parish Hall/Surgery car park during flooding. Springs rise in the field and the Parish Hall car park during times of high ground water levels. Any development would increase pressure on the ageing sewage system which can be overwhelmed during periods of flood and storm surges. Run off from tarmac or paved drives would exacerbate the situation. The sewerage system blocks easily as connection from Roman Road and Dolphin Hill enter the main system in Hazeley Road. Culvert under the footpath on the north side of Hazeley road can become blocked or overloaded during flooding.</p> <p>10) Hazeley Road is busy and used as an escape route from the motorway. Car parking in Hazeley road repeatedly creates difficult and dangerous situations with blocked sight lines for both vehicles and pedestrians.</p> <p>11) Further development on this site is likely to reduce ground water drainage increasing the risk of flooding which has happened twice in recent years which impacts on the sewers.</p> <p>12) Adverse impact on the landscape for the existing approach to the village along Hazeley road.</p>	<p>issues are addressed in policies CP1,DB1 and MA3.</p> <p>9) Agreed. The role of development on site 26 in flood alleviation must be fully understood and planned for. This issue is addressed in Policies WE1, DE1 and DB1.</p> <p>10) This is an existing problem for the Highway Authority. Policies MA2 and DB1 will help reduce current car parking problems.</p> <p>11) Addressed in Policies WE1 and DB1.</p> <p>12) Landscape impact has already been studied by Terra Firma who identified part of the site as suitable for housing. Further work will establish the extent to which the site can be developed and whether good design and</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Twyford Neighbourhood Plan  
 Consultation on Housing Site Options – April 2016**

		<p>13) The traffic problems on Hazeley road will only be compounded.</p> <p>14) Land next to surgery desperately needed for parking for village businesses to be viable.</p> <p>15) Consider car park and 2or 3 units owned by village providing income for the benefit of the village with housing behind.</p> <p>16) Concern for the drainage off Wickham’s field.</p> <p>17) <i>Comments by Developer of Site 26:</i>        Until such time as an LVIA has been undertaken and the true capacity of the Site has been determined it would appear premature to curtail the developable area of Site 26 to its westernmost parcel. Site capable of accommodating approximately 30 dwellings whilst maintaining adequate distances between neighbouring properties. Dwellings would be designed to reflect characteristics of Twyford Conservation Area within which it is partly set. Site 26 is a fantastic opportunity, readily available and fulfils the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.</p>	<p>landscaping can enhance the existing approach and views along Hazeley Road.</p> <p>13) See (10) above. The creation of additional car parking would hopefully help reduce this problem. A different access onto Hazeley Road may also help. See Policy DB1.</p> <p>14) Agreed. See Policies MA2 and DB1.</p> <p>15) This is for the Parish Council to consider.</p> <p>16) See (9) above</p> <p>17) (LVIA) Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will be required development is restricted to western half for landscape reasons as identified by Terra firma. It is uncertain whether the residual land identified as being suitable by Terra Firma is sufficient for 20 dwellings. 30 dwellings is in excess of the SDNP allocation and would be in conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan. Design needs to be of the highest quality. Site can be made sustainable in social and economic terms but the environmental side</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Twyford Neighbourhood Plan  
 Consultation on Housing Site Options – April 2016**

		<p>18) 20 houses on site 26 will have a direct visual impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>19) The risk of flooding is likely to be exacerbated by building on site 26.</p> <p>20) Traffic and parking on Hazeley Road is already difficult and likely to be worsened.</p> <p>21) Concerns regarding the developer. Tactics with Hart District Parish and Town councils described as “bordering on blackmail”.</p> <p>22) Site 26 should only be considered if it includes significant additional parking (30 spaces). Centre currently choked and on street /verge parking detracts hugely from the attractiveness of the village.</p> <p>23) Site 26 should be avoided because of the increased risk of flooding and interference with sewage system. Course of the Bourne and its flood plain should be untouched.</p> <p>24) Large carpark extension on site 26 should be the first priority.</p> <p>25) Site 26 seems suitable for 20 houses. Serious concerns about vehicular access and traffic.</p> <p><b>Site S1</b></p> <p>1) An alternative might be to locate the community building at Northfields.</p> <p>2) Site S1 if considered further please retain the green.</p>	<p>has important landscape and drainage issues which constrain its use. Social sustainability depends on provision of social housing for rent.</p> <p>18) See (12) above. Further work is required to establish the capacity of the site. See Policy DB1.</p> <p>19) See (9) above.</p> <p>20) See (10) and (13) above</p> <p>21) Noted.</p> <p>22) Addressed in Policy MA2 and DB1</p> <p>23) Development will need to address these issues. See (9) above.</p> <p>24) Addressed in Policies MA2 and DB1</p> <p>25) Vehicular access and traffic problems addressed in Policies MA2, MA3 and DB1.</p> <p>1) The need or not for a new community building is a matter for the village as a whole. There are a number of alternatives</p> <p>2) The Hewlitt Close open space is a</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Twyford Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation on Housing Site Options – April 2016**

		<p>3) Access to S1 needs consideration re traffic. 4) S1 seems suitable for 20 houses. Would prefer not opposite Hewlett Close as lives there. Serious concerns about vehicular access and traffic.</p> <p>5) Site S1 should not be considered because wild life such as Roe deer are seen in that field. The lawned green between Northfields and Waterhouse Close is a community space used by children and adults. The access road will become severely congested at peak times and increased traffic will affect children playing in the road.</p>	<p>recognised community facility and will be protected under policy CP1. 3) Agreed. 4) S1 has capacity for 20 houses. Hewlitt Close is a single sided road so building along it would be likely. Access concerns noted. 5) Wildlife concerns noted. The green is to be retained. See Policy CP1. Access concerns noted.</p>
<p>3. Are there other sites around the village which are better than sites S1 and S26 and are large enough for at least 10 houses?</p>	<p><b>Yes:</b> 6 <b>No:</b> 16 <b>Unsure:</b> 1</p>	<p>1) Site 18, 6/7 and 5 should all be reconsidered as suitable for 10 houses. Sites 18 and 5 are no more “isolated from the village core” than S1. Site 6/7 is “visible from Shawford Down” but so is S1.</p> <p>2) Site 23 should be considered for housing.</p>	<p>1) Site 18 fully considered by Terra Firma and rejected. Development here would erode the green buffer zone between Twyford and Colden Common. Site is now included in Twyford/Colden Common Gap Policy LHE1. Site 6/7 Considered by terra firma and rejected for a number of reasons of which visibility from Shawford Down is just one.. Site 5 was rejected by terra Firma on landscape and visual grounds. The site is constrained by the fact that it falls within a conservation area and contributes to the setting of a number of listed buildings. 2) The site is an arable field the</p>

**Twyford Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation on Housing Site Options – April 2016**

		<p>3) Sites 6&amp;7 and 20 should be considered as alternative choices.</p>	<p>lower part of which floods when th Winterbourne rises. It is further from the village centre and mauch more prt of the countryside than sites 26 and S1. 3) See (1) above re sites 6&amp;7. Site 20 is now a playing field and is not available.</p>
<p>4. Do you support the way we have carried out the selection of sites for housing?</p>	<p><b>Yes:</b> 16 <b>No:</b> 3 <b>Largely:</b> 4 <b>Unsure:</b> 2</p>	<p>1) Poor presentation by Terra Firma made basis for selection of sites difficult to follow.</p> <p>2) <i>Comment by Developer of Site 26:</i> Housing needs survey shows 16 affordable dwellings currently required so the Neighbourhood Plan should be looking to allocate at least 40 dwellings not just 20.</p> <p>3) Rationale for selecting sites to investigate for building is fundamentally flawed as it is based on assumptions around the type of housing that might be needed or no assumptions. Parish Council needs to agree on what housing is to be built and then look at the sites.</p> <p>4) Parish Council should respond to SDNP with a flat refusal to consider any housing other than in-filling. Twyford is an essential buffer between Winchester and Eastleigh with little space between the Downs and the Watermeadows so that even the most suitable sites selected will add to the traffic and congestion. There will be further demands for housing. Relentless refusal to cooperate at all</p>	<p>1) Noted. Further explanation subsequently uploaded to Parish Council and TNP websites. 2)Neither Winchester/SDNP Joint Core Strategy nor the SDNP options require Twyford to meet all housing needs beyond the building of 20 houses. Policy HN5 provides opportunity for additional affordable housing. 3) The site selection process follows SDNP’s own criteria plus two of its own; one to prefer sites close to Twyford’s facilities, the other to maximize provision of affordable housing. The type of housing is now specified. 4) Noted and role of Twyford s buffer agreed. There is strong local support for affordable housing and Housing Needs Survey confirms shortages of certain housing types.</p>

**Twyford Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation on Housing Site Options – April 2016**

		(perhaps by holding a referendum) is the only course that is in everyone's interest. If we are truly determined SDNP may go away and not come back.	Allocation of 20 houses set by SDNPA is modest and accepted by Twyford.
5. Do you agree with Terra Firma's appraisal of Twyford's landscape character?	<b>Yes:</b> 16, <b>Possibly:</b> 6, <b>No:</b> 0 2 Not in relation to 26	1) <i>Comment by Developer of Site 26:</i> Site 26 has a markedly more urban feel than alluded to by Terra Firma. 2) <i>From individual who stated that he has a particular interest and is sensitive to site 26.</i> The village character assessment does not take account of the field in question in my view. Site 26 demonstrates well many of the features which are quoted for other sites that are considered to make them less suitable for development and is a rare example of rural character directly visible from other dwellings including Roman Road and adds greatly to the character of this area being a rare field within the village boundary. Landscape assessment Part 3: TLCA-D gives a description that applies strongly to site 26. " Broad, branching valley carved from the chalk downs and indented by dry valleys and coombes to produce smoothly rounded valley sides. The character area flows through and provides a landscape setting for Winchester, shallow well drained, calcareous silty soils support intensive arable cultivation on shallow slopes of the valley sided. Pasture and paddocks occur on the valley floor. This comment includes considerable detail relating to the Terra Firma report with extensive quotations and two photographs taken from Roman Road in the spring.	1) Disagree  2) Comments noted, however Terra Firma's conclusions on Site 26 are firmly based on their overall landscape study and then by detailed analysis of the site.
6. Do you support the Settlement (or development) boundary and/or the changes proposed by Terra Firma? If not please give	<b>Yes:</b> 7 <b>No:</b> 5 <b>Do not understand impact:</b> 3	1) Poor presentation by Terra Firma made basis for boundary changes difficult to follow. Particularly drawing of line across our garden.  2) <i>Comments by Developer of Site 26:</i> Disagree with S1 being included in the settlement boundary and 26 being excluded. There is no logical reason. Increases the risk of piecemeal development, possible unmet need and lack sustainability.  3) Settlement boundary may need to be extended on site 26.	1) Noted Further explanation now posted on Neighbourhood Plan website. 2) Site S1 is not included within the Settlement Boundary only houses built at Northfields since the previous boundary was set.  3) The Settlement Boundary is not extended to include allocations

**Twyford Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation on Housing Site Options – April 2016**

your reasons.		4) Settlement boundary excludes properties immediately on the Twyford side of Norris’s Bridge. Setting the boundary there excludes a number of properties characteristic of the village on the main road. A more sensible delineation would be on the Shawford side of Norris’s Bridge where the village naturally peters out. Placing the boundary there may put children living there outside the catchment for Twyford St. Mary’s School, with the development of School Academies.	until development is complete. 4) A Settlement boundary defines the area of a settlement where development such as infill may be permitted. Development outside the Settlement Boundary is more tightly controlled. It is an important way of protecting the character of the village and conserving the landscape and countryside around it. It is not the same as a Parish or village boundary and will not change the catchment area.
7. Comments on the consultation process		1) Only became aware of the process because of the banner in the village so concern about consultation process.  2) Feedback process not very transparent. Should be an open online forum.	1) Other methods of publicity were used including posters located around the village and notices through the Twyford email system and in the Parish Magazine. We are glad the banner worked. 2) Noted. Period of consultation was extended.
8. Comments on housing type and construction		1) Self-build for those with village connections needs consideration. 2) Would like further discussion of self-build.  3) Need both rented and affordable housing. 4) Any development in a village as beautiful as Twyford will draw concerns from many people. Expansion needed in careful considered fashion. Sites 26 and S1 should not be handed over to developers but developed in a mix of styles. Hand	1 and 2) Agreed. Self-build group were invited to discuss needs with the Technical Committee preparing the draft Neighbourhood Plan. 3) Agreed. See Policy HN1. 4) First three points agreed. Self-build group not yet established and would need to purchase land.

**Twyford Neighbourhood Plan  
 Consultation on Housing Site Options – April 2016**

		<p>over at least 50% of land to self-build.</p> <p>5) All development should be highly energy efficient with adequate parking, ensuring current density of housing is maintained and favouring owner occupiers not second homes or buy to let.</p>	<p>Suggested 50% self-build objective (i.e. 10 houses) would conflict with other objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>5) Energy efficiency and parking agreed and addressed in Policies SD1, SD2 and MA2. There is a very wide range of densities See Character Assessment on website. We will explore ways of controlling tenure but this may not be possible.</p>
9. Traffic issue on B3335		1) Improved access to Twyford School as part of development as queuing on the main road in the morning produces an unacceptable gridlock	1) Agreed. Issue addressed in Policies BE3 and DB1.