

Charlton Neighbourhood Development Plan Decision Statement: 12 March 2021

1. Introduction

1.1 Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), the Test Valley Borough Council has a statutory duty to assist communities in the preparation of neighbourhood development plans and orders and to take plans through a process of examination and referendum. The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) sets out the Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning.

1.2 This statement confirms that the modifications proposed by the examiner's report have been accepted, the draft Charlton Neighbourhood Development Plan will be altered as a result of it; and that this plan may now proceed to referendum.

2. Background

2.1 The Charlton Neighbourhood Plan relates to the area that was designated by Test Valley Borough Council as a neighbourhood area in February 2020. This area corresponds with the Charlton Parish Council boundary that lies within the Test Valley Borough Council Area.

2.2 Following the submission of the Charlton Neighbourhood Plan to the Borough Council, the plan was publicised and representations were invited. The publicity period ended on **Friday 20th March 2020**. An additional Regulation 16 Consultation and Consultation on the Strategic Environmental Assessment was undertaken and this consultation ended on **Monday 4 January 2021**.

2.3 Peter Biggers was appointed by the Test Valley Borough Council with the consent of Charlton Parish Council, to undertake the examination of the Neighbourhood Plan and to prepare a report of the independent examination.

2.4 The examiner's report concludes that subject to making the modifications recommended by the examiner, the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

3. Decision

3.1 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the local planning authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations of an examiner made in a report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4A to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to a neighbourhood development plan.

3.2 Having considered each of the modifications made by the examiner's report and the reasons for them, and the modifications to reflect comments made Test Valley Borough Council in consultation with Charlton Parish Council has decided to accept all the modifications to the draft plan. Table 1 below outlines the alterations made to the draft plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of 2004 Act) in response to each of the Examiner's recommendations and the modifications required in response to comments made at the Regulation 16 consultation. This statement should be read alongside the Examiners report.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 14	OS license needs adding to the map	1A	Update all mapping to accurately show the recent parish boundary change, to ensure key blocks and text are legible and relevant and that OS licensing details are shown and legible on all maps.	Accept Examiners Modification
Mr Hand	Comment	Figure 17	In the aerial view of Charlton lakes, the Carters meadow signage is wrongly positioned on the Local Green Space land to the south of Carters Meadow.	1A	Update all mapping to accurately show the recent parish boundary change, to ensure key blocks and text are legible and relevant and that OS licensing details are shown and legible on all maps.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 3	This does not show the correct parish boundary and the OS licence number needs to be added to the map.	1A	Update all mapping to accurately show the recent parish boundary change, to ensure key blocks and text are legible and relevant and that OS licensing details are shown and legible on all maps.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 33	This map would benefit from being clearer. TVBC can help with the maps in the final document if required.	1A	Update all mapping to accurately show the recent parish boundary change, to ensure key blocks and text are legible and relevant and that OS licensing details are shown and legible on all maps.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 4	This does not show the correct parish boundary and the OS licence number needs to be added to the map.	1A	Update all mapping to accurately show the recent parish boundary change, to ensure key blocks and text are legible and relevant and that OS licensing details are shown and legible on all maps.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 5	This does not show the correct parish boundary and the OS licence number needs to be added to the map.	1A	Update all mapping to accurately show the recent parish boundary change, to ensure key blocks and text are legible and relevant and that OS licensing details are shown and legible on all maps.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 6	This does not show the correct parish boundary. The OS number and copyright is too small and illegible.	1A	Update all mapping to accurately show the recent parish boundary change, to ensure key blocks and text are legible and relevant and that OS licensing details are shown and legible on all maps.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Maps		1A	Update all mapping to accurately show the recent parish boundary change, to ensure key blocks and text are legible and relevant and that OS licensing details are shown and legible on all maps.	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	General		1B	Revise reference to 'Parish' to read 'Plan Area' where this is strictly necessary to the sense and understanding of the sentence.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 2.2	The date of designation stated in the plan is 16th September 2016, when the actual date of designation is 8th August 2014. The plan should be amended accordingly.	2A	Paragraph 2.2 Line 3 – change the date to “8 August 2014”	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 2.2		2A	Paragraph 2.2 Line 3 – change the date to “8 August 2014”	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 2.5	Some changes to the wording suggested for clarity. The date range in the text states that the plan will be valid for 15 years, and this does not tally with the date range on the front cover of 2019 – 2029.	2B	Paragraph 2.5 Line 1 – change the figure “15” to “10”	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	General		2C	Ensure all procedural references in the plan are updated for the final version of the plan.	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Section 3		3A	Delete title to section 3 and replace with the current subheading “Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 3.2		3B	Add to the end of paragraph 3.1 the following: “TVBC considered that, given the nature of the plan and the fact that there were no European sites either within the plan area or within 10 kilometres of it the plan would be unlikely to have any significant effects on European sites either	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
					alone or in combination with other plans and programmes.”	
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 3.2		3C	Delete paragraph 3.2 in its entirety and replace with updated paragraphs 3.2 to 3.4 to read as follows: “3.2 During consultation on the screening opinion and determination statements relating to SEA and HRA, Natural England made representations that raised concerns over the potential impact of raised nitrate levels in treated foul water from the allocated housing site on water quality in the River Solent Catchment which could impact on European sites in the Solent.	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 3.3		3C	3.3 As a result of this, TVBC requested detail from CPC as to where foul drainage from the housing allocation would be treated. As the drainage would be treated at Fullerton Waste Water Treatment Works which discharges into the River Test and ultimately the Solent, and this could lead to increased nitrate levels in the Solent, it was decided during the CNP examination stage that the plan should be subject to HRA (Appropriate Assessment) and SEA before being completed.	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 3.4		3C	3.4 The result of the AA and SEA of the plan was that, provided the policy relating to the allocation of land north of Goch / Peake Way for housing was modified to require the development to be nutrient or nitrogen neutral, there would be no significant adverse effect on the European sites in the Solent Catchment. This would be the case both in respect of the CNP	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
					alone and in combination with other plans and programmes.”	
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 5.2		4	Paragraph 5.2 Line 3 - delete the words ‘is consistent with’ and replace with the words “has regard to”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective 5	Amend Objective 5 as follows: Preserving the historic sites assets in the Plan Area (recognised by English Heritage as of national importance) of Charlton Village with Foxcotte and the character of these sites, in particular the ancient burial ground. The final sentence does not need to be in the objective, but should be within a policy or the supporting text.	5A	Reword Objective 5 to read: “Preserving the heritage assets of the Plan Area”	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 7.2	Environment and sustainability Objectives section. It is unclear as to the purpose of this section in relation to the objectives above.	5B	Reword the subtitle following the objectives box as: “Implementing the objectives to improve sustainable living”	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 7.3	Some changes to the wording suggested for clarity.	5C	Reword paragraph 7.3 line 2/3 to read: “It is considered from ...feedback that most support measures for a cleaner...”	Accept Examiners Modification
Hampshire County Council	Support	Para 7.8	Paragraph 7.8 requires rewording as gateways (white fences as referred to in the text) on the approaches to the village will not by themselves solve air quality. They can, when used alongside other traffic management measures, have a positive impact on driver behaviour i.e. reduce vehicle speeds which may then have an impact on air quality.	5D	Reword paragraph 7.8 lines 2-4 as follows: Line 2 – replace the words ‘white gates’ with the word ‘gateways’ Line 3 – delete the words ‘reducing emissions and’ Line 4 – add to end of line the words “and potentially improving air quality”.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Hampshire County Council	Comment	Para 7.11	The County Council note in paragraph 7.11 that the Parish do not support the provision of public electric charging points for vehicles in this Plan. With both Test Valley Borough and Hampshire County Councils having recently declared a 'Climate Emergency' and with the expectation that Developers should implement electric charging points in new developments (cross reference para 8.17.4), the County Council think this point should be reconsidered in light of the Government's decision to ban the sale of diesel and petrol cars by 2035. If charging points are installed within the Highway Boundary this will be a decision for Hampshire County Council.	5E	Delete paragraph 7.11 and replace with the following: "The Parish Council will, as part of the community aspirations in Appendix 2, review the need for and provision of public charging points for electric vehicles."	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Par 8.1.3		6A	Delete paragraphs 8.1.1 to 8.1.3 and replace with the following (or similar): 1.3 A revised settlement boundary has therefore been shown overlaid on the proposal map below (Fig 7) with the Peake Way development and housing allocation washed over in yellow to indicate the new settlement area."	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.1.2	Some changes to the wording suggested for clarity.	6A	6A Delete paragraphs 8.1.1 to 8.1.3 and replace with the following (or similar):	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.1.3	There is no purpose to the revised settlement area as shown by the dotted line. This approach is not supported by the Borough Council as it serves no purpose and is confusing. The settlement boundary is established in the Local Plan, and the mechanism for separating the boundary would be through the Local Plan Review.	6A	Delete paragraphs 8.1.1 to 8.1.3 and replace with the following (or similar): "8.1.1 The parish is adjacent to Andover. The residents feel strongly that the identity of Charlton as a village has been eroded over the years due to its proximity to Andover. There is concern that Charlton will be subsumed in the future and the village character will be lost. The	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
					neighbourhood plan therefore requires that the approach to development within Charlton respects the rural village character. 8.1.2 Notwithstanding this, the plan recognises that at present Charlton sits within the settlement boundary of Andover and as a strategic policy of the TVBRLP this will continue to apply for the time being. There is however a need to propose a change to the settlement boundary to reflect recent development granted on appeal at Peake Way (off Goch Way) and to incorporate the CNP housing allocation north of Peake Way (CHA1). Such significant development should logically be included within the settlement boundary.	
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.1.4		6B	Amend start of paragraph 8.1.4 to read: "The settlement boundary as revised and related policies...."	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 7	It would be helpful if the new allocated site CHA1 was shown on the map as an extension to the settlement boundary. The key on the map has some layers that are not shown on the map. The OS licence number needs to be added to the map.	6C	Amend the map at Fig 7 to better define the proposed extension to the settlement boundary on the east side of Charlton identifying the Peake Way development and the allocated site. Delete the proposed southern settlement boundary to Charlton in Fig 7.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP1	This policy repeats Local Plan Policy COM2 and is not required in this plan.	6D	Revise Policy CNP1 clause 2 a) to read: "it is allocated within the Adopted Local Plan or its replacement"	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP1	This policy repeats Local Plan Policy COM2 and is not required in this plan.	6E	Delete the words in clause 2b) after the words 'development plan'	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Gladman Developments	Object	CNP1	<p>This policy states that development within the development boundary identified in Figure 7 will be supported. Other than the inclusion and washing over of the Goch Way site and the proposed allocation, the reasoning for the inclusion of the dotted red line is unclear. Whether the separation of Charlton and Andover is identified or not there is a continuous area of land contained within the settlement boundary between the two settlements where application of the Local Plan Policy COM2 would already apply. The identification of this red line could therefore reduce clarity and cause confusion in the application of this policy. The policy then goes on to more or less repeat adopted Local Plan policy, offering little in terms of further detail conflicting with Paragraph 16(f) of the Framework. Therefore, to meet the basic conditions Gladman submit that changes will be required to be made to the policy.</p>	6F	<p>In 'Justification from Evidence Base' following policy CNP1, delete first sentence and begin second sentence as follows: "The settlement boundary has been revised...." Link last sentence of the paragraph to the preceding sentence to make grammatical sense.</p>	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.2.6	<p>It would appear that the NP is ignoring the evidence from the AECOM study.</p>	7A	<p>Reword paragraph 8.2.6 and the start of 8.3.1 as follows: "8.2.6 In community consultation events and the Parish Survey, residents generally support positive development at a level that is sustainable within the parish. The original survey concluded that 100 to 250 new homes should be the maximum over the CNP period. Taking the Goch Way development and completions to date into account, in excess of 90 homes have been completed already. The plan proposes that an allocation of a further 50 homes plus</p>	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
					ongoing windfall development would take the total provision in the plan period to around 150 dwellings or approximately a 17% growth rate over the existing housing stock in the parish. TVBC has confirmed that this housing provision rate is acceptable and in general conformity with the strategic housing provision set out in the TVBRLP.	
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.3.1		7A	Site Assessment. 8.3.1 In order to identify a site for the housing allocation an assessment has been.....”	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.3.7 and 8.3.10		7A	Delete paragraphs 8.3.7 and 8.3.10 in their entirety as these are now encapsulated in new paragraph 8.2.6.	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.2.2		7B	In Paragraph 8.2.2 last line delete the words “Neighbourhood Plan” and substitute the words “Local Plan” In paragraph 8.2.3 line 3 insert the word “Local” before the word “Plan” Reword the second sentence of 8.2.3 to read: “However, as a settlement with only 853 dwellings, a 34% increase in housing would be a significant change over a relatively short Local Plan period.”	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.2.5		7C	In paragraph 8.2.5 line 1 delete the words “and not be part of” and replace with the words “and be distinct from”. Reword the second sentence of paragraph 8.2.5 to read: “However, the settlement in the village centre to support large growth in population”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Footnote		7D	Delete the footnote on Page 20.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.3.9	Better than industry standard insulation' is referred to in the text. Planning are unable to require anything over and above Building Regulations and whilst this can be encouraged, it cannot be required and enforced.	8A	Delete the following clauses in Policy CNP2 to remove repetition: l – (First section) - repeats Policy CNP15 – Retain “Siting and orientation to optimise passive solar gain”,	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP2	Criteria h) Any new development would need to satisfy this criteria, through the design and access statement, and therefore does not need repeating in the policy.	8A	Delete the following clauses in Policy CNP2 to remove repetition: h – repeats Policy CNP14,	Accept Examiners Modification
Hampshire County Council	Comment	CNP2	The County Council request that this policy should include mention that any application should be supported by a Transport Statement and a Travel Plan. Mitigation measures should also include mention of access by means / modes other than car.	8B	Add after the word “parking” in c) the words “with electric charging points” Add after the word “safe” in d) the words “pedestrian/cycle” Add at the end of e) the words “as demonstrated through a transport statement and travel plan”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP2	Criteria c) d) e) and f) Any new development would need to satisfy these criteria, and therefore do not need repeating in the policy.	8B	Add after the word “parking” in c) the words “with electric charging points” Add after the word “safe” in d) the words “pedestrian/cycle” Add at the end of e) the words “as demonstrated through a transport statement and travel plan”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP2	Criteria g) What does ‘Lower Density’ mean?	8C	Reword g) to read: “Ensure the density of development is appropriate ... location.”	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	CNP2		8D	Add new clause at end of revised Policy CNP2 to read as follows: “Development proposals will be required to confirm the nitrogen budget and set out specific and appropriately located mitigation measures that will be implemented in order to ensure development is nutrient neutral from the start of its operational phase. Such	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
					<p>mitigation measures must be secured for the duration of the development's effects. A financial contribution to strategic mitigation measures may be an appropriate alternative to direct provision of mitigation. In this case it will be necessary to liaise with Test Valley Borough Council and Natural England to confirm an appropriate mitigation scheme to which the contributions will be directed and to ensure any contributions are sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts of the development on the Solent internationally designated sites."</p>	

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.3.7		8E	<p>Add new replacement text at 8.3.7 regarding the mitigation of nutrient effects as follows: "8.3.7 Site CHA1, along with all the identified sites, has the potential for treated wastewater from the new residential development to adversely affect the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar and the Solent Maritime SAC as a result of nitrates discharged into the River Test, and any development therefore needs to demonstrate nitrate neutrality. Mitigation to achieve nutrient neutrality include direct measures, through upgrading sewage treatment works, or alternatives such as interceptor wetlands, which can remove some nitrogen through sedimentation and denitrification. Alternatively, indirect mitigation could be put in place by taking land out of high-nitrogen uses. This could include taking land out of agricultural use, either on-site or off-site and using it instead as open space, a wildlife site or woodland, providing these have low nitrogen inputs. The developer could carry out such measures on land they already own, purchase land for this purpose, or work with other landowners in the River Test catchment and/or TVBC to take land they own out of nitrogen-intensive uses. The Natural England Guidance* also states that strategic solutions are being investigated, which could provide an opportunity, particularly for smaller developments, such as Land North of Goch Way, to provide financial contributions to strategic mitigation, as an alternative to direct mitigation. Irrespective of which mitigation</p>	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
					<p>method is proposed, the developer of the Land North of Goch Way site will need to demonstrate that the type, extent and location of the mitigation measures are sufficient to offset the additional nitrogen load from the development (calculated using the Nutrient Budget Calculations in the Natural England Guidance), and therefore avoid adverse effects on integrity of the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar and the Solent Maritime SAC. The mitigation measures need to be appropriately located, i.e. if direct mitigation is implemented, this should be at Fullerton Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) or along the River Test between Fullerton WwTW and the Solent. Indirect mitigation, i.e. taking land out of high-nitrogen uses, will only be acceptable where this is undertaken on land within the River Test or River Itchen catchment areas and on land with appropriate geology to ensure mitigation is effective and timely. The mitigation measures need to be secured for the lifetime of the development's effects, generally 80-125 years. * Natural England Guidance on Achieving Nutrient Neutrality in the Solent Region (June 2020)</p>	
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.3.8	Homes to meet the local needs' How will this be achieved? 'Starter homes' are referred to in the text. Is this the definition In Annex 2 of the NPPF or does it mean smaller homes for first time buyers and downsizers?	8F	Reword the start of paragraph 8.3.8 to read: "The plan allocates Site CHA1..."	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.3.10		8G	Add new paragraph 8.3.10 to read: "Policy CNP2 sets out the principles for the development of the site and it is important	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
					that these are applied in conjunction with policies CNP3, CNP7, CNP10, CNP14 and CNP15”	
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	CNP2		8H	Renumber policy criteria and paragraph referencing in the supporting text as necessary.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP3	Amendments to the wording of the policy - please see track changes document for detail.	9A	Amend paragraph 1 of Policy CNP3 to read as follows: “To respond to the local need for smaller dwellings and to achieve a balanced community new housing development should provide a mix of dwellings predominantly of 2 and 3 bedrooms to help address the current imbalance of stock.”	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP3	5 or more dwellings! What is the justification for 5 or more dwellings – if smaller homes are needed then in order to rebalance the housing stock, all new homes should be for 3 bedrooms or less. Criteria b) The policy should be more specific than this, so that it is clear what is expected from new development.	9B	Insert at the end of paragraph 1 of the Policy the following: “Exceptionally, development of larger homes will be supported where there is up-to-date evidence of a need for such homes.”	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP3	Amendments to the wording of the policy - please see track changes document for detail.	9C	Delete the first part of paragraph 2 of the Policy and part a). Adapt part b) to read as a stand-alone paragraph following paragraph 1 to read as follows: “The housing mix proposed should also be of a type that reflects the requirements set out in the Charlton Parish Housing Needs Assessment (2019) or other up-to-date evidence of local need.”	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.4.3		9D	In paragraph 8.4.3 line 7 of the supporting text delete the words “an appropriate level of future” and replace with the words “the nature and type of future”.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.4.4		9E	In paragraph 8.4.4 line 2 replace the word “starter” with the word “smaller”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.4.9 & 8.4.10		9F	Relocate paragraphs 8.4.9 and 8.4.10 to precede Policy CNP3.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP4	There is not locally distinctive element to this policy. Development within the settlement boundary, including for residential care and nursing homes would be covered by COM2, therefore this policy could be deleted. The policy title refers to ‘retirement’ homes, but the policy only refers to residential care.	10A	Retitle Policy CNP4 as “Retirement Living, Residential Care and Extra Care	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP4	There is not locally distinctive element to this policy. Development within the settlement boundary, including for residential care and nursing homes would be covered by COM2, therefore this policy could be deleted. The policy title refers to ‘retirement’ homes, but the policy only refers to residential care.	10B	Reword Policy CNP4 introductory paragraph to read: “Development for new build, redevelopment or change of use providing retirement living, residential care or extra care homes will be permitted ...”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP4	Criteria c and d) These would be addressed through CNP14 on Design and do not need to be repeated here.	10C	Delete clause d) and renumber remaining clauses.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP4	Criteria f) Energy efficiency is covered by building regulations and does not need to be repeated in the policy.	10C	Delete clause f) and renumber remaining clauses.	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.4.11		10D	Reword supporting text at paragraph 8.4.11 line 1 to read: “...Charlton’s population is ageing with the proportion of adults over 65 expected to rise over the plan period from 25.6% of the population in 2015 to 28.7% of the population by 2020	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
					and to over one third by the end of the plan period. The....”	
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP5	This policy in not locally distinctive and repeats Local Plan policy E2, therefore this policy could be deleted. Criteria 2a) and b) do not need repeating here as the issues are addressed in CNP5 and CNP12. Criteria 2 c) and d) This repeats policy E2, and is therefore not needed.	11A	In Policy CNP5 Line 2 delete the words ‘inappropriate development’ and revise text to read: “...against development with an adverse impact on landscape character”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Gladman Developments	Object	CNP5	This policy sets out that Charlton’s landscape and countryside is to be protected against inappropriate development. This approach is contrary to the Framework which does not propose such protection of the countryside, which instead seeks for its character and beauty to be recognised, with policies contributing to and enhancing the natural and local environment. Development can often be accommodated in the countryside, adjacent to settlements without adverse impacts on the landscape and its character with appropriate mitigation measures. Development proposals should be considered on a case by case basis where the merits of such are considered in the planning balance.	11B	Revise rest of the Policy following to delete current sections 1 and 2 and replace with the following to read: “Development will only be permitted where it protects, conserves or enhances: a) The landscape setting ... the Charlton Character Appraisal and Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment and b) Local landscape features such as ... historical value.”	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP5	This policy in not locally distinctive and repeats Local Plan policy E2, therefore this policy could be deleted. Criteria 2a) and b) do not need repeating here as the issues are addressed in CNP5 and CNP12. Criteria 2 c) and d) This repeats policy E2, and is therefore not needed.	11B	Revise rest of the Policy following to delete current sections 1 and 2 and replace with the following to read: “Development will only be permitted where it protects, conserves or enhances: a) The landscape setting ... the Charlton Character Appraisal and Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment and b) Local landscape features such as ... historical value.”	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.6.1	Amendments to the wording of the text-please see track changes document for detail. A map showing the landscape character appraisal areas would be helpful here.	11C	Paragraph 8.6.1 line 1 – revise start to read: “The Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment sets out full details....”	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP5	In the justification of the policy the text would benefit from being in the supporting text to signpost the reader to the LCA.	11D	Relocate text from CNP5 Policy Box under ‘Justification from Evidence Base’ starting ‘Specific to Charlton’ into new paragraphs following paragraph 8.6.1 of supporting text.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 10	This map appears to be showing the land use of the land and the quality of the agricultural land in the plan area, and not the Landscape character not a landscape assessment. The map is not referred to in the text. In the key, there is no colour showing if there is any priority habitat. This could be removed and replaced with the map showing the Landscape Character Area. TVBC can help with the mapping in the final document if required.	11E	Replace Fig 10 with an illustration showing the Landscape Character Areas from the TVLCA.	Accept Examiners Modification
Gladman Developments	Object	CNP6	Gladman raise concerns with this policy as it is our interpretation that this policy is seeking to extend the adopted Local Plan Local Gap, a Local Gap determined on the evidence at that time. Gladman submit that new development can often be located in the countryside without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character and as such this proposed extension of the Local Gap is therefore inappropriate. Further, if this is not the intended interpretation of the policy and it is only intended to apply where Local	12A	Reword Part 1 of Policy CNP6 to read: “The village lies adjacent to the ‘Local Gap’ between Andover and the Pentons which is subject to adopted Local Plan Policy E3. Development on the western and south western edges of Charlton village particularly major housing development and taller or larger buildings and structures will only be permitted where: 1) A landscape and visual impact appraisal demonstrates that the development would not be detrimental to the openness of or views to and from the Local Gap between Charlton and Penton Mewsey. 2) The edge of the built-up area is reinforced through good design and appropriate landscape	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
			Plan Policy E3 already applies, this would be repetition contrary to Paragraph 16(f) of the Framework.		planting and intrusive development is avoided.” Retain current section 3 as an unnumbered paragraph following 2) with wording amended as follows: “Proposals in and adjoining the Local Gap for agriculture and forestry-related development, playing fields, allotments and other open land uses that might benefit local communities and help preserve the separation between settlements and the retention of their individual identities will be supported.”	
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP6	This repeats Local Plan policy E3 and therefore does not need repeating in this plan.	12A	Reword Part 1 of Policy CNP6 to read: “The village lies adjacent to the ‘Local Gap’ between Andover and the Pentons which is subject to adopted Local Plan Policy E3. Development on the western and south western edges of Charlton village particularly major housing development and taller or larger buildings and structures will only be permitted where: 1) A landscape and visual impact appraisal demonstrates that the development would not be detrimental to the openness of or views to and from the Local Gap between Charlton and Penton Mewsey. 2) The edge of the built-up area is reinforced through good design and appropriate landscape planting and intrusive development is avoided.” Retain current section 3 as an unnumbered paragraph following 2) with wording amended as follows: “Proposals in and adjoining the Local Gap for agriculture and forestry-related development, playing fields, allotments and other open land uses that might benefit local communities and help preserve the separation between settlements and the retention of their individual identities will be supported.”	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.7		12B	Change the subheading to the section and the title to the policy to “Supporting the Local Gap” or similar	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.7.2	The first sentence of this paragraph does need repeating in the plan.	12C	Delete paragraph 8.7.2 and revise to read: “The CNP evidence base containing the character appraisal and the viewpoint assessment both highlight the quality of the landscape and views around the Local Gap on the west side of Charlton and it is important that development on the western edges of the village supports the purposes of the Local Gap and strengthens its role in preserving the separation of Charlton from Penton Mewsey and retaining individual identities.”	Accept Examiners Modification
Hampshire County Council	Object	CNP7	Hampshire County Council (HCC) in its role, as both a public landowner and service provider, supports the aspiration of Policy CNP7. Notwithstanding its support for the policy’s intentions, the County Council is concerned that, as currently written, the order of the paragraphs in draft Policy CNP7 does not allow sufficient flexibility to facilitate change within the Plan period to contribute to achieving sustainable development in line with the NPPF. The County Council would be mindful to overcome its objection if the policy wording is amended to allowing flexibility in the wording. This would still seek to protect the important views but in a way that would allow for appropriate changes during the Plan period.	13A	In Policy CNP7 Paragraph 1 lines1-2 – delete the words “following notable” and insert after the word “views” in line 2 the words “of moderate and significant value”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP7	Amendments to the wording of the policy - please see track changes document for detail.	13A	In Policy CNP7 Paragraph 1 lines1-2 – delete the words “following notable” and insert after the word “views” in line 2 the words “of moderate and significant value”.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP7	Second paragraph is not required to be repeated in the policy.	13B	Delete second paragraph to Policy CNP7	Accept Examiners Modification
Gladman Developments	Object	CNP7	<p>Gladman strongly object to this policy seeking for development not to introduce any prominent built form beyond the settlement boundary. It is not clear how this would be applied by a decision maker on a consistent effective basis and as such is contrary to the Framework. Further concern is raised in relation to the policy seeking to preserve a myriad of 'important views' with little evidence other than a photograph of each view in support. Gladman submits that new development can often be located in such areas without eroding the views considered to be important to the local community and can be appropriately designed to take into consideration the wider landscape features of the surrounding area to provide new views and vistas. In addition, as set out in case law, to be valued and worthy of such protection, a view would need to have some form of physical attribute. These policies must allow a decision maker to come to a view as to whether particular locations contain physical attributes that would 'take it out of the ordinary' rather than selecting views which may not have any landscape significance, based solely on community support. Views can change annually, seasonally, monthly, daily and even hourly. The evidence supporting the identified views is vague and does not provide detailed, substantive</p>	13B	Delete second paragraph to Policy CNP7	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
			evidence in respect of the precise nature of the views to be protected. It appears instead to be an attempt to restrict all development on the edge of Charlton and Andover contrary to the requirements of the Framework. As a consequence, it is not clear how the policy could be interpreted by a decision maker, having regard to Paragraph 16 of the Framework.			
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP7	Third paragraph 'outside the settlement boundary' The policy should also apply to development inside the settlement boundary as these could have an impact on some of the views.	13C	In Policy CNP7 Paragraph 3 line 1 – delete the words “outside the settlement boundary” and in line 3 the words “identified” and “as”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Gladman Developments	Object	CNP7	Gladman strongly object to this policy seeking for development not to introduce any prominent built form beyond the settlement boundary. It is not clear how this would be applied by a decision maker on a consistent effective basis and as such is contrary to the Framework. Further concern is raised in relation to the policy seeking to preserve a myriad of ‘important views’ with little evidence other than a photograph of each view in support. Gladman submits that new development can often be located in such areas without eroding the views considered to be important to the local community and can be appropriately designed to take into consideration the wider landscape features of the surrounding area to provide new views and vistas. In addition, as set out in case law, to be valued and worthy of such protection, a view would need to have some form of	13D	Incorporate the Viewpoint Assessment, including the additional justification at Appendix 2 below, into the CNP as Appendix 1A (as it is part of the evidence base listed in Appendix 1 to the CNP). (A summary of the Viewpoint Assessment eg the map indicating the views and the description and significance of each view would suffice). Reference the new Appendix in the Contents of the CNP.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
			<p>physical attribute. These policies must allow a decision maker to come to a view as to whether particular locations contain physical attributes that would 'take it out of the ordinary' rather than selecting views which may not have any landscape significance, based solely on community support. Views can change annually, seasonally, monthly, daily and even hourly. The evidence supporting the identified views is vague and does not provide detailed, substantive evidence in respect of the precise nature of the views to be protected. It appears instead to be an attempt to restrict all development on the edge of Charlton and Andover contrary to the requirements of the Framework. As a consequence, it is not clear how the policy could be interpreted by a decision maker, having regard to Paragraph 16 of the Framework.</p>			
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.8.3	<p>Amendments to the wording of the text for clarity - please see track changes document for detail.</p>	13E	<p>Reword the first line of paragraph 8.8.3 to read: "The policy seeks to protect the high quality landscape setting and sense of place of the village."</p>	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP8	<p>The supporting text could signpost to the Local Plan Policies rather than repeating them in this policy. Bullet 1 - This is partially covered in CNP14 on design in 2, bullet 2. This text could be incorporated into that bullet. Bullet 2 - repeats Local Plan Policy E6 and is therefore not required. Bullet 4 - This is covered in CNP9. Bullet 5 - repeats Local Plan Policy E5 and is therefore not required.</p>	14A	<p>Revise the wording at the start of Policy CNP8 to read: "Major development proposals will be required to :...."</p>	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP8	The supporting text could signpost to the Local Plan Policies rather than repeating them in this policy. . Bullet 2 - repeats Local Plan Policy E6 and is therefore not required.	14B	Revise start of second bullet to read: "Create new natural green corridors using landscape features....."	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP8	The supporting text could signpost to the Local Plan Policies rather than repeating them in this policy.	14C	Revise start of bullet point 3 to read: "Improve the green environment by adding trees..."	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP8	The supporting text could signpost to the Local Plan Policies rather than repeating them in this policy. Bullet 5 - repeats Local Plan Policy E5 and is therefore not required.	14D	Delete bullet point 5 in its entirety.	Accept Examiners Modification
Hampshire County Council	Comment	CNP9	HCC in its role, as both a public landowner and service provider, supports the principle of Policy CNP9 but considers that the wording of Policy CNP9 should have regard to national policies set out in the Countryside Rights of Way Act in order to avoid the use of ambiguous terminology.	15A	Policy CNP9 paragraph 1 lines 1-2 reword as follows: "The creation of new and enhancement of existing permissive paths and Public Rights of Way will be supported. Development proposals will be supported..."	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP9	Second paragraph is covered in Policy T1d) of the Local Plan and does not need repeating here.	15A	Policy CNP9 paragraph 1 lines 1-2 reword as follows: "The creation of new and enhancement of existing permissive paths and Public Rights of Way will be supported. Development proposals will be supported..."	Accept Examiners Modification
Hampshire County Council	Comment	CNP9	The County Council recommends that draft Policy CNP9 removes the reference to 'enjoyment of', in order to align with the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Although the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 does refer to 'enjoyment' in some parts, this is in relation to the diversion of, restriction of, improvement to, or specific designations such as Sites of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI's) or	15B	Policy CNP9 paragraph 1 line 4 delete the words "or enjoyment of it".	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
			Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB's) rather than in all cases.			
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP9	The text in the justification section should be moved to the supporting text for clarity	15C	Relocate text from CNP9 Policy Box under 'Justification from Evidence Base' starting 'Permissive or Public Rights of Way' into new paragraph following paragraph 8.10.4 of supporting text.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP10	First paragraph. Not all development will need to demonstrate a net gain. 'Where required' would be more appropriate wording. Paragraph 1.	16A	Revise the 1st paragraph of clause 1 in Policy CNP10 to read: "In pursuit of this requirement development proposals which comply with the following principles will be supported:"	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP10	Paragraph 1i) This is addressed in Local Plan Policy E5 and does not need repeating here.	16B	in clause 1i) – delete the first sentence and reword the clause to read: "Where loss of biodiversity is unavoidable any loss shall be mitigated on site.....in accordance with a scheme which shall....." (Note the word 'planting' in the penultimate line of the policy is superfluous and should be deleted as planting may not be required)	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP10	Paragraph 1 iii) Is there scrubland in the plan area?	16C	In clause 1 iii) line 1 replace the word "scrubland" with the word "habitat"	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP10	iv) What is the evidence for this? Also if an applicant put up an owl box and a bat box, but these species were not present, it would meet the tests of this policy, but would not necessarily deliver any net gain.	16D	Reword clause 1iv) to read: "Habitat provision such as hedgehog corridors, bat boxes and bird boxes (particularly those suited to use by owls, swifts, swallows and house martins) should be installed...."	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP10	vi) Surface water Drainage hierarchy. Is this explained in the plan? This could be included in a Glossary of terms.	16E	Delete clause 1vi)	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP10	Paragraph 2. 'replaced at a ratio of at least 2:1' What is the evidence for this requirement?	16F	Revise clause 2 line 3-4 to read: "...are to be replaced, generally at a ratio of 2:1".	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	CNP10		16G	Reword clause 3 to read: "Development proposals in the area covered by the River Anton Strategy will be supported where they demonstrate how they have taken account of the issues raised in the strategy and where...."	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP11	Bullet 6 - This is covered in Local Plan policy E2 and therefore does not need repeating here. Bullet 7 - A flood risk assessment will need to be submitted with any applications within FZ 2 or 3, and so does not need repeating here. This is also addressed in Local Plan policy E7. Bullet 8 - This repeats policy CNP7. Bullet 9 - This repeats the local Plan policy E5 and policy CNP10.	17A	In Policy CNP11 delete criteria 6-9.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP11	Bullet 3 - This might not be in the gift of the applicant.	17B	Reword criteria 3 to read: "Mitigate the impact of highway infrastructure".	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	CNP11		17C	Renumber the criteria accordingly.	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Figure 17		17D	Identify on Fig 17 the area around the lakes which will be subject to Policy CNP11.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP11	Policy implementation - This is not a land use planning matter, but would be better suited in a community aspirations section of the plan.	17E	Relocate the text from the 'Policy Intention' section of the CNP11 policy box to Appendix 2 as a community aspiration.	Accept Examiners Modification
Mr Hand	Comment	Para 8.12.1	Charlton Lakes are managed by Places for People Leisure and not by TVBC	17F	Review the accuracy of statements made on the management of the Lakes in paragraph 8.12.1 and of Fig 17 as referred to in Regulation 16 representations and correct as necessary.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP12	Amendments to the wording of the policy- please see track changes document for detail. This is dealt with in the NPPF and does not need to be repeated here. Final paragraph - This is dealt with in the NPPF and does not need repeating here. The supporting text includes signposting to the NPPF and this is sufficient.	18A	Policy CNP12 Paragraph 1 – delete all except first sentence. Add to line 1 after the words “map below” the words “and in the LGS Assessment at Appendix 1B”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 20	The detailed mapping should be in this document, as it is allocating the sites.	18A	Policy CNP12 Paragraph 1 – delete all except first sentence. Add to line 1 after the words “map below” the words “and in the LGS Assessment at Appendix 1B”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP12	Amendments to the wording of the policy- please see track changes document for detail. This is dealt with in the NPPF and does not need to be repeated here. Final paragraph - This is dealt with in the NPPF and does not need repeating here. The supporting text includes signposting to the NPPF and this is sufficient.	18B	Policy CNP12 last paragraph delete everything after first sentence.	Accept Examiners Modification
Mr Hand	Comment	CNP12	A major problem arises in respect of recording the existence of Charlton Village Green. The Village Green straddles the Charlton Stream broadly stretching from the first property in Carters Meadow, then across the road and down to the watercress beds now named Charlies Lake. The Village Green exists as a major feature of Charlton Village. See representation for evidence to support this representation	18C	Revise footnote to the list of sites in Policy CNP12 to read: “Areas ‘c’, ‘d’, and ‘e’ although not formally designated as village green are what remain of Charlton’s village green and are therefore historically significant LGS”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP12	Amendments to the wording of the policy- please see track changes document for detail. This is dealt with in the NPPF and does not need to be repeated here. Final paragraph - This is	18C	Revise footnote to the list of sites in Policy CNP12 to read: “Areas ‘c’, ‘d’, and ‘e’ although not formally designated as village green are what remain of Charlton’s village	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
			dealt with in the NPPF and does not need repeating here. The supporting text includes signposting to the NPPF and this is sufficient.		green and are therefore historically significant LGS”.	
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.13.4 & 8.13.5	This is dealt with in the NPPF and does not need to be repeated here.	18D	Delete paragraph 8.13.4 and all of paragraph 8.13.5. Replace paragraph 8.13.4 with the following wording: “Once designated the LGS will be managed in a manner consistent with that applicable within designated Green Belt.	Accept Examiners Modification
Mr Hand	Comment	Appendix 1B	I consider the Local Green Spaces document to be an important appendix to the CNP submission draft, and note with concern that it is not listed with other appendices on page 2 of the document. Some confusion has been introduced because areas covered by the document are listed numerically on page 3, but alphabetically on other pages. In addition there are no page numbers of this 36 page document.	18E	Add the LGS assessment, including the detailed maps of each site as Appendix 1B to the plan (as it is part of the evidence base listed in Appendix 1). This could be in tabular form. Reference the new Appendix in the Contents of the CNP.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.16.8	Density of development in Charlton should be appropriate to a village environment and reflective of that in each Character Area! What does this mean in practice?	19A	Amend start of paragraph 8.16.8 to read: “The plan sets out...”	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.16.9		19B	Amend paragraph 8.16.9 to read: “Charlton’s historic past is evidenced in the designs, features and materials of its built environment which establishes its village character. The built environment policies are intended to ensure development respects this character developed over time”.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP14	Paragraph 1. This policy should apply to all development in the area. 'In keeping with is a nebulous term and 'to reflect or in sympathy with' would be more appropriate.	19C	Revise wording of CNP14 clause 1 to read: "Where permission is required all development should be to a high standard of design to respect the character of the area....."	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	CNP14		19D	Delete bullets 4 and 5 in clause 2.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP14	Charlton Character Appraisal' It would be helpful if this was appended to the document as an annex.	19E	Add into Appendix 1, as Appendix 1C, the Development Guidelines identified in the Charlton Character Appraisal.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP15	Bullet 1 This is addressed in Local Plan Policy E7 and therefore does not need to be repeated here. Bullet 2 - '5 new dwellings must secure at least 10%' What is the evidence to support this? Planning policies are unable to insist on this without the evidence to support the policy. Bullet 3 - This is addressed in Local Plan Policy COM15 and therefore does not need to be repeated here.	20A	Reword part 1 of Policy CNP15 as follows: "All new developments are encouraged to: • Minimise overall carbon impact during construction • Achieve water efficiency standards set out in the Local Plan • Provide for sustainable transport (including electric car charging) and • Use renewable energy technologies for energy supply with developments encouraged to secure at least 10% of their total regulated energy from renewable or low carbon sources."	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	CNP15		20B	Insert in CNP15 part 2 line 1 after the word "water" the word "facilities"	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	8.17.3	This is covered in building regulations and the planning system cannot require that developments achieve 'excellent'	20C	Reword paragraph 8.17.3 of the supporting text to read: "Developers are encouraged to demonstrate how they have addressed the principles of minimising energy use and overall carbon impact during construction and in occupation/use and are encouraged to take opportunities to exceed Building Regulation Standards where possible."	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	8.17.4	This is covered in building regulations and the planning system cannot require that developments achieve 'excellent'	20C	Delete Paragraph 8.17.4 which is relocated in part into the policy.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP16	Bullet 4 - This is addressed in Local Plan Policy E9 and therefore does not need to be repeated here. Bullet 5 - This is addressed in Local supporting text in paragraph 7.75 and therefore does not need to be repeated here.	21A	Renumber Policy CNP16 sections 1-5	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP16	Bullet 4 - This is addressed in Local Plan Policy E9 and therefore does not need to be repeated here. Bullet 5 - This is addressed in Local supporting text in paragraph 7.75 and therefore does not need to be repeated here.	21B	In new section 3 line 3 insert the word "Local" after the word 'designated' and insert the letter 'C' after the word 'areas' in line 4 of the section.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP16	Bullet 4 - This is addressed in Local Plan Policy E9 and therefore does not need to be repeated here. Bullet 5 - This is addressed in Local supporting text in paragraph 7.75 and therefore does not need to be repeated here.	21C	In new section 4 reword the start to read: "Proposals affecting a heritage asset should demonstrate..."	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP16	Bullet 4 - This is addressed in Local Plan Policy E9 and therefore does not need to be repeated here. Bullet 5 - This is addressed in Local supporting text in paragraph 7.75 and therefore does not need to be repeated here.	21D	In new section 5 delete the first sentence.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP16	Bullet 4 - This is addressed in Local Plan Policy E9 and therefore does not need to be repeated here. Bullet 5 - This is addressed in Local supporting text in paragraph 7.75 and therefore does not need to be repeated here.	21E	Reword the sentence commencing 'Where the proposed site' as follows: "Where the proposed site ...particularly the allocated site CHA1 and in close proximity....medieval village the development proposals should be informed by a programme of archaeological investigation including a desk based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation. The County..."	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP17	Where is the evidence of the need for a new community hall? Second Paragraph - This is addressed in Local Plan Policy COM15 and therefore does not need to be repeated here. Contributions towards these facilities would normally be through the community infrastructure levy that all new residential development has to pay.	22A	Reword paragraph 2 of policy CNP17 to read: "Major residential developments must provide or contribute towards formal and informal sport and recreation facilities in relation to the individual site where this is necessary to meet adopted standards for the increased population generated by the development. Contributions must be directly, fairly and reasonably related to the development and will be secured through planning obligations."	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.20.6		22B	Insert two new paragraphs of supporting text after 8.20.5 as follows: "8.20.6 Test Valley has implemented a Community Infrastructure Levy that applies to all residential development. However, the CIL expenditure excludes the provision of or contribution towards site-specific community facilities, including sport and recreation, necessary to meet the specific needs arising from individual sites. Policy CNP17 seeks to ensure this provision is made through planning obligations."	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.20.7		22B	Insert two new paragraphs of supporting text after 8.20.5 as follows: 8.20.7 A clear need identified in the community surveys was for the provision of a new community hall to serve Charlton. In the 2018 survey 80% of residents supported the proposal. Policy CNP17 seeks to encourage its provision."	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 8.20.1		22C	Insert missing text at the foot of page 61 – (see the list provided by CPC in Appendix 1 below).	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP18	The policy should be rewritten to identify the community facilities, shops and local businesses that Local Plan policies LE10 and COM15 would cover. First	23A	Reword the first paragraph of Policy CNP18 to read: "Local shops and hospitality businesses particularly those registered as Assets of Community Value	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
			paragraph This is addressed in Local Plan Policy COM14 and therefore does not need to be repeated here. Second Paragraph - The policy also covers Assets of Community Value – are there any in the Plan area? Being on the ACV register only delays the sale of the property. If the asset is also a shop or community facility listed in the policy, then Local Plan Policy COM14 will apply and therefore this text does not need repeating.		are vital to the economic and social life of the Plan Area. Proposals that would result in their loss will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the tests in Policy COM14 of the Local Plan are met or: - Satisfactory alternative facilities are provided or - The proposed development would provide sufficient community benefit to outweigh the loss of the existing facility.” Delete paragraph 2 on page 67 in its entirety.	
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Appendix 2		23B	Include in CNP Appendix 2 - Community Aspirations, the intention to nominate Assets of Community Value	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP19	This policy as written is in conflict with Local Plan policies COM2, LE17 and LE17. Therefore this policy is in conflict with the Local Plan and does not add any locally distinctive criteria, and should therefore be deleted from the plan.	23C	Delete Policy CNP19. If the CPC wish to see a supportive policy retained emphasising support in particular for smaller enterprise developments, the wording set out in paragraph 6.8.21 x) above could be used along with appropriate supporting text.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP20	The issues raised in Criteria 1, 2, 4 and 5 are already addressed in Local Plan Policy T1 and does not need to be repeated in this plan. Bullet 2 change appropriate to required . Bullet 3 - It would not be reasonable for all development requiring planning permission, eg for a conservatory or a fence, therefore the word ‘appropriate’ would be better suited.	24A	Delete clauses 1 and 4 of Policy CNP20.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP20	The issues raised in Criteria 1, 2, 4 and 5 are already addressed in Local Plan Policy T1 and does not need to be repeated in this plan. Bullet 2 change appropriate to required . Bullet 3 - It would not be reasonable for all development requiring planning permission, eg for a conservatory or a fence, therefore the word 'appropriate' would be better suited.	24B	Renummer existing clause 3) as 1) and reword to read: "1. Development proposals for new dwellings and new commercial buildings should provide evidence to demonstrate....impact on: a. Traffic flow and highway safety in the village. b. LocationsFoxcotte Lane."	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP20	The issues raised in Criteria 1, 2, 4 and 5 are already addressed in Local Plan Policy T1 and does not need to be repeated in this plan. Bullet 2 change appropriate to required . Bullet 3 - It would not be reasonable for all development requiring planning permission, eg for a conservatory or a fence, therefore the word 'appropriate' would be better suited.	24C	Amalgamate clause 2) with clause 5), reword as follows and number as new clause 2): "2. Development proposals which include mitigation to improve road safety including traffic calming, new junction arrangements and dedicated pedestrian and cycle paths will be supported but should minimise... urbanising features."	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP21	This is covered in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement and the pre application advice note and is a matter for the council to lead. Therefore this does not need repeating in this plan.	25A	Retitle Policy CNP21 as "Delivery and local community engagement on major development proposals"	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP21	This is covered in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement and the pre application advice note and is a matter for the council to lead. Therefore this does not need repeating in this plan.	25B	Reword the first paragraph of the Policy to read: "In order to ensure a positive and structured engagement with the local community potential applicantsto follow the Local Community Consultation Protocol (See Appendix 5)."	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP21	This is covered in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement and the pre application advice note and is a matter for the council to lead.	25C	Reword the second bullet to read: "or any application for • 10 or more new homes or • A commercial development of more than 1000m2 floorspace or a site likely to have five or more employees."	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
			Therefore this does not need repeating in this plan.			
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Appendix 5	This is covered in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement and the pre application advice note and is a matter for the council to lead. Therefore this does not need repeating in this plan.	25D	Retitle Appendix 5 "Charlton Local Community Consultation Protocol" and review content to ensure it deals only with consultation with the CPC and local community. Either remove Section 4 of Appendix 5 or ensure it is compatible with the policy.	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Para 9.1.2		25E	Number the text at the top of page 72 as Paragraph "9.1.2". Reword line 2 of that paragraph after the words "local community" to read "in early development of planning proposals."	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Appendix 4		26	Add after paragraph c of Appendix 4 the following sentence: "d. Any review will follow the neighbourhood planning legislation and regulations applying at that time."	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	General		27	Make typographical and grammatical corrections as set out in Appendix 3 at the end of this report	Accept Examiners Modification
Modifications put forward by the Examiner	Modification	Referendum		28	I recommend to TVBC that the Charlton Neighbourhood Plan, modified as specified above, should proceed to a referendum based on the Charlton Neighbourhood Area as designated by the Borough Council on 8 August 2014 and subsequent amendment on 3 February 2020 to reflect the change in the Parish Council Boundary.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Mr Hand	Comment	General	I believe that the procedures call for the submission draft to be approved by the full parish council before being forwarded to the Borough Council. Having checked through the minutes, I have failed to find any record of the full parish council approving the submission draft.	4.1.2	One of the Regulation 16 representations has challenged the fact that there appeared to be no record of the Parish Council formally agreeing for the plan to be submitted to the Borough Council. As it is important that the plan is officially signed off by the qualifying body, particularly at the submission stage, I requested that CPC provide the minute adopting the plan for submission. This has been provided (see Appendix 1) and, although the minute postdates the actual submission, it confirms that the Parish Council has formally adopted the CNP for submission. 4.1.3 I am satisfied that the requirements set out in the Localism Act (2011) and in section 61F(1) and (2) of the TCPA (as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the PCPA) have been met.	No Modification required
Gladman Developments	Object	SEA	Gladman raise significant concerns that the need for a SEA has been screened out as the CNP allocates a site for development. The PPG is clear that in situations like this a SEA is likely to be required. It is the responsibility of the Council to ensure that all regulations appropriate to the nature and scope of the neighbourhood plan have been met. Having considered the responses of statutory consultees to the SEA Screening Assessment it is clear that the Council should have deviated from advice received. Historic England's response was that it did not have capacity to provide a response, whilst the Environment Agency (EA) mistakenly concluded that the CNP did not include any site allocations. The	5.4.24	I am satisfied that having examined the submitted SEA against the requirements of Schedule 2 of the EAPPR 2004, the report does meet all ten of the requirements for an environmental report, establishing a baseline, assessing impacts of alternatives against the baseline and sustainability objectives and presenting measures to offset the single identified significant adverse effect which might arise from the CNP. Provided those mitigation measures recommended are incorporated into the plan, the CNP and its SEA meet Basic Condition f) and g) and I am not persuaded that the SEA is so flawed procedurally or in terms of content that the examination cannot proceed. I therefore do not agree with Gladman Developments request that the plan should be withdrawn and, given	No Modification required

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
			<p>wording of this response suggests if it realised the plan did allocate a site its advice would have been different. The lack of response when the Council informed the EA of this mistake should not be relied upon to support the reasons not to undertake a SEA. Gladman consider that an SEA should have been undertaken and the fact that it has not to demonstrate that the proposals of the CNP would not lead to significant environmental effects when considered against the reasonable alternatives renders the CNP unlawful and therefore also unable to meet basic condition (e).</p>		<p>my assessment above and the fact that all stakeholders have had the opportunity to comment on the SEA and plan together, I do not consider that a public hearing needs to be convened in this instance to consider the matter.</p>	

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Gladman Developments	Object	CNP2	<p>This policy proposes to allocate a site for 50 dwellings. Paragraph 8.3.6 suggests that this is a result of a site assessment undertaken using detailed criteria however Gladman have not been able to locate this document. A key piece of evidence informing the site selection has not been available during the consultation and as such it has not been possible to ascertain whether the assumptions made in selecting that site are correct. This issue is compounded by the fact that undertaking a full SEA has been screened out, an issue that will be returned to in Section 5. Regardless of the process undertaken and the lack of evidence available to support the determination this is the most suitable site to allocate, this would not meet the suggested housing needs of the area. There is much discussion throughout the submitted CNP regarding the identity of Charlton and its role in relation to Andover however for the purposes of the Local Plan it is determined to be a part of Andover, as it is contiguous with its settlement boundary. This is a large factor in the results of the work undertaken by AECOM in determining that the residual minimum housing needs of the neighbourhood area is 200 dwellings, when removing the commitment at the Goch Way site. Section 8.2 of the CNP discusses the housing requirement and refers to a 34% increase in housing being disproportionate when compared to the majority of village of this size. It</p>	6.8.3	<p>ii) Gladman Developments Ltd., in their Regulation 16 representations, object that the evidence to support the selection of the allocated site CHA1 is not present and it is therefore impossible to conclude that site CHA1 is the most appropriate. In the light of this representation, I requested CPC to provide the site assessment. This has now been uploaded as a document on the TVBC website. It is clear to me from the document that the housing sites assessment was carried out according to a robust methodology considering a wide range of criteria and that the conclusion regarding the allocation of site CHA1 was justified given the information available to CPC at the time.</p>	No Modification required

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
			<p>must be considered in the context of its relationship to Andover. The Local Plan directs a significant proportion of growth to Andover, a built area to which Charlton is considered to be a part. If not seeking to support the level of growth suggested by the evidence serious questions have to be raised whether it can be considered that basic condition (d) can be met. Before the CNP can rule out assisting Andover the strategic policies of the Local Plan and restricting policies for further development, there needs to be element of certainty that the housing target of Andover will be met in the remainder of the plan period.</p>			

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Mr Hand	Comment	CNP12	Area c – Land to the front of the Church and extending southwards to be council owned, and not privately owned as shown. The description does confirm that the land to the front of the church was part of a larger Village Green - along with areas d and e as can be seen on historic mapping.	8.6.13	v) A respondent at the Regulation 16 stage considers that the references to areas d) and e) being historically Charlton's village green are imprecise. The respondent also argues that area c) should be included as part of the village green. I have checked with TVBC and following consultation with HCC they have confirmed that the land is not formally designated village green, although it is true that the areas were formerly part of the village green and inasmuch as they continue to hold that character and historic significance they are appropriately designated LGS. The respondent raises a number of detailed inaccuracies regarding the LGS assessment. These should be corrected if they are inaccurate and I agree that it is important for the LGS assessment, as it defines the sites, to be included in the appendices to the plan even if only in summary tabular form.	Accept Examiners Modification
Mr Hand	Comment	CNP12	Area d – the land to the front of Carters meadow forms part of the Charlton Village green and is not privately owned as shown. The Village Green provides residents with an area of 'tranquillity' in the centre of their village and should be recorded as such	8.6.13	v) A respondent at the Regulation 16 stage considers that the references to areas d) and e) being historically Charlton's village green are imprecise. The respondent also argues that area c) should be included as part of the village green. I have checked with TVBC and following consultation with HCC they have confirmed that the land is not formally designated village green, although it is true that the areas were formerly part of the village green and inasmuch as they continue to hold that character and historic significance they are appropriately designated LGS. The respondent raises a number of detailed inaccuracies regarding the LGS	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
					assessment. These should be corrected if they are inaccurate and I agree that it is important for the LGS assessment, as it defines the sites, to be included in the appendices to the plan even if only in summary tabular form.	
Mr Hand	Comment	CNP12	Area e – the land in front of 111 and 112 Charlton Village / Brooks Cottager forms part of the Village green and is not privately owned as shown.	8.6.13	v) A respondent at the Regulation 16 stage considers that the references to areas d) and e) being historically Charlton’s village green are imprecise. The respondent also argues that area c) should be included as part of the village green. I have checked with TVBC and following consultation with HCC they have confirmed that the land is not formally designated village green, although it is true that the areas were formerly part of the village green and inasmuch as they continue to hold that character and historic significance they are appropriately designated LGS. The respondent raises a number of detailed inaccuracies regarding the LGS assessment. These should be corrected if they are inaccurate and I agree that it is important for the LGS assessment, as it defines the sites, to be included in the appendices to the plan even if only in summary tabular form.	Accept Examiners Modification
Mr Hand	Comment	CNP12	Area g – I contend that land of Hengest Close has Amenity Value and should be recorded as such on Page 4	8.6.13	v) A respondent at the Regulation 16 stage considers that the references to areas d) and e) being historically Charlton’s village green are imprecise. The respondent also argues that area c) should be included as part of the village green. I have checked with TVBC and following consultation with HCC they have confirmed that the land is not formally designated village green, although it is true that the areas were	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
					<p>formerly part of the village green and inasmuch as they continue to hold that character and historic significance they are appropriately designated LGS. The respondent raises a number of detailed inaccuracies regarding the LGS assessment. These should be corrected if they are inaccurate and I agree that it is important for the LGS assessment, as it defines the sites, to be included in the appendices to the plan even if only in summary tabular form.</p>	

Please note that as a result of the Examiner's recommended modifications, consequential changes also need to be made to the Plan in order to avoid factual errors and inaccuracies (Schedule 4B s.12(6) Town and Country Planning Act 1990). Such modifications are not all listed in the Schedule above. Furthermore, other minor changes such as typographical and factual updates are also not all listed in the schedule.

Summary of remaining comments made that require no action.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Action
Gladman Developments	Object	General	As the CNP is proposing to follow the same timescales as the adopted Local Plan it is anticipated that the neighbourhood plan will need reviewing following the adoption of the Local Plan review. As suggested that the housing requirement is expected to increase, drafting sufficient flexibility into the policies now and planning for sufficient housing could reduce the need for such a review. Otherwise, conflicting policies will be superseded under Section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.	No action required
Gladman Developments	Object	SEA	Gladman raise significant concerns that the need for a SEA has been screened out as the CNP allocates a site for development. The PPG is clear that in situations like this a SEA is likely to be required. It is the responsibility of the Council to ensure that all regulations appropriate to the nature and scope of the neighbourhood plan have been met. Having considered the responses of statutory consultees to the SEA Screening Assessment it is clear that the Council should have deviated from advice received. Historic England's response was that it did not have capacity to provide a response, whilst the Environment Agency (EA) mistakenly concluded that the CNP did not include any site allocations. The wording of this response suggests if it realised the plan did allocate a site its advice would have been different. The lack of response when the Council informed the EA of this mistake should not be relied upon to support the reasons not to undertake a SEA. Gladman consider that an SEA should have been undertaken and the fact that it has not to demonstrate that the proposals of the CNP would not lead to significant environmental effects when considered against the reasonable alternatives renders the CNP unlawful and therefore also unable to meet basic condition (e).	No action required
Gladman Developments	Object	Basic Conditions	As currently drafted, we submit that the CNP does not meet basic conditions (a), (d) and (e) and as such the neighbourhood plan should not be able to proceed to referendum. Due to the nature and scale of these concerns we respectfully request the Examiner to open the examination up and hold a public hearing session as part of the examination to discuss these issues. Should the Examiner agree and hold a hearing session we request to be invited to participate at that session.	No action required
Hampshire County Council	Comment	CNP13	The Lead Local Flood Authority are pleased to see a robust policy (CNP13) with regards to the use of SuDS and permissible development in flood prone areas - Following the comments made by the County Council as LLFA on the pre-submission plan in September 2019, the County Council is happy the Parish has responded to this feedback with appropriate amendments to the	No action required

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Action
			Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore the County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority has no further comments to make.	
Hampshire County Council	Comment	CNP18	The County Council supports the retention of local shops and businesses as this will enhance the sustainability and viability of the village and encourage the use of non-car modes of transport for short, local convenience trips.	No action required
Hampshire County Council	Comment	CNP20	The Parish should continue to liaise with the County Council with regards to traffic management initiatives for the Borough. Policy text 1: The County Council consider that this should reference public transport as a mode of transportation.	No action required
Hampshire County Council	Comment	Community Aspirations	Objective – To retain the bus service as exists: Hampshire County Council is happy to work with residents and bus operators to maintain services through the village, subject to viability/available funding.	No action required
Hampshire County Council	Comment	Community Aspirations	Objective – Improve Off Road Parking: Hampshire County Council is happy to continue working with the Parish to ensure appropriate traffic calming is implemented taking into consideration highway polices including engineering standards.	No action required
P E Snow	Support	CNP2	We fully support the housing allocation contained in Policy CNP2 for approximately 50 new dwellings on land top the north of Goch Way	No action required
P E Snow	Support	CNP3	We fully support the housing mix as contained within policy CNP3	No action required
P E Snow	Support	Basic conditions Statement	We fully support the proposals as contained in policy CNP2	No action required
P E Snow	Support	Basic conditions Statement	We fully support the proposals as contained in policy CNP3	No action required
National Grid	Comment	General	National Grid has identified that it has no record of assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.	No action required
Southern Water	No Comment	General	I confirm that we have reviewed the document and are pleased to note that our comments on the Pre-Submission Plan have been addressed. We therefore have no further comments to make, and look forward to being kept informed of Charlton Neighbourhood Plan's progress.	No action required

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Action
Highways England	No Comment	General	We have reviewed the above consultation and have 'No Comments'.	No action required
Mr Hand	Comment	General	I accept that the full heading 'Charlton Neighbourhood Development Plan' may be abbreviated down to Charlton neighbourhood plan for general use. However I contend that, now the submission draft stage has been reached the front cover should carry the full descriptive 'Charlton Neighbourhood Development Plan' heading	No action required
Mr Hand	Comment	Para 6.1	In a letter dated 13 September 2015 [REDACTED] confirms that 84% of the recent survey returns expect Green Spaces to be protected. However, this fact does not appear along with other Key findings (CNP page 15).	No action required
Mr Hand	Comment	General	In the absence of a return address being provided, the regulation 14 consultation questionnaire attracted only 25 returns – on which the steering group have framed / based the Charlton Neighbourhood Plan.	No action required
Mr Hand	Comment	Local Green Spaces Assessment Evidence Document	Area g – I contend that land of Hengest Close has Amenity Value and should be recorded as such on Page 4	No action required
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP1	This policy repeats Local Plan Policy COM2 and is not required in this plan.	No action required
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP5	This policy is not locally distinctive and repeats Local Plan policy E2, therefore this policy could be deleted. Criteria 2a) and b) do not need repeating here as the issues are addressed in CNP5 and CNP12. Criteria 2 c) and d) This repeats policy E2, and is therefore not needed. In the justification of the policy the text would benefit from being in the supporting text to signpost the reader to the LCA.	No action required
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.9.1	Not all development will need to demonstrate a net gain. 'Where required' would be more appropriate wording	No action required
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.15.2	This is dealt with in the NPPF and does not need repeating here.	No action required
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.15.3	This is dealt with in the NPPF and does not need repeating here.	No action required

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Action
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CNP14	Paragraph 4 - This may not require consent and therefore this element of the policy would not apply.	No action required
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.18.1	This does not need to be repeated in the plan	No action required
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 8.19.1	This repeats part of paragraph 8.18.2 and the NPPF, and does not need to be repeated in the plan.	No action required
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Appendix 3	This is addressed in the Local plan in policy COM15 and does not need repeating in this plan	No action required
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Appendix 5	This is covered in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement and the pre application advice note and is a matter for the council to lead. Therefore this does not need repeating in this plan.	No action required