

T a b l e o f C o n t e n t s

Need

- 1: Are there people in housing need in the village? How many and what is the demographic mix? Is need really established?
- 2: Is there continuous need over subsequent generations - and previous! (longevity of need)?
- 3: Why should a specific group be found housing when the rest of us are subject to market forces?
- 4: Have we considered the 'needs' of our current villagers - those who already live here - are their needs more or less important than those needing housing?
- 5: Why should affordable housing be provided in the village when there is major development taking place in Andover?
- 6: How important is it for our community (or parts of it) for families to be able to live near each other and support each other (parents providing childcare, children supporting elderly parents)?
- 7: Is it true that there are units in North Acre that are not let to Longparish associated people?
- 8: If need is demonstrated must this mean new build?
- 9: If new build, does there have to be a commercial bit?
- 10: Should land be released that would not otherwise be released?
- 11: If TVBC are happy that a need has been demonstrated, should we be following a route of further questionnaires, and will they have any effect on a final decision?

Mix of People/Tenure

- 12: What sort of mix of housing is being proposed?
- 13: Should the low cost content be maximised?
- 14: Why should there be any "commercial" development?
- 15: How do we match those identified in 'need' to houses?
- 16: Should we provide purely affordable rent or should we also help people 'onto the housing ladder' by providing part-ownership homes?
- 17: Have we considered that a mixed development could be a benefit (avoiding a ghetto effect)?
- 18: Can we be sure that the allocation of properties will go to locals only?
- 19: What guarantees are there that these homes will be for village people? And will they still have priority over others regardless if some else's need is greater?
- 20: Should the focus be on young people/ families?
- 21: Which planning policy is going to be used- ESNO6 or 5?
- 22: To date there are no developments that have been built under ESNO6. Are villagers happy to be "guinea pigs"?
- 23: Aren't there other developments in the area that would meet these needs?

Size of any Development

- 24: Now that new sites have come to light, can we confirm how many properties the housing group / TBVC are proposing to build?
- 25: How do we limit size to meet only ongoing village need?
- 26: Why should we build if we can't meet all the needs anyway? (And what do we do in 20 years' time if we're in a similar situation?)
- 27: How/who decides how many to build - is there a formula/ratio?
- 28: Sustainability: this point as an argument is used to promote the development and yet we would have a serious issue in accommodating more residents

Site(s)

- 29: Which sites are under consideration?
- 30: Who decides where the site would be?
- 31: Do we need to consider other sites - eg: extend dwellings in North Acre?
- 32: Has the avenue of using the current housing stock in North Acre been explored fully? There must be a way of using what is already there to deal with the needs of the community.
- 33: Should 'sites' be split into a number of smaller sites?
- 34: Should we be building on "Green field" sites?

Density

- 35: How many homes are likely to be proposed?
- 36: What would be area be of each dwelling and garden?
- 37: Will density be defined by national government, and, if so, what is the number of homes per acre?
- 38: What will the impact of high density be on neighbours?

Traffic/Transport

- 39: Where will traffic access be made to potential site(s)?
- 40: Will there be adequate parking?
- 41: How will we mitigate the effects of increased traffic through the village?
- 42: Bus service - or lack of
- 43: How will the safety of parents and children travelling to school be ensured?

Environment

- 44: "Sustainability" works both ways- can the current infrastructure accommodate more residents? Won't this increase the problems of flooding risk, run-off, etc?
- 45: How will trees/hedges be affected?
- 46: Can we ensure the "environmental friendliness" of any development/houses/gardens?
- 47: The sewage pumping station is inadequate for current housing stock; won't adding more houses just make problems worse?
- 48: How can we minimise the impact of additional noise and light pollution?
- 49: What are the positive benefits of development (including so-called "community gain" under planning policy)?

Views

- 50: Is it fair to change the landscape and affect the location that influenced purchase of property by current owners?
- 51: How will the development blend in with existing village?
- 52: Is the 'need' (if there is one) big enough to justify the destruction of part of the agreed joy of the village?
- 53: Do proposed sites only impact on the views of adjacent properties?
- 54: Would especially beautiful views be obstructed?
- 55: Can we retain the 'green' open feel of the village?

Design

- 56: How can I be sure that the look of the village will not be spoilt by new houses?
- 57: Will design be in accordance with Parish Design Statement?
- 58: Will we be able to influence the design of the development?
- 59: Is it best to have an integrated one site design to include different mix in same development?

Local Amenities

- 60: What effect will the development have on the School? Can our village school take more children? Does school have a 'villagers first' priority? If school is full, where will new families go?
- 61: But, isn't the school over subscribed? Even the most recent family to move in couldn't get their children into the school!
- 62: What effect will the development have on the **Shop**? Isn't it true that national economics are affecting village shops rather than any "lack" of people in the village?
- 63: What effect will the development have on the **Pubs**?
- 64: What effect will the development have on the **Doctors/dentists, etc**? Isn't it true that the local Doctors and Dentists both have several years' worth of people on their waiting lists?
- 65: How can we define appropriate 'community gain' so that the proposed development will bring with it benefits that could add greatly to village amenities?

Financial Impacts

- 66: What effect will these affordable houses have on the value of my house?
- 67: Will this financial cost (if any) be left for me to cover personally, or will the cost be shared by the whole village community?
- 68: What potential community gains are there?
- 69: Who would decide on what community benefits were obtained

Limits

- 70: Does this create a precedent for future development?
- 71: We have seen planning regulations change to enable this to occur with ESNO6 - are there any guarantees for the future that policy won't change again?

And ...

- 72: Is it accepted that development would have more impact on some current residents than others?
- 73: How will we decide/measure the overall decision of the village?
- 74: Is it fair to expect the few to pay the costs (not simply financial costs) for the benefit of the many? If not, how could fairness be achieved?
- 75: Do we want to be part of a traditional rural community, or chocolate box commuter village?
- 76: Is it fair to make "assumptions" about who does and does not support the idea of an affordable housing scheme?

Need

Question 1: Are there people in housing need in the village? How many and what is the demographic mix? Is need really established?

Agreed background:

“Housing Need” is defined by the Government as people who have a strong connection with the village but who are unable to live here because of a lack of homes available that they could afford - National Planning Guidance PPS3 describes the provision of affordable housing as meeting this need “at low enough cost for them to afford, determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices”

Test Valley Borough Council are responsible for defining and identifying housing need and they do this in a number of ways including assessing the results of specific Housing Needs surveys and monitoring housing register figures. These sources are accepted by the Housing and Planning departments of TVBC as evidence of need and this definition and methodology is also accepted by other boroughs.

The most recent Housing Needs survey in Longparish was commissioned by Longparish Parish Council and carried out by Community Action Hampshire in July/August 2005. It was done according to nationally accepted procedures, using a methodology and questions that are endorsed by DEFRA. CAH do such surveys for villages all over Hampshire and this type of survey is designed to help the planners understand the scale of need.

Based on the 2005 survey, Community Action Hampshire identified at least 24 households with a local connection in housing need and recommended that a scheme be advanced as soon as possible to address these needs. The Executive Summary of the Housing Needs Survey say that the greatest demand for new accommodation comes from people in the 35-65 year old age group, with a large demand also from 16-34 year olds. Most are couples or families.

Some applicants who are in need, register with TV Homes - a partnership between Test Valley Borough Council and 13 Registered Social Landlords (RSLs). TVBC monitor the number and composition of households on this Housing Register. There are 21 households with a strong connection to Longparish currently on the housing register and actively looking for an affordable home in Longparish.

A ‘strong connection’ to Longparish is defined by Test Valley Housing Department as:

- living in the village already
- employed full time, or with family employed full time, in the parish strong family
- connection/parents and siblings live in the parish
- left parish but previously lived in the parish

The Housing Register includes the following

- 6 Couples/singles. Dates applied, 2/02, 10/03, 10/04, 7/05, 1/06, 3/04
- 5 2 bed families. Dates applied, 4/04, 11/04, 4/06, 4/06, 9/06,
- 4 3 bed families. Dates applied, 9/02, 11/04, 5/06, 5/06
- 6 Elderly. Dates applied, 10/03 (couple), 10/04 (single), 12/04 (single), 7/05 (couple), 6/06 (couple), 9/06 (couple)

TVHomes advise that if a project is started other people who meet the criteria may well come forward as some people don’t register as they think there is no point and that they will have no chance of getting a home.

Any new affordable housing project for Longparish would have these criteria as a basis for eligibility. Please note that the existing affordable homes on North Acre are allocated on slightly different criteria.

The Parish Plan questionnaire in 2004 had responses from 38 individuals who said they would like to move back to Longparish. [See www.longparish.org.uk].

14 individuals who attended the Affordable Housing Exhibition consultation in November 2006 had expressed personal interest in and need for affordable housing in Longparish. [See the website]

There is good evidence of people with strong Longparish connections who need affordable homes in the village. The huge increase in house prices in recent years has made it impossible for many to get a foot onto the housing ladder. Nor can they afford commercial rents in the village. And the stock of family homes to rent at affordable rents in North Acre has been greatly reduced in the same period by the 'right to buy'. So people brought up here have to continue to live with their parents or to move away.

The village owes much of its identity as a community to those families who have lived here for many years and who provide a collective memory linking past and present. If we do not help them then we will lose them.

The Housing Needs surveys of 1990, 2001 and 2005 were motivated by public pressure on successive Parish Councils to try to secure some more affordable housing for village people.

Government policies recognise the value of enabling those who wish to live in the communities in which they were brought up to do so and the Parish Plan consultations on housing show that a significant majority of those who commented have the same view

- Only 34 out of 327 who commented considered that we have enough family/starter homes in the village. 100 had no view and 193 disagreed
- 183 out of 330 who commented considered that we do not have enough accommodation for young single people in the village. 114 had no view and only 33 disagreed
- A huge 285 out of 336 (85%) considered that young people can't afford to live in the village when they leave home. ...

see: www.longparish.org.uk/parishplan/consultations/questionnaire/analysis/img17.gif

The background information describes what TVBC and other local government organisations understand by housing need. However, it accepted by all members of the Affordable Housing working party that people rarely if ever 'need' a local house in the dictionary sense. What we are talking about here is people's desire, preference or wish to live in Longparish

The village has to choose whether the price of satisfying the requirements of a relatively small number of past and present inhabitants of Longparish for affordable housing is worth the potential cost and drawbacks of the scheme.

In order to meet these requirements, the present proposals involve building up to 12 low cost houses and a number of commercial properties on one of two green field sites. To embark on such construction has "costs" or drawbacks which will be covered later in this document but involves such issues as

- Changing of planning policy that has served the village well to this present day
- Building on green sites
- Additional loading on the village infrastructure
- Setting a precedent for future development
- Potential loss of house values

Need	
Question 2: Is there continuous need over subsequent generations - and previous! (longevity of need)?	
Agreed background:	
Two previous housing needs surveys (in 1990 and 2001) have shown a similar level of need to the one in 2005. Some households have been on the housing register for many years, waiting for a suitable property to become available to them in Longparish. Turnover in the 43 affordable units left in North Acre units is very low, especially for family homes, of which only two have become available since November 2004.	
View 1	View 2
<p>From 1936 until the 1980s, the expanding Council estate in North Acre provided affordable housing. The sale of council houses in the 1980s gave some village families a valuable opportunity to become home owners, but reduced the stock of housing for rent. Ironically these houses have increased in value so much that they could not now be afforded by those who bought them originally. The small cottages which previously provided homes for agricultural workers have been sold and improved, making them too expensive for those on average wages to buy. The small terraced houses have similarly been enlarged. In the years from 1997 to 2007 the cost of houses nationally has trebled, but wages have not. It is now more difficult than it has ever been for young villagers to set up their own homes here. Housing Associations normally charge rents similar to those for Council houses.</p> <p>SEEDA, in its Economic Strategy for the South East of England states “Over recent decades the age profile of rural communities has changed as younger people have moved away and older people have moved in, If communities in rural areas are to be sustainable they need to be nurtured as places where a wide range of people can choose to live and work.”</p> <p>Commenting on the fact that young people were finding it impossible to afford homes in Longparish, one contributor to the Parish Plan consultation said “We need affordable housing otherwise we’ll just become a village of old people like some Cotswold villages”</p>	<p>The population fall shown above is a reflection of the changing face of employment in the countryside. In the mid 18th century the majority of the population of Longparish were employed in the surrounding farms. This is no longer the case with very few of the population of Longparish employed within the parish boundaries.</p> <p>The level of people living in the village is only important if the village is in danger of losing valuable facilities due to lack of population. There is no evidence that this is the case - in fact the opposite is seems to be true where in general the village seems to be thriving compared with any time in the last twenty years with the school and pubs thriving an active social life throughout the village. Comments such as that from SEEDA are generalised comments which may or may not apply to Longparish either now or in the future.</p> <p>One specific comment in favour of affordable housing is not a legitimate argument for promoting the project. It would be equally possible to find people prepared to offer opinions against the idea. Even the comment used does not reflect the number of young families that have moved into the village over the last two years</p>
Question 3: Why should a specific group be found housing when the rest of us are subject to market forces?	
Agreed background:	
Government policy supports the view that villages need to retain their population and provide a mix of social groups to be “sustainable” longer term. For this reason, they have put in place policies to enable villagers who so wish, to remain in their villages over generations, rather than be forced to move out of the village when housing prices rise.	
View 1	View 2
<p>Restrictive planning policies have led to high house prices which have greatly benefited house owners but mean that some people with strong village connections cannot afford to enter the market. Market forces affect us all, but those living in towns or cities generally have more affordable housing options available locally and, with better transport infrastructure than most rural areas, are less likely to be forced away from their families by these market forces than village people.</p> <p>A living village needs a mixed community – long term and new residents, young and old, affluent and poorer. In other places market forces have resulted in social imbalance which is divisive and detrimental to village life, especially when village amenities are not used and valued.</p>	<p>The facts show that at present Longparish enjoys the same percentage level of affordable housing as other Hampshire villages and as Hampshire overall. They are no special circumstances that justify increasing this percentage for Longparish - no special deprivations etc. It is argued that the balance of the present affordable housing stock is not suitable for present needs/preference. The issue here is that timescales for developments are such</p> <p>Local and central government policy tends to encourage larger developments such as that proposed at Picket20. Here there can be a large mixed developments together with all the facilities needed such as leisure, community and health.</p>

Need	
<i>Question 4: Have we considered the 'needs' of our current villagers - those who already live here - are their needs more or less important than those needing housing?</i>	
View 1	View 2
<p>Some of the people who need homes currently live in the village, for example people living with parents who wish to set up their first home. Others who need housing have family or employers in Longparish, who wish or need to have them in the village.</p> <p>Many current villagers have been able to meet their own needs by buying, extending and improving their properties. The open housing market provides for those who are able to purchase or rent homes at commercial rates, and planning polices permit extension and improvement. Unfortunately, this entirely understandable process has resulted in smaller homes in the village becoming larger (for example in Wood Walk and Gladstone Terrace) with the result that the bottom rung has dropped off the housing ladder.</p> <p>The needs of all villagers will be considered alongside the needs of those looking for affordable homes by the planning authorities as part of the approval process for any affordable housing development - in the same way as neighbours' needs are taken into account for other planning applications.</p>	<p>If we are to consider the preferences or desires of those who would like to make use of Affordable Housing in Longparish then we should give equal consideration to the preferences and desires of existing villagers. There should be no automatic assumption that the "needs" of those seeking affordable housing are of greater merit than the "needs" of those who already live here.</p> <p>There is affordable housing being built close by at Picket 20 - less than 6 miles away. The village itself is over 3 miles long. What is the problem with those travelling from Picket 20 if there is family or work needs within the village. - why does the housing have to be within the Longparish boundaries</p> <p>As part of the decision making process it is vital that the needs, desire and preferences of those who are already living in the village are recognised and taken into full account.</p>
<i>Question 5: Why should affordable housing be provided in the village when there is major development taking place in Andover?</i>	
View 1	View 2
<p>Local people in housing need who are currently living in Longparish or who have a local connection and want to return, have strong reasons for living in Longparish. Their needs for village accommodation in Longparish will not be met by the large urban housing developments that are being built elsewhere.</p>	<p>For the vast majority of people in this country, life is a series of compromises. If some one has a requirement to be close to parents or children in Longparish then Picket 20 is sufficiently close to provide easy access. It might not be as pleasant an area to live in as Longparish but should we feel obliged to provide a 100% solution to these desires or a solution to the problem of living in close proximity to their family</p>

Need	
Question 6: How important is it for our community (or parts of it) for families to be able to live near each other and support each other (parents providing childcare, children supporting elderly parents)?	
View 1	View 2
<p>Very important to those in need. An example is the number of properties that have been improved to include accommodation for elderly parents and the number of homes bought for their dependents by people living in the village. A community is defined by the connections that draw us together, and these needs are not confined to those who can afford to pay the market price. Low income families where both parents need to work but cannot afford paid child care need the support of relatives more than most.</p> <p>Some residents were born here and grew up here. It is becoming increasingly difficult for many people to afford to buy homes in Longparish as house prices have greatly outstripped earnings over the last few years. Helping generations of families stay in close proximity to each other is recognised as an important part of a thriving village life. The Rural Housing Commission states “the countryside is not solely about the landscape, but the communities within it. This means the needs of people, particularly a need as basic as housing, should be taken into account alongside those of the environment and the economy when taking decisions affecting future generations. Without more affordable housing, those on lower incomes will increasingly be excluded from living in many parts of the countryside, offering the next generation little choice but to move away to find homes. Families separated by distance will be less able to support each other by providing childcare or doing shopping for elderly relatives and local services will become increasingly difficult to maintain without a critical mass to use them. Having worked hard to make urban areas more attractive and sustainable, we will look back and find we have created rural areas which are less sustainable and increasingly socially polarised.” Source: Report of the Affordable Rural Housing Commission, May 2006.</p>	<p>The villagers of Longparish should form their own view about the social issues raised in this question. The views of external bodies such as the Rural Housing Commission are not relevant and should not be used as an argument either for or against</p>

Question 7: Is it true that there are units in North Acre that are not let to Longparish associated people?

Agreed background:

The remaining North Acre affordable housing stock consists of 43 units of which 29 are ground floor accommodation. These homes are administered by Testway Housing and allocated by TVHomes. Preference is given to those with a local connection to Longparish, but they allocate ground floor properties to people with ground floor needs (mainly elderly and disabled) rather than families or younger people in need, with the result that some people without a village connection have been allocated properties over the years.

View 1	View 2
<p>Homes in any new affordable housing development would not be allocated in the same way as North Acre but be reserved for people with a strong Longparish connection. This can be assured through binding legal covenants, such as the section 106 agreement used at West Wellow.</p>	<p>There is still no guarantee that these new homes will go to people with Longparish connections particularly well into the future. Not one of the potential organisations involved in allocating the housing will go into writing to confirm that any one who would take up one of the new affordable houses can be guaranteed a strong local connection.</p> <p>Instead of focusing on new build the pressure should come onto TV Homes to change their allocation process. In is not acceptable that they as a public body can pursue a policy that disadvantages the local community - i.e. Longparish</p>

Need	
Question 8: If need is demonstrated must this mean new build?	
Agreed background:	
No; nor are we obliged to do anything to meet these needs. But if we choose to do so and the current housing stock is not adequate to meet needs, then new build is required. The Parish Council has explored allocation policies with Testway Housing and TVHomes to see whether different use of the existing stock might help meet needs. They operate hundreds of units across the borough. They have a significant number of people with ground floor needs (for example, there were 26 applicants for the last one-bed bungalow in North Acre to change hands) and do not propose to change their allocation policies for the ground floor homes in North Acre to meet to meet Longparish's other needs. A new affordable housing scheme can be contractually protected so that our village's needs are given more precedence.	
Question 9: If new build, does there have to be a commercial bit?	
Agreed background:	
The commercial housing is needed to finance the development, as landowners have not been willing in the past to provide a site, despite discussions over the last 15 years.	
View 1	View 2
Test Valley Borough Council insists that the commercial element is kept to the minimum needed to release the land and to provide substantial community gain. A possible advantage of some small market houses would be to enable existing residents who would like to move to smaller houses within the village to do so	
Question 10: Should land be released that would not otherwise be released?	
View 1	View 2
This is the whole point of the exceptions policies, ESN 05 and ESN 06, which make building social housing possible. Under current planning policy for rural areas only infill development and development in North Acre is allowed in Longparish, and virtually all possible sites have been built on. There are currently no sites that a landowner has agreed to put forward for consideration and that TVBC consider to have planning potential, except green field sites. See question below on commercial development.	The policy is there to allow Greenfield development AS LONG AS this is the wish of the community. The policy itself is neutral and should not be used as an argument either for or against development. Land should not be released unless it is the wish of the village that it should be
Question 11: If TVBC are happy that a need has been demonstrated, should we be following a route of further questionnaires, and will they have any effect on a final decision?	
View 1	View 2
Test Valley Borough Council has to balance the differing views of local people with their statutory responsibilities when it comes to making planning decisions. Housing need has already been demonstrated according to accepted guidelines and it is unlikely they would require further research to decide upon this point. But further consultation may help them assess the level of community support for any proposed development and influence their response	It is up to the village to decide in the first instance whether, as a community, it wishes to go ahead with seeking to develop affordable housing. Only then will this question have any relevance

Mix of People/Tenure	
Question 12: What sort of mix of housing is being proposed?	
View 1	View 2
The mix of homes has not been defined in detail. A project might well involve different types of housing, including flats and types of tenure such as rented and shared ownership, if this is what is needed to meet the existing and predicted need. In North Acre there are a considerable number of ground floor (including bungalow) homes that are currently occupied by older residents, and this would be taken into account in any new development. The Housing Group is recommending no more than 18 “homes” - not necessarily “houses”, and that these homes will take different shapes and sizes. Those on the housing register at the moment include single people and couples who are interested in two bed flats, as well as households in need of small family houses. If there is a project then the mix of properties and tenure would be a subject for consultation.	This comment is only applicable if the village agrees that the scheme should go ahead
Question 13: Should the low cost content be maximised?	
View 1	View 2
Yes. The project being proposed maximises the number of affordable homes, and limits commercial (or “open market”) homes to only what is necessary to support the development. The Housing Group’s proposal is for 12 affordable homes and somewhere between three and six commercial homes. Some people support the idea of making the village a little bigger by increasing the number of commercial homes as an increase in the population (or, more likely, the prevention of further population decline) would help us retain our facilities. But the policy (ESNo6) only permits the minimum number of commercial homes to enable a project to be viable.	This comment is only applicable if the village agrees that the scheme should go ahead
Question 14: Why should there be any “commercial” development?	
Agreed background:	
Without the commercial or open market homes, landowners in many villages have not been willing to consider an affordable housing development. Policy ESNo6 was developed by TVBC to address this issue with the full support of our parish council and the Test Valley Association of Parish Councils. Under ESNo6, open market housing is included in any proposed development to secure the purchase of land for the affordable units and provide other benefits for the village. In the past, without such a policy, no landowner has been willing to provide land.	
View 1	View 2
The Parish Council and Housing Associations have tried in vain to find a site since 1990. The village will benefit not only from the affordable housing but also from the community gain TVBC insists on which could include, for instance, a new village green, space for a community building, improvements to the path from North Acre to the school and improved parking.	Until detailed commercial negotiations have been carried out on a particular site and housing configuration, talk of additional village benefits are premature. The economics of the deal could be such that there is very little over from the deal to fund additional village facilities. The least risk assessment of these schemes is to assume no additional funding for village facilities.

Mix of People/Tenure	
Question 15: How do we match those identified in 'need' to houses?	
Agreed background:	
The mix of homes would take into account the types of households that need homes. TV Homes would administer the allocation	
View 1	View 2
We would ensure the extra restriction (which does not apply to the existing affordable homes in North Acre) that the needs of households with a strong Longparish connection take absolute precedence. See the West Wellow Section 106 agreement for an example of how this can be done.	We still have the situation where if the housing association is faced with no one with a connection to Longparish they will allocate the dwelling to someone who is a stranger to the village.
Question 16: Should we provide purely affordable rent or should we also help people 'onto the housing ladder' by providing part-ownership homes?	
Agreed background:	
Most affordable housing developments now being built offer a mixture of tenures, with some rented accommodation and some form of shared ownership. Shared ownership enables people to buy a share of a home, paying rent to the landlord on the un-owned share. This is particularly attractive for people on modest incomes who want to own their own house, but find it difficult to finance a normal mortgage and deposit.	
View 1	View 2
The Housing Group suggests offering a proportion of the affordable homes on a shared ownership basis, depending on demand and financial considerations. These properties can never be 100% bought, and so remain as affordable housing.	This comment is only applicable if the village agrees that the scheme should go ahead.
Question 17: Have we considered that a mixed development could be a benefit (avoiding a ghetto effect)?	
View 1	View 2
This is an important feature of modern planning policy designed to prevent concentrations of particular types of homes. A mixed development that brings both affordable and open market housing together should enhance the overall look and impact of any development and how it fits into the village. North Acre is now a mixture of social and private housing which works well.	This comment is only applicable if the village agrees that the scheme should go ahead
Question 18: Can we be sure that the allocation of properties will go to locals only?	
View 1	View 2
There cannot be absolute and perpetual guarantees, but any development would be subject to a special legal agreement (known as a Section 106 agreement) to ensure that the homes go only to people with a strong Longparish connection. And there might also be restrictive covenants to reinforce the S106 agreement. Restricting the number of affordable homes to 12 (that is about half the level of need indicated by survey and the housing register) would also ensure that the affordable housing goes to local people only.	It is possible to put safeguards in place but ultimately it will still be the decision of TVBC or their agents as to who will live in any potential development. They can give assurances about giving priority to people with local connections but will those assurances apply when there has been a change of personnel at TVBC, new local and central government rules and priorities have changed some time in the future

Mix of People/Tenure	
Question 19: What guarantees are there that these homes will be for village people? And will they still have priority over others regardless if some else's need is greater?	
View 1	View 2
There cannot be an absolute guarantee but careful choice of the mix of homes will ensure that they are suitable for the needs of people with strong Longparish connections. A local connection to Longparish would always take precedence over another's needs, provided that the housing unit is suitable. But people would not be offered accommodation that was not suited to their needs. For example, if a three-bedroom home became available it would not be offered to a couple without children. When a vacancy did occur, it would always be offered first to those with a local connection. In the unlikely event that there were no one with a Longparish connection who is in need of that size and shape of accommodation, then it would be offered to someone outside the village, in preference to it being left empty. Typically TVBC Housing Department would allocate to someone in need from another village rather than a town. We could explore whether any such lets could be short term until a Longparish household comes up that suits the property.	
Question 20: Should the focus be on young people/ families?	
View 1	View 2
Yes, if that is what is needed. Given our understanding of the current properties available in North Acre, managed by Testway Housing, the needs of older Longparish villagers or those with a local connection for ground floor accommodation are currently being met. As result, any affordable housing development would be likely to be aimed at younger people and families.	
Question 21: Which planning policy is going to be used- ESN06 or 5?	
Agreed background:	
ESNO6 is the new planning policy that allows a "mixed development" of affordable and commercial housing to proceed. We have been unable to find a landowner in the past willing to make land available under the policy ESN05.	
Question 22: To date there are no developments that have been built under ESN06. Are villagers happy to be "guinea pigs"?	
Agreed background:	
The Test Valley Association of Parish Councils supported the development of policy ESN06 because there are many villages where, as in Longparish, policy ESN05 has not resulted in land coming forward for affordable housing. Only since the adoption of ESN06 has it been possible to find potentially suitable sites for development in Longparish. TVBC will be ensuring that all requirements of the new policy must be met before any development can proceed.	
View 1	View 2
ESNO6 is a minor modification of the existing policy and there is no reason to expect that using it (whether or not we are the first) will result in significantly different issues from those which arise with ESN05 which has been in place for many years. Longparish is not the only village to be considering a development under this policy and similar policies have been implemented in other districts, such as North Curry in Somerset and South Hams in Devon.	It is for the village to make that decision in a democratic manner. However, allowing development of green field sites not a "minor modification" in terms of the impact it could have on planning decisions

Mix of People/Tenure	
Question 23: Aren't there other developments in the area that would meet these needs?	
Agreed background:	
Developments at Andover's Picket Twenty, and possibly at Micheldever and Wonston will be going ahead at some point in time. This could give a total of approx 15,000 homes in the locality of the village and with the current figures, up to 40% of the mix would be affordable.	
View 1	View 2
None of these developments meet the needs of Longparish villagers or those with a connection to Longparish who want to live in this village. Nor would they help us to preserve a balanced community.	If some one has a requirement to be close to parents or children in Longparish, or needs to live close to the village for any other reason, then Picket 20 is sufficiently close to provide easy access. We already have the means of preserving a balanced community via the existing lower cost housing already in the village

Size of any Development	
Question 24: Now that new sites have come to light, can we confirm how many properties the housing group / TBVC are proposing to build?	
View 1	View 2
The housing group suggests 12 affordable homes plus the minimum number of commercial homes up to a maximum of six, needed to make a project financially viable. The affordable homes would be protected from “right to buy” or “right to acquire” and would therefore remain as social housing for the future	
Question 25: How do we limit size to meet only ongoing village need?	
View 1	View 2
It is clearly not possible to predict ongoing village need with complete certainty. However there is evidence through 3 Housing Needs Surveys conducted in different time periods that there is a consistency of demand for affordable homes at approximately double the level of the proposed development. The reduced number of homes is being proposed partly to increase the certainty that the homes will go only to those with a village connection into the future.	
Question 26: Why should we build if we can't meet all the needs anyway? (And what do we do in 20 years' time if we're in a similar situation?)	
View 1	View 2
A smaller development that meets some of the local need is surely preferable to no development that meets none of the need. If in 20 years time there is evidence of similar unsatisfied need for affordable housing within the village then, as now, the village would need to decide whether it would benefit from a new development. Current policy permits us to have a small development to address the present needs of the village, under strict conditions.	Today's decisions should be taken today. It will be for those living in the village in 20 year's time to take decisions relating to issues current to them at that time
Question 27: How/who decides how many to build - is there a formula/ratio?	
Agreed background:	
However, there are no quantified planning ratios or formulas and it is important that the village has a strong influence upon the nature of any planning application. That is one reason for the current extensive consultation. The policy requires public support and involvement to be taken into account. The decision making process for a planning application includes first consideration by the Parish Council and then Test Valley Borough Council, both of which are elected bodies.	
View 1	View 2
During the earlier consultation phases the feedback from the village demonstrated concern as to the size of any proposed development. After advice from TVBC planners and housing experts, the Housing Group proposal is to limit the number of new affordable homes to 12 (meeting only half the identified need) and to limit the number of market houses to the minimum number (and no more than six) required to ensure the viability of the scheme.	

Size of any Development

Question 28: Sustainability: this point as an argument is used to promote the development and yet we would have a serious issue in accommodating more residents

View 1	View 2
<p>The population of Longparish in 1991 was 730 and in 2001 703, and TVBC predicts a small sustained reduction. The rise in population created by up to 18 small houses in a village of over 300 homes would be unlikely to cause problems. Longparish is one of the smallest villages to have a school, playgroup, church, community and village halls, shop, Post Office, two pubs, and some public transport and it is important to keep them. A reversal of the decline in our population should help the viability of our facilities but the effect will be modest, and the major benefit to the village will be the affordable housing and the community gain attached to ESN 06.</p>	

Site(s)

Question 29: Which sites are under consideration?

Agreed background:

For a project to be feasible you need land which is suitable and a landowner who is willing to make it available.



Discussions with landowners as part of the research for the Parish Plan established that there were at least two landowners who had sites which might be suitable and which they might be willing to make available.

Consultation at the exhibition in the Village Hall in November identified a further 21 possible sites.

They concluded that two sites are potentially suitable for an affordable housing project - the Zurich field and the field immediately west of North Acre at the rear of Lower Mill Villas (see very rough plan).

The landowners concerned have indicated that they would be prepared to co-operate to enable a project that might include elements of both sites and include a village green.

In addition the Parish Council has had discussions with Testway Homes, who own the affordable homes on North Acre to see whether needs could be met by modification of properties there or new build within North Acre. Their reaction was that this would not be possible.

Question 30: Who decides where the site would be?

Agreed background:

Without a willing landowner there cannot be a project. So the first answer to this question is that the landowner decides.

The next consideration is whether a Housing Association (a special type of charity which builds and owns affordable homes) is able to establish that it is financially viable to build on the site concerned. For example high infrastructure costs might rule out some sites.

If there is a willing landowner and a scheme is potentially financially viable then a project could be developed by a process of consultation leading to a planning application. The decision to accept or reject any planning application would be made by the Test Valley Borough Council.

Question 31: Do we need to consider other sites - eg: extend dwellings in North Acre?

Agreed background:

The Parish Council has had discussions with Testway Homes, who own the affordable homes on North Acre to see whether needs could be met by modification of properties there or new build within North Acre. Their reaction was that it would not be possible to meet the needs within North Acre.

Question 32: Has the avenue of using the current housing stock in North Acre been explored fully? There must be a way of using what is already there to deal with the needs of the community.

Agreed background:

Discussions with Testway Housing, who own the 43 affordable homes in North Acre and TVHomes who allocate places have established that it is not possible to meet needs using the existing stock. This is largely because most of the family homes have been sold under the 'right to buy'. The 43 homes include only 14 which are suitable for families. The rest are bungalows and ground floor flats allocated to people with ground floor needs (elderly and disabled). Testway and TVHomes have a responsibility for housing a large number of people with ground floor needs and do not wish to modify their properties or their allocation policy to meet other needs. Turnover of the family homes is very low and only 2 have become available since November 2004.

Site(s)

Question 33: Should 'sites' be split into a number of smaller sites?

Agreed background:

The costs of building on several different sites would be significantly more expensive than building on one site. This is largely a function of duplicating infrastructure costs such as access and putting in services. This is against the background that an affordable housing scheme is from the outset constrained within the tight economic objective of producing the best quality housing at the lowest possible price. But if smaller sites were available they could be considered. Most small sites in the village have already been developed under the 'infill' policy which has applied for many years. It is unlikely that people who own remaining small sites (for example as part of their garden) would offer them at a price which would be low enough (max £10,000 per building plot) for affordable housing - certainly no such sites have been identified in the extensive consultation which has already taken place.

Question 34: Should we be building on "Green field" sites?

Agreed background:

Planning policy only permits sensitive building on green field sites to meet exceptional needs explained in the rural exceptions policies. Nowhere inside the main residential areas of the village is available for building a development like this except a greenfield site.

View 1	View 2
<p>Longparish has around 5,000 acres of land within its boundaries. There is always a balance to be struck between the need for housing and preserving the countryside.</p>	<p>This question reminds us that we have duties and responsibilities to more than just those who may or may not wish to live in Longparish but who can't afford to do so. We also have duties and responsibilities to our fellow villagers and to the village itself. We are its guardians and should look after it with care. We must not allow its character to be altered lightly or without good reason.</p> <p>The figure of 5000 acres is spurious. The green field areas that affect the village along the ribbon development along the B3048 is less than a few hundred acres. Both of the proposed schemes would use a significant portion of the main Greenfield acreage.</p>

Density	
Question 35: How many homes are likely to be proposed?	
View 1	View 2
The proposal from the Housing Group is for 12 affordable homes and to limit the number of market houses to the minimum number required to ensure the scheme is viable. The Housing Group proposal would limit the market houses to a maximum of 6 and recent advice from TVBC suggests they would wish to see fewer than 6 market properties.	
Question 36: What would be area be of each dwelling and garden?	
View 1	View 2
No decision has been made but it is likely that the homes will be small – up to three bedrooms and modern planning policies mean that gardens will be small as well. It will depend on the mix of housing units, some of which are likely to be houses, some flats, etc.	
Question 37: Will density be defined by national government, and, if so, what is the number of homes per acre?	
Agreed background:	
There are strict national guidelines in terms of housing densities for new build developments. The best estimate indicates that for a development of 15 to 18 homes the land requirement would be between 1-2 acres including building and garden. Paragraph 47 of Planning Policy Statement 3 issued in October 2006 (http://www.communities.gov.uk/pub/931/PlanningPolicyStatement3Housing_id1504931.pdf) states that the minimum indicative density is 30 homes per hectare. But it also provides that local authorities may, in certain circumstances, permit lower densities for reasons listed in paragraph 46. That might permit lower densities, particularly bearing in mind paragraph 1(vi) of PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas) which says, “ All development in rural areas should be well designed and inclusive, in keeping and scale with its location, and sensitive to the character of the countryside and local distinctiveness.”.	
Question 38: What will the impact of high density be on neighbours?	
View 1	View 2
Well designed visually attractive developments can be built within these density requirements, for example there are pictures of a development at Shillingstone in Dorset on the village website. It will be important that great care is taken in design to ensure that any adverse impact on neighbours is minimised. Consultation will be crucial	Even with best design, new build can still have a detrimental visual effect on existing home owners. However, the impact is much more than visual. Issues such as noise, traffic activity and the upkeep and maintenance of buildings and gardens are just as important and can not be “designed” away

Traffic/Transport	
Question 39: Where will traffic access be made to potential site(s)?	
Agreed background:	
This depends on the site chosen. Experts from Hampshire Highways will be consulted, and planning permission will not be given unless what is proposed is acceptable.	
View 1	View 2
	This comment is only applicable if the village agrees that the scheme should go ahead
Question 40: Will there be adequate parking?	
Agreed background:	
Again, planning permission will not be given if there is insufficient parking provided in the eyes of the planning department	
View 1	View 2
In addition, improved parking is one of the suggested improvements in village amenities which could form part of a project.	This comment is only applicable if the village agrees that the scheme should go ahead
Question 41: How will we mitigate the effects of increased traffic through the village?	
View 1	View 2
By careful design of access to existing roads and by helping reduce traffic by including improvement of the spinal footpath as part of the project so as to reduce the number of local journeys made by car. This is something that will be considered by the planning and highway authorities in detail. The effects of 15 -18 homes on traffic depend a great deal on where the access roads are sited, and what happens to traffic at particular times of the day but this number is small in relation to the size of the village. We are fortunate not to be on a main road.	It is clearly not going to be possible to mitigate traffic effects at the actual site of the development

Traffic/Transport

Question 42: Bus service - or lack of

Agreed background:

There are bus services currently available. Longparish is served by the Stagecoach 61 and the Cango C4 routes. The Stagecoach goes via the Walworth Industrial Estate to Andover. The Cango now only comes through Longparish when booked. It can be booked to Andover town centre, the Hospital or to the out of town Tesco. Specifically, on Monday to Friday there are:-

- 4 Buses to Andover per day: 1 Stagecoach + 3 Cango
- 5 Buses from Andover: 2 Stagecoach + 3 Cango

On Saturday there are:-

- 4 Buses each way: all Cango

Compared with other similar size villages Longparish is well provided for. The stagecoach buses are used mainly by office workers, shop workers and college students. The Cango is used primarily by the elderly. These services are under utilised; this has resulted in Longparish losing its timed Cango stop.

These services are subject to the HCC Northern Area Transport Review and are under consideration for reduction or removal due to increased operating costs and frozen funding from national government. In particular the 5 variations in the Stagecoach routes between Andover and Winchester which includes the 61 route are being reviewed with the object of streamlining the services.

View 1	View 2
The development could increase demand for existing bus services and strengthen the possibility of them remaining available for all villagers.	Given that the development would be aimed at young families it is more likely that it would increase the number of cars within the village and have no effect whatsoever on the use of public transport

Question 43: How will the safety of parents and children travelling to school be ensured?

Agreed background:

The Longparish Parish Plan proposed that the spinal path (path 14 from North Acre to The Plough) be upgraded with an “all weather” surface, so as to offer a safer walking route from North Acre through to the school, church and village hall.

View 1	View 2
We can stipulate this as one of the community gains that the new development would have to pay for. That would encourage more people to go to school on foot and provide a safe alternative to the main B3048 for those who already go on foot.	We cannot assume that there will be sufficient money in any deal for this or any other local amenity.

Environment	
Question 44: “Sustainability” works both ways- can the current infrastructure accommodate more residents? Won’t this increase the problems of flooding risk, run-off, etc?	
Agreed background:	
Both sites currently under discussion would be assessed for any particular flooding and drainage issues as part of the planning process. Any proposed development would need to satisfy the local planning authority that steps had been taken to mitigate any risks or improve the sites to reduce these risks.	
View 1	View 2
In fact, investment arising from any development could help solve some of the existing problems.	We cannot assume that there will be sufficient money in any deal for this or any other local amenity.
Question 45: How will trees/hedges be affected?	
View 1	View 2
Planning policy is quite robust in protecting existing mature trees, so it is unlikely that these would be felled. If a village green is included in any project, for instance, then some of the hedge along the B3048 on the Zurich site might be removed to make the village green a feature of the village.	
Question 46: Can we ensure the “environmental friendliness “of any development/houses/gardens?	
View 1	View 2
So far as possible, yes though some ideas may be impractical on grounds of cost. We can explore whether any new development should comply with a “carbon neutral” standard, even if this will not be required under the law for a few years. This and other environmentally favourable steps would be part of the discussions with potential developers, and villagers will be able to comment when the designs are proposed.	
Question 47: The sewage pumping station is inadequate for current housing stock; won’t adding more houses just make problems worse?	
Agreed background:	
The problems we have experienced (for example in January 2003) are not caused by the number of houses. Problems happen when the water table is high and are caused by ground water leaking into the sewer and overloading it. The water company responsible proposes to undertake a major capital project to address this issue.	
If a site is chosen which is prone to drainage, water and sewage problems, then it is unlikely to be considered acceptable to the planning authorities, unless the development has taken clear measures to remedy them as part of the building process. TVBC will not give planning consent for the housing unless the developer deals with issues arising from drainage and water needs of the new development- and any impact on the rest of the village, too. Working with the utilities providers (electricity, water, sewage, etc) is an important part of the planning process.	
Question 48: How can we minimise the impact of additional noise and light pollution?	
Agreed background:	
By careful and sympathetic design.	
View 1	View 2
	Careful and sympathetic design can only minimise these issues. It cannot abolish them completely

Environment

Question 49: What are the positive benefits of development (including so-called “community gain” under planning policy)?

Agreed background:

See below under the topic, “How can we define appropriate ‘community gain’ so that the proposed development will bring with it benefits that could add greatly to village amenities?”

View 1	View 2
	It would be wrong to assume that any specific community gain will be forthcoming. There can be no guarantees until commercial negotiations have been completed

Views	
Question 50: Is it fair to change the landscape and affect the location that influenced purchase of property by current owners?	
View 1	View 2
The landscape of the village has changed considerably over the past fifty years. New houses have been built and owners have always made changes to their land/gardens and properties which affect their neighbours. It is unreasonable to think that things will not change further in the future. Planners maintain that no one has a right to a view, and their job is to balance the interests of all parties. With consultation and the constraints imposed by the Village Design Statement and the planning authorities, changes can be managed to be acceptable to the village as a whole, and there is likely to be more consultation and control in this instance than in most new build.	This is a judgment that must be made by the village in a democratic manner
Question 51: How will the development blend in with existing village?	
Agreed background:	
The Village Design Statement sets out guidelines for acceptable appearance which ensures continuity of the present village character. The VDS is considered supplementary planning guidance and used by TVBC when judging planning applications. The VDS would also help shape discussions with any developer, as would consultations with villagers which would be an important part of the planning process for any affordable housing development.	
Question 52: Is the 'need' (if there is one) big enough to justify the destruction of part of the agreed joy of the village?	
View 1	View 2
It will be a very small change to Longparish in total and, if sensitively designed, the result could actually enhance the village. For instance we could have a village green to act as a heart for, and be owned by, our community.	The project, if it goes ahead, will inevitably change the village and will, by definition, destroy part of the current joy of the village (that is its open spaces, specified both in the Village Design Statement and the Village Plan as elements of the village that are integral to its character and which should be protected)
Question 53: Do proposed sites only impact on the views of adjacent properties?	
View 1	View 2
For those who live adjacent to the two sites under discussion, their views could obviously be affected. Sensitive development could ensure that potential sites were made more attractive with increased village amenities.	Village views are enjoyed not only by those living near them. Development will have a negative impact for all residents of the village who enjoy the views and outlooks that exist throughout the village
Question 54: Would especially beautiful views be obstructed?	
View 1	View 2
This is a matter of personal opinion. Inevitably a development will have some impact on the landscape but that can and should be mitigated by careful design	
Question 55: Can we retain the 'green' open feel of the village?	
View 1	View 2
Yes. Given the 5,000 acres of land within the parish and the limited amount of residential housing that currently exists, the overall impact of changing up to two acres needs to be kept in perspective. And adding a village green would improve that open feel.	It is inevitably that green field development will have a negative impact on the "green open feel" of the village

Design	
Question 56: How can I be sure that the look of the village will not be spoilt by new houses?	
View 1	View 2
Enforcement of the Village Design Statement will ensure new homes would be of sympathetic appearance to present homes and a village green would enhance the village.	There can be no guarantee that this will not be the case
Question 57: Will design be in accordance with Parish Design Statement?	
Agreed background:	
Yes, the design will accord with the Village Design Statement which TVBC Planners have adopted as supplementary planning guidance.	
Question 58: Will we be able to influence the design of the development?	
Agreed background:	
Yes – consultation is important at every stage. A developer would want to consult in putting together a project in order to make sure that what is proposed has taken village opinion into account as far as possible. There would always be opportunity to question the design at the Planning Application stage.	
Question 59: Is it best to have an integrated one site design to include different mix in same development?	
View 1	View 2
That is something to be discussed at the design stage. The important thing is to ensure that the design is as good as possible and enhances the village. Current thinking among planners is that a mix is beneficial.	

Local Amenities	
Question 60: What effect will the development have on the School? Can our village school take more children? Does school have a ‘villagers first’ priority? If school is full, where will new families go?	
Agreed background:	
<p>Longparish School can accommodate about 105 children and is essentially a village school, which the community has made great efforts to sustain. The school does operate a “villagers first” policy. The Admissions policy is available on www.hants.gov.uk/education/schools/admissionpolicies/3357admission20082009 or search on Longparish School UK. Funding now depends on the number of pupils so the school has to try to fill all available places. Priority is given to children living in the catchment area (Longparish and Hurstbourne Priors) and, as long as local parents apply in time for places, 15 are available each year. Children who attend the playgroup are known to the school and the LEA supplies lists of children living in the village. If these places are not taken up by parents in the catchment area, they are offered to other children, as the school cannot afford to have empty places. Currently just under half of the places in the school are taken by children in the catchment area, and the school would be pleased to have more children from the local area. Other local schools are in St Mary Bourne, Whitchurch, Wherwell and Barton Stacey.</p>	
View 1	View 2
The school is successful in filling its places but it would help to assure its future to have more children from the catchment area. It is true that some of the pupils who live outside the village have close connections to the village.	
Question 61: But, isn’t the school over subscribed? Even the most recent family to move in couldn’t get their children into the school!	
Agreed background:	
<p>The school makes every effort to allocate places to children from the village and is largely successful in meeting this objective. Its admissions policy (see http://www.hants.gov.uk/education/schools/admissionpolicies/3357admission20082009.pdf) states clearly that if the school is oversubscribed then priority is given in order, to Siblings of children attending the school at the time of the applicant’s proposed admission, and who reside in the area served by the School (4 in 2007) Children of families residing in the area served by the School (5 in 2007). Siblings of children attending the school at the time of the applicant’s proposed admission, but residing outside the area served by the School (4 in 2007). But there can be a problem if a family moves into the village with children of primary school age, particularly if they move in after the time for applying for places. A small school cannot afford to keep empty places on the off chance that children may move into the village. Nor can it be expected to “expel” children from outside the village who have been attending, just to make room for a new Longparish child. Classes for children in key stage 1, that is 5-7year olds, are limited to 30 children, which in Longparish means 15 in each year group. Sometimes a family moves out of the village or children move on to other schools and there are spaces in the later year groups, but this cannot be guaranteed. The school is very keen to provide places for all village children, but if there is more than one child in an incoming family it may be difficult to find spaces in all the required classes, and parents may then decide to send all the children to a school that can take them all. This is unfortunate but applies to all schools. For this reason, if the development goes ahead, it will be important that the school and playgroup are kept informed of likely demands.</p>	

Local Amenities

Question 62: What effect will the development have on the Shop? Isn't it true that national economics are affecting village shops rather than any "lack" of people in the village?

View 1	View 2
<p>The village shop needs support and the more village residents use it the more likely it is to survive. If every household spent just £10 a week in the shop, its future would be pretty well assured. The more people who use the shop the better and those who live in the village are most likely to use it. It follows that an increase in numbers could help, but obviously would not save the shop on its own. It is true that many prefer do a weekly shop at a supermarket, but many also like to be able to buy at the village shop. For those without a car or who are housebound, the village shop is a lifeline. The shop is willing to stock what people want to buy and it is worth asking for things that you will buy regularly.</p> <p>The shop provides other services which would be very much missed if it closed - the post office, newspaper deliveries, the banking facilities, dry cleaning, lottery tickets, and an informal place to exchange information. The post office has helped to subsidise the shop but national policies (for example on the payment of pensions and collection of TV licenses) and the supermarkets have reduced its profitability, and it is important that the shop itself makes money. Only an increase in customers and what they spend can make it viable. Additional housing could increase that support, albeit in a modest way, and help ensure the viability of the shop - but it is unlikely to make enough difference on its own.</p>	<p>Extra housing in the village would have a beneficial effect on the village shop</p>

Question 63: What effect will the development have on the Pubs?

Agreed background:
The pubs welcome customers from the village as well as elsewhere.

Question 64: What effect will the development have on the Doctors/dentists, etc? Isn't it true that the local Doctors and Dentists both have several years' worth of people on their waiting lists?

Agreed background:
Shortages of doctors and especially NHS dentists, is a problem for the whole northwest Hampshire area, and it is not unique to Longparish. One of the advantages of the new large-scale housing developments at Picket Piece may be to bring medical services even closer to Longparish than currently. Overall this is a matter of policy for the Primary Care Trust and market forces.

Local Amenities

Question 65: How can we define appropriate ‘community gain’ so that the proposed development will bring with it benefits that could add greatly to village amenities?

Agreed background:
The planning policy under which any new affordable housing would be built is ESN06 which includes community gain as an essential element of any proposal. Any proposal must show how existing community facilities will be sustained as a result of the development or how any new facilities will be provided.
The landowners concerned have indicated that they would be prepared to provide these benefits as part of a scheme and the community will be able to suggest others should a development go ahead.

View 1	View 2
<p>The biggest benefit is, of course, providing homes for people with a strong village connection who need them.</p> <p>An important element which could be included is a village green which would be owned by the parish council or a charitable trust thus ensuring that it was protected from development for ever. This would provide a social focus for the village and remove the uncertainty which inevitably exists about how the land concerned might be used if planning policies are relaxed in future. Other benefits which could be provided as part of a scheme would be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• improving the spinal path so it could be used for access to the school from North Acre all year round instead of people having to use cars or the B3048 on foot with small children• providing a parking area• providing space for a community building which could serve as a meeting room and provide replacement premises for a shop should that ever become necessary	<p>All these possibilities are no more than that – possibilities. There can be no guarantee of “community gain” until commercial negotiations have been completed. Even if they are forthcoming, the decision still has to be made as to whether the gains outweigh the negative impact of the development.</p> <p>The only safe way to proceed at this stage is to assume that community gain would be either limited or non-existent</p>

Financial Impacts	
Question 66: What effect will these affordable houses have on the value of my house?	
View 1	View 2
<p>There may be a temporary effect on values while work is going on, although this will be an effect on paper rather than in reality, unless someone actually needs to sell during this period. Long term effects are harder to predict. Any development will have to bring with it clear evidence of Community Gain. The Housing Group strongly support the idea of Community Gain including the village being given the balance of any field used for such a development. This would bring to the whole community an additional amenity that could be used as village green and would have a positive impact on house values. In addition it could ensure that the site is protected in perpetuity from further development. For many potential buyers, this certainty, which does not exist at present, would add to the value of nearby properties.</p>	<p>Informal discussions with Estate agents indicate that, during the process of planning and its associated uncertainties and during construction, houses in close proximity to the site could suffer loss of value of up to 20%. Other property will also be affected during planning discussions and construction depending how close they are to the new development. This effect could be of the order of 5 to 15% Areas such as Forton are unlikely to be affected to any large extent.</p> <p>This reduction in house values may or may not improve over time or not depending on the quality of the development and its effect of Longparish life.</p>
Question 67: Will this financial cost (if any) be left for me to cover personally, or will the cost be shared by the whole village community?	
Agreed background:	
<p>Planning regulations are quite specific. The value of neighbouring housing which may or may not be affected by a development is not a matter for compensation. This is the same as what happens when people enlarge their houses or build under the existing infill policy.</p>	
View 1	View 2
	<p>It is easy to be in favour of something if to be so does not disadvantage you in any way. It is accepted by all that this development could cause values of nearby houses to fall. These are houses belonging to our friends and neighbours, some of whom may have made significant financial sacrifices to live in this beautiful village.</p> <p>For financial loss to be imposed on them by decisions taken by others who will not be disadvantaged is unfair, and should at least be accepted as such. To suggest to our fellow villagers who will take the brunt of the financial loss that they should accept it willingly in the light of recent house price rises shows considerable insensitivity. Also, the argument that it is not "real" money is incorrect. Anyone needing to sell their house to re-locate would find that the loss was very "real" indeed.</p> <p>If it is truly the view that such financial loss is acceptable to the cause, then surely it would be fairer to spread the loss among the village as a whole rather than leaving it for a few to bear the full amount.</p> <p>Planning regulations, whether specific or not, have nothing to do with the decision that we as a village could make about whether or not we should spread the financial load.</p>
Question 68: What potential community gains are there?	
View 1	View 2
<p>The proposed amenities should enhance the value of living in Longparish for all villagers. See above for specific recommendations currently under discussion, which were suggested during the Parish Plan consultations</p>	<p>There is no guarantee there will any additional amenities.</p>

Financial Impacts

Question 69: Who would decide on what community benefits were obtained

Agreed background:

Consultation has already begun on what priorities are attached by the village to specific community improvements – most particularly through the original Parish Plan consultation. More specific consultation would be done when any site were agreed and proposals for financing the development were underway.

Limits

Question 70: Does this create a precedent for future development?

Agreed background:

A planning application will fail at any point if it falls outside planning policy. The current and long established planning policy for Longparish is to allow only ‘in fill’ (single plot between existing houses) new build. Most such sites have been developed so the effective position has for some time been for very little new development within the village apart from enlargement of existing properties.

This proposed development would be considered under the ‘Rural Exceptions’ policy ESN06 which seeks to find a planning solution for small rural affordable housing led schemes. There is a strict set of criteria within the policy.

Steve Lees, Policy, Design and Conservation Manager, Planning Service, Test Valley Borough Council has given the following advice

“Schemes which come forward to meet local housing needs under Policy ESN 05 and ESN 06 are done so as an exception to the countryside policies of the borough local plan. Development for affordable housing under ESN 05 is permitted to meet a specific need which would have been established through a local housing needs survey. Similarly development coming forward under ESN 06 would have been justified in terms of satisfying specific local needs. There is no strategic requirement to release land for open market housing in the villages. Were a proposal to come forward for open market housing on land (assuming it was a greenfield site) adjoining an affordable housing scheme the specific any exceptional reasons why that land had been developed would not be seen as setting a precedent. The current policy position regarding new housing in Longparish is that only development for infilling or under Policy SET 06 is acceptable in principle; other forms of development would be contrary to policy.”

View 1	View 2
It is clear that, within current planning policy, it would be impossible for the proposed development to become a catalyst for more general housing development.	The view expressed in View 1 has already been shown to be incorrect. Already Zurich have started to push forward with plans for the redevelopment of Lower Mill Villas in a way which raises the possibility that they are looking to link this development on a quid pro quo basis with the sale of some of their land to the village for affordable housing.

Question 71: We have seen planning regulations change to enable this to occur with ESN06 - are there any guarantees for the future that policy won't change again?

Agreed background:

Policy ESN06 was developed within the national planning framework in Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3, formerly PPG3) which says,

“Rural exception sites should only be used for affordable housing in perpetuity. A Rural Exception Site policy should seek to address the needs of the local community by accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection, whilst also ensuring that rural areas continue to develop as sustainable, mixed, inclusive communities.”

TVBC policies must be approved nationally before they can be adopted. All proposed changes are subject to a rigorous inspection process and public enquiry.

View 1	View 2
Unless the national framework changes there is no possibility of TVBC developing exceptions policies outside this guidance. Of course no one can guarantee that national policies won't change. That there are no guarantees that national policy will never change, is a strong argument for protecting some land in the village as a Village Green, which could be done as part of the community gain under policy ESN06. Also this proposal is subject to much greater community consultation and influence than housing developments usually are and that is another argument for going ahead with a small development now, rather than waiting for a change in national policy.	

And ...	
Question 72: Is it accepted that development would have more impact on some current residents than others?	
Agreed background:	
The nature of any development of any size is that it will impact some more than others. The planning system provides a framework in which the needs and rights of individual residents is balanced against those of the community as a whole.	
Question 73: How will we decide/measure the overall decision of the village?	
Agreed background:	
In one sense we do not decide because the decision on any planning application will be taken by the Borough not the Parish. But ESNO6 requires “community support” for such a development to be shown. Test Valley Borough Council is the statutory planning authority that will make this judgement, balancing the results of the consultation processes and other representations they receive with meeting housing need and community gains to fulfil the conditions of the policy.	
View 1	View 2
	<p>The decision in principle must be made by the people who live in the village of Longparish. It would not be acceptable for the decision to be imposed on the village by TVBC or any other external agency.</p> <p>Only if the village agrees to the idea in principle should the planning authorities become involved.</p> <p>If the TVBC can provide the criteria it considers would show “community support” in advance, then it would be sensible to ensure that the criteria the community uses at least equals this.</p> <p>The exact figures can be debated, but in such an important issue as this it is vital that the decision should be shown to be that of a substantial proportion of the voters.</p> <p>It important to be aware that even relatively stringent criteria such as requiring a 60% response and a 75% majority of responders in favour could, in the worst case, result in the project going ahead with the explicit agreement of only 45% of the local community.</p>

And ...	
Question 74: Is it fair to expect the few to pay the costs (not simply financial costs) for the benefit of the many? If not, how could fairness be achieved?	
Agreed background:	
Planning law and regulation do not extend additional rights to those who are adjacent to a proposed development.	
View 1	View 2
Unlike people who need affordable homes, people who have bought property in Longparish have benefited from a large and sustained increase in the value of their properties over many years. The effect of building affordable housing will be modest compared with such gains.	<p>As already noted, it is easy to be in favour of affordable housing if to be so does not disadvantage you in any way.</p> <p>Amenity costs (views, noise, traffic etc) can not be shared and so will have to be borne by those particular villagers who live close to the development. However, it would be possible to devise a system that shared the financial costs, as discussed above.</p> <p>Planning regulations have nothing to do with the decision that we as a village could make about whether or not we should spread the financial cost.</p> <p>As already mentioned, if village homeowners not otherwise adversely financially affected by the development are not prepared to accept a share of the cost why should they expect others to cover a much larger amount?</p>
Question 75: Do we want to be part of a traditional rural community, or chocolate box commuter village?	
View 1	View 2
Longparish is a village that has been in existence for almost 900 years, with substantial changes in population and character over that time. Some residents have had family living in the village for generations; others have only recently arrived from outside the local area. Inevitably there will be differences of opinion about what the character of the village going forward should be. Agreeing a development of affordable housing to meet the needs of village people would be an important defining moment in the life of the village. We cannot prevent change; it is inevitable whether or not we build affordable housing, but we can influence it.	There is a suggestion that if this scheme is not approved the village will die. This is patent nonsense – the village has survived hundreds of years and will survive well into the future. It may not survive in a form that some present members of the village would approve but this is for the whole village to decide.
Question 76: Is it fair to make “assumptions” about who does and does not support the idea of an affordable housing scheme?	
Agreed background:	
No! The consultation process should ensure that everyone who has an opinion on the idea of the development, as well as any subsequent proposals, is given a fair chance to articulate those views. This is precisely why we are proposing this document to form the basis of discussion at the Open Forum meeting.	