Braishfield Housing Survey Analysis July 2025

Cllr Sally Yalden

243

Responses

84.4%

Homeowners

46.9%

Lived > 20 Years

100%

Verified Braishfield Residents 34% knew little about it and 33% heard about it for the first time

Surrounding developments

47.7% knew little about it

Opposition Levels

- Strongly Oppose: 52.3%
- Somewhat Oppose: 18.9%
- Total Opposition:71.2%

Support Levels

- Strongly Support:1.6%
- Somewhat Support: 18.1%
- **Neutral:** 9.1%
- Total Support: 19.7%

Key Finding: 71.2% opposition vs **19.7%** support indicates strong community resistance to the current proposal scale

Primary Community Concerns

Traffic Impact:

Overwhelming majority concern (8 out of 10 residents) - village roads already used as a "rat run" with speeding traffic.

Infrastructure Strain:

School at capacity, GP surgeries oversubscribed, sewage system concerns, utilities

Environmental Impact:

Loss of green spaces, impact on wildlife and ecosystems, threat to mature oak trees and agricultural land

Loss of Village Character:

Fear of becoming "suburb of Romsey" rather than maintaining rural village identity

Traffic and Safety Concerns: 54 +244 +309 = 607 extra houses. Total new cars on the road = 1396 cars....

Critical Issues Identified:

- **Traffic crisis: 79.4%.** Safety concerns for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Narrow rural lanes surrounding village.
- Village Character Under Threat: 74.9%. Fear of losing rural, village identity. Concern about urbanisation and density.
- **Infrastructure Strain:** School capacity, medical facilities, utilities, highways water, sewage, electricity, mobile coverage and internet bandwidth and local services

Residents' Verdict: Infrastructure "stretched" and "cannot cope with existing developments"

"Thousands of houses built between Braishfield and Romsey in past 20 years"

Recent Major Developments:

- Abbotswood: Large housing estate
- Ganger Farm: 309 additional houses
- Cupernham Lane: Major infills
- Multiple others: Cumulative impact on infrastructure

Alternative Questioned: Residents cite unused "Brewery site in Romsey with 250 house allocation for >30 y

What Scale Would Be Acceptable?

Community Preferences

- Small (fewer than 10 homes) 60.1%
- **Medium** (10-30 homes) 18.1%
- Large (31-50 homes) 2.5%
- No development 19.3%

What Residents Want

- Developments "similar to Oak Close"
- Small, incremental growth
- Housing for locals with village connections
- Sympathetic design maintaining character

60.1% prefer small developments - the proposed 54 house development is significantly larger than the community considers acceptable

Democratic Process Concerns:

Many residents stating "first I've heard about it"

Engagement Problems:

- Poor Communication: Many unaware of proposal initially
- Lack of detail: Insufficient information on housing types, infrastructure plans
- Community input: Desire for Parish Council involvement in design
- Developer motive: Skepticism about "making money vs genuine need"

Residents Want: "Village-led, not imposed" development with meaningful community consultation

Among Those Who Support Development:

Housing Types Preferred:

- Starter/first-time buyer homes
- Affordable/social housing
- Downsizing/retirement or senior living

Conditions for Support:

- Small-scale development
- Priority for local residents
- Infrastructure improvements first
- Sympathetic design

Key Insight: Community not opposed to housing per se, but wants appropriate scale and local benefit.

What the Comments Reveal:

- **Informed Opposition:** Residents provide specific, factual concerns about infrastructure capacity
- **Sophisticated Understanding:** References to Village Design Statement, precedent effects, planning law
- Alternative Solutions: Constructive suggestions for brownfield sites, phased development
- **Local Expertise:** Intimate knowledge of village constraints and opportunities

"This isn't NIMBYism - it's evidence-based concern about genuine constraints"

What Residents Suggest:

- **Scale:** Small, phased developments over large single developments
- Timing: Infrastructure upgrades must precede housing development
- **Design:** Maintain Village Design Statement standards
- Priority: Reserve affordable housing for people with village connections
- Alternatives: Consider brownfield sites before greenfield
- **Traffic:** Implement traffic calming measures

Bottom Line: Community willing to accommodate appropriate growth, but current proposals exceeds acceptable limits.

Strong Opposition Evidence:

- 71.2% oppose current proposal
- Infrastructure already at capacity
- Traffic safety concerns
- Village character threatened

Path Forward:

- Consider smaller scale (under 10 homes)
- Address infrastructure first
- Improve community engagement
- Explore brownfield alternatives

Final Assessment: Survey reveals informed community opposition based on practical constraints, not blanket resistance to housing

Next steps:

- Revised Regulation 18. Complete TVBC's formal consultation by midday Friday 5 September. Online, or email, or in writing to Andover. planningpolicy@testvalley.gov.uk
 Paper copies here.
- Consider writing to the MP. Tell her to raise the matter directly in Parliament and press ministers on why such disproportionately high targets have been imposed on areas like Test Valley. Ask her what she is doing about the infrastructure crisis.
- Plan period 2025-2042
 - ? End June 2026 ? Revised Regulation 19 (formal publication stage). Final draft before submission. Anyone can make further representations - and forward to Planning Inspector. Last chance to object.
 - ? End Sept 2026 ? Submission to Planning Inspectorate
 - ? End Dec 2026 ? Examination by Planning Inspector. Public hearings.
 - ? End December 2027 Adoption of Local Plan (if found to be sound)

QR code direct to online consultation. You will need to login or set up an account.

Policy SA26: Land West of Braishfield Road

