

## Summaries of the written representations submitted to the Independent Examiner.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Environment Agency	Comment	Para 5.2.8	Section 5.2.8 refers to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). BNG forms part of the forthcoming Environment Bill. This will legislate for developments to deliver at least 10% BNG. It is recommended that Policy EL6 is enhanced to reflect this.
Environment Agency	Comment	Map A4	Map A4 identifies surface water flooding risks within the neighbourhood plan area. However, there is no map identifying the fluvial flood risk. We would recommend including a separate map identifying this to ensure there is no confusion regarding these separate flooding sources in the area. Our 'Flood Map for Planning' identifies fluvial flood risk areas and can be accessed here - <a href="https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/">https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</a> (a pdf map can be downloaded).
Southern Water	Object	HD6	Policy HD6 seeks to prevent development in flood zones 2 and 3. However, it should be recognised that that water treatment and supply infrastructure may sometimes need to be developed in flood risk areas. By their nature water treatment works are often located close to watercourses in order to abstract water for treatment and supply. In the life time of the plan, existing works may need to be upgraded or extended to provide an increase in treatment capacity to service new development. Flood risk sustainability objectives should therefore accept that water infrastructure development may sometimes be necessary in flood risk areas. The National Planning Practice Guidance (ref: 34-005-20140306) recognises this scenario and states that 'it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has particular locational needs (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered'. Proposed amendment Having regard to the above, we suggest the following addition to Policy HD6 (new text underlined); Policy HD6 No Development on Flood Zones (2 and 3), unless it is for the provision of essential infrastructure and no suitable alternative site is available, where risk of natural flooding is likely and where water flora and fauna are to be protected.
Highways England	No Comment	General	We have reviewed the above consultation and have 'No Comments'.
Hampshire County Council - Highways	Comment	General	<u>References to increases in weight and volume of traffic.</u> The County Council would encourage the Parish Council to gather evidence of an increase in the volume of vehicles travelling through both villages. This would enable a clearer understanding as to the issue of traffic volumes in the villages and provide an evidence base when using this as a justification. The County Council's survey team can arrange these for a fee and the County Council would encourage the Parish Council to contact them to discuss the requirements of a survey.
Hampshire County Council - Highways	Support	Policy IC2	This policy is supported by the County Council.
Hampshire County Council - Highways	Support	Policy IC4	This is supported and the County Council would encourage the Parish Council to discuss the options to achieve this with Hampshire County Council's Passenger Transport team.
Hampshire County Council - Highways	Comment	Policy IC5	Proposals for traffic calming would need to be in line with the County Council's Traffic Management Policy. This is available at <a href="https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/roadsafety/makingroadssafer">https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/roadsafety/makingroadssafer</a> . If the proposals do not meet this policy, the Parish Council could seek to implement some light touch traffic calming measures through a Community Funded Initiative. For more information regarding CFI's, please contact Hampshire County Council's Traffic Management team. The County Council would again encourage evidence gathering of the increases in weight and volume of traffic.
Hampshire County Council - Property	Comment	Policy IC8	Hampshire County Council (HCC) notes that the accompanying text Policy IC8(ii) appears to be inconsistent with the adopted Policy COM14 in the Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) Local Plan. TVBC Policy COM14 (extract) states that "Development involving the loss of cultural and community facilities and places of worship will be permitted if it can be demonstrated that: d) there is no longer a need for that facility for its existing use or another community use; or e) the building can no longer provide suitable accommodation". This policy provides flexibility to potential change of use of a community facility, should it satisfactorily demonstrate that the facility is no longer required, or the building is no longer suitable. HCC considers that the proposed Policy IC8 (ii), which does not afford any flexibility to the potential loss of community facility through change of use, are not consistent with the adopted Policy COM14, and therefore is not considered a 'sound' policy (according to National Planning Policy Framework, para. 35-36). HCC in its role, as service provider, support the presumption to retain existing community facilities and services for the benefits of local communities. As service provider and landowner, HCC has an on-going review process to assess the services it provides as part of a strategy of service-driven improvements. This can sometimes potentially result in the relocation and/or re-provision of services to an alternative location to continue to meet operation needs. A policy approach that is too stringent could hinder public service providers, such as the County Council, in being effective in delivering and transforming community. HCC would therefore suggest that the Policy IC8(ii) to be revised and include an element of flexibility consistent to the adopted Policy COM14.
Friends and Trustees of Bentley Wood	Comment	Objective EL1	Add at the end of the objective 'and ensure that the existing open countryside is maintained'
Friends and Trustees of Bentley Wood	Comment	Objective EL3	Add at the end of the objective ' as well as the green and woodland spaces across the entire NDP area'
Friends and Trustees of Bentley Wood	Comment	Objective EL8	Add after 'in the open countryside' 'including Bentley Wood and Frenchmoor Copse as well as'

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Friends and Trustees of Bentley Wood	Comment	Objective IC1	Add between 'provide' and 'mitigation the following : 'acceptable, viable and sustainable'
Friends and Trustees of Bentley Wood	Comment	Policy EL1	Add 'Conserve' to the beginning of the policy heading. Add the following to the end of the policy heading 'and ensure that the existing open countryside is maintained' After 'development proposals' delete 'that conserve and if possible enhance the' and replace with 'must preserve and enhance the natural beauty and' . After 'rural landscape' add ' as well as the open gaps between existing settlements'. Bullet i) insert 'the' after 'reflect'. End of bullet ii) add 'and not result in loss or degradation of any rights of way, ancient woodland and or any associated biodiversity and related features' Delete criteria v).
Friends and Trustees of Bentley Wood	Comment	Policy EL3	add new criteria iv) "Not deliver light pollution in the Conservation Area'
Friends and Trustees of Bentley Wood	Comment	Para 5.2.7	Bullet 4 add 'including Frenchmoor Copse' after 'Bentley Wood'
Friends and Trustees of Bentley Wood	Comment	Policy EL5	Add 'Conserve and' to the policy title. Bullet i) Delete 'unacceptable'
Friends and Trustees of Bentley Wood	Comment	Policy EL6	add to the end of the policy 'and not deliver light pollution'
Friends and Trustees of Bentley Wood	Comment	Appendix B4	Add 'Bentley Wood' to 'Frenchmoor Copse'
Mr Morgan	Comment	Map B1	The inclusion of 16 maps each titles "West Dean Village Green" is confusing at best, possibly misleading. Following discussions with Mr Alan Bannister I have been informed that only the final map which shows the "Public Green Space and Rights of Way" will be included as this reflects the Definitive Map. How a footbridge can be included as Green Space I do not understand as it is not "Land"; it should be described as Footpath 22.
Mr Morgan	Comment	Policy HD6	The issue of flooding in West Dean needs to be addressed more proactively. I understand that measures will be put in place to constrain the width of the River Dun and this is to be welcomed. However, there remains a real issue concerning the footbridge which constrains the flow of the River Dun and the bridge's design serves to form a dam in times of flood with debris washed down by the river catching under the bridge and on its railings. I believe that 2 actions need to take place. Firstly the replacement of the bridge with a design that allows the free flow of water and debris in time of flood; a higher, arched structure, would allow this without diverting Footpath 22. Secondly, in addition to the narrowing of the river in the village, the riverbed downstream needs to be deepened in order to increase the volume of flood water that can escape.
Mr Morgan	Comment	Policy HD1	Upon the matter of new housing; it is clear that there is excessive demand for housing in both villages which has driven up the cost of the average property to extraordinary levels. It is clear that only those decamping from London and those with very well paid professional jobs and an inheritance will be able to afford to buy homes in this area. Of course, other people who work locally, use the pub and shop and send their children to the village school need somewhere to live. The only way that they can afford to remain locally is through inheriting the family home or living in rented accommodation. I believe that the plan should encourage the release of land for residential development for local families to rent. Such developments could be "Community Led" with local landowners collaborating with Parish Councils to provide a range of affordable accommodation which would give the landowner a steady income from letting, capital growth and the knowledge that they are supporting their community. Home ownership only arrived in this area in 1945 with the disbandment of the Norman Court estate! New housing could meet all the modern building criteria and still blend in with existing building styles so that the built environment would be enhanced – a mini Poundbury. Should older people be able to rent a suitable property in their home village they may be amenable to renting out their larger dwelling to other families or allow the next generation to move in. In the new developments they would end up living alongside a range of different households, not restricted to geriatric company in a fold or home. In short, the popularity of rural homes has increased since COVID and working from home has proven to be very positive to those who have access to outside space. This will drive up prices and the only solution to providing homes for local families on a normal wage is to build houses to rent. Without this, local employers will struggle to find employees and the villages will ossify into settlements for rich retirees who will then complain that they can't get local tradesmen to fix their expensive houses and that the pub has closed as it can get neither staff not customers.
Bentley Wood Trust	Comment	Appendix B4	Heritage Sites and Treasured assets B4 The omission of Bentley Wood from the list of heritage sites in annexe B4 needs to be rectified and we would urge you to ensure that this happens. Bentley Wood should be accorded the highest possible status in the list of Heritage Sites and Treasured Assets (Appendix B4) within the plan given its nationally important status as an SSSI and as one of the largest ancient woodland complexes in lowland England. It appears to be missing from the list of such assets and this needs to be corrected. This appears to be an error given that Frenchmoor Copse does appear. Frenchmoor Copse is a detached woodland owned and managed by the Bentley Wood Trust. The wood is a key asset used for recreation and the enjoyment of nature for the people of the area and the mandate of the Trust is to ensure that it is managed to ensure access and enjoyment is sustained in perpetuity. The wood also provides employment for at least 3 full time equivalent posts, as well as supporting a very wide range of rare and declining wildlife species such as dormouse, many butterfly species and rare birds.
Bentley Wood Trust	Comment	Policy EL7	We would also suggest amending the wording of policy EL7 to state "woodland and any of its adjacent surrounding land"
Mr Parry	Comment	General	I would like to commend the effort that has been made to listen to and, where appropriate, integrate stakeholders comments within the document.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Mr Parry	Comment	General	There are a number of points that I feel need to be raised for consideration at this stage. Firstly the evidence that the draft document is based on is dated and this is likely to have a material impact on the validity and relevance of the document unless it is updated.
Mr Parry	Comment	General	Secondly there has been no reference to the housing need of those working in and around the development plan area. Individuals working at Dean Hill Park (and elsewhere locally) regularly make contact seeking homes in the local area, however due to the lack of supply, have to live/move further afield. Those making contact tend to already have personal connections to West Dean and the surrounds and while able to find local employment, are unable to live here. This need is predominately for low cost market housing and would greatly benefit the sustainability of rural living and working.
Mr Parry	Comment	General	Thirdly without more suitable sites being identified within the document, I would like to identify the areas around Hillside Close in West Dean for possible long term housing delivery should the need be there and the site be suitable for the use. Whilst this has not been a site objective at Dean Hill Park, I would not want less suitable sites to be developed without prior consideration of these areas.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Policy titles	The NP Steering Group may wish to consider revising the policy titles as they are more akin to policy objectives and some are very lengthy. The previous iteration of the NP took a more concise and possibly more logical approach to the policy titles. For example Policy EL4 might be simply renamed as <b>Policy EL4: Landscape Protection and Enhancement</b>
Wiltshire Council	Comment	General	It is noted that some of the changes made to the draft plan at the Regulation 14 stage appear to reflect comments made at that time, namely: Changing the plan period, More detail on the planning context in the Introduction, More detail around the vision and objectives, The presence of a consultation statement However, some comments do not appear to have been taken forward and there does not seem to be any evidence of them being considered in the consultation statement, namely: Reference to a settlement boundary (West Dean is classified as a small village under Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and, therefore, does not have a settlement boundary), Lack of further detail on the monitoring of policies
Wiltshire Council	Comment	General	In general, the following comments apply to the Regulation 16 draft plan: The Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan has been adopted (February 2020) since the Regulation 14 stage, and Wiltshire Council's latest housing figures (as at April 2019) still show there is a residual indicative housing requirement of 0 dwellings to be delivered in the Southern Wiltshire CA over the WCS plan period
Wiltshire Council	Comment	General	The Reg 14 responses from Wiltshire Council which do not appear to have been taken are: Policies PD1, PD2 and PD3, in the Planning and development policies section, refer to 'the settlement boundary' and go onto to talk about development within the settlement boundary. However, West Dean is classified as a "Small Village" by the WCS and, as such, does not have a settlement boundary under Core Policy 1 Settlement Strategy. We strongly suggest revising these policies to reflect this because, as it stands, the draft neighbourhood plan is not in conformity with the Wiltshire Core Strategy on this matter; The draft neighbourhood plan states, at paragraph 8.3, that 'the Plan will be monitored by the Parish Councils on an annual basis, using the planning data collected by Test Valley Borough Council and Wiltshire Council and any other data collected and reported at a parish level relevant to the plan.' This is a little vague and lacking in detail. We would suggest being clearer about what planning data will be used to monitor the Plan and linking these to individual policies, where appropriate, to show how they will be monitored.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	General	The draft NDP does not allocate any new sites for housing development in West Dean and this is compliant with Core Policy 23 and the aims of the Development Plan.
Wiltshire Council	Object	Policy EL1	Policy EL1 states that '... development proposals should ... v. consider Rural Exception Sites in open countryside where there is a specific need' This is contrary to Core Policy 44 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy which requires Rural Exception Sites to be 'within, adjoining or well related to the existing settlement.'
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Para 5.3.3	Paragraph 5.3.3 combines elements of Wiltshire Council's and Test Valley Borough Council's rural exception site policies in a single list, without making it clear which requirements relate to which local authority. Some requirements from Core Policy 44 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy are missing from this list (e.g. the requirement to be within, adjoining or well related to the existing settlement) and some requirements which are not relevant in Wiltshire are stated (e.g. the requirement to consider small business use). It is a concern that trying to combine the requirements of two local planning authorities in this way will weaken the implementation of Core Policy 44 in West Dean. The NDP should make it clear that any application for a Rural Exception Site will be considered in accordance with the Rural Exception Site policy of the relevant local planning authority.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Policy HD1	The header to Policy HD1 states that development in and adjacent to the villages should be community led. However the policy then goes on to describe community supported housing. The header to the policy should make it clear whether the policy relates only to development which is led by the community, or also relates to development which may be proposed (and subsequently led) by another organisation e.g. a Registered Provider of Affordable Housing, but which has the support of the community. With respect to point (i) of HD1, it should be noted that Wiltshire Council's Allocations Policy does not make provision for households with a local connection to an adjacent parish to Wiltshire to bid for properties unless the housing need of that adjacent parish has been used to support the case for the development of affordable housing within the Wiltshire parish. If it is the intention of the NDP that households with a local connection to West Tytherley should be eligible to bid for properties on affordable housing developments within Wiltshire Council's area in West Dean, this should be clearly stated and the NDP should make it clear that in determining the need for Affordable Housing, planning applicants should take the Affordable Housing need of both villages into account.
Wiltshire Council		Policy IC1.	It may not be possible under the legislation to accept a condition which states that all contributions are used in this way, but this may be more of an issue for Test Valley Borough Council. It would be better if this policy reflected the NPPF wording and tests set out under para 57 ie: Planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following test 26:a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development 26 Set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
Wiltshire Council		Policy IC3	It is noted that the parking standards in Policy IC3 differ from Wiltshire Council's parking standards. The additional parking spaces required will have an impact on the number of housing units that could be developed, for example, on a Rural Exceptions Site. This policy also refers to avoidance of on street parking. Development cannot "avoid on street parking" as visitors/deliveries etc will all park on the road as they are entitled to do by law! It should say is that new development should meet on site parking standards in order to limit on street parking. Whilst the aim of the policy is supported, there is no mandate or policy currently to enforce or insist upon the policy requirements and developers may well refuse to deliver. At planning application stage, officers would normally request the consideration of EV charging units per dwelling of any significant new development.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Policy IC5	The policy wording seems to suggest that there already is a current safety issue. Traffic calming is a broad area and it may be better to suggest "traffic management" in the text, as "calming" often suggest speed humps / cushions which are not the council's preferred method. Consideration is given to pedestrian safety and parking at the planning application stage and developers have to undertake a Transport Appraisal or Assessment. Both these documents consider the impact of extraneous traffic but any significant development would inevitably generate extra vehicles on the local network. It would be difficult to assess the impact on parking at these destinations as this would be a behavioural science regarding the residents' decision to use their cars.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Policy IC7	The wording of "development proposals within existing businesses" should be re-worded to be "within existing employment premises or commercial sites," as planning permission runs with the land use and not the individual business or occupier. The reference under (v) to social distancing has already been superseded and this should be removed.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Policy CP1	Particularly for Wiltshire, which is no longer a County Council, this should be reworded as "the Highway Authority."
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Policy HD2	The policy wording is supported. However, the "evidence" table at the end of the Plan for this policy mentions Core Policy CP1, when infill is Core Policy CP2.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Policy HD3	The wording for this policy and its title appears confused and unclear, by mixing residential use with business uses. Does the policy mean to refer to ancillary residential uses such as home working, home offices and businesses being run from the home? The term "business buildings" is likely to be confusing to applicants and may be misapplied to buildings for fully commercial business uses which are incompatible with residential areas. This raises a number of questions. How does HD2 (infill development) relate to HD3 (new dwellings in existing gardens) when proposals for new dwellings come forward? What happens if an applicant applies for a new dwelling in a secluded garden outside the settlement boundary under HD3, which does not comply with the infill development requirements of HD2 ie not a continuously developed road frontage. This could raise potential policy conflict within the draft NDP. The policy part (v) appears to reflect the wording of the policy in WCS saved policy H33. However, the use of a Section 106 Agreement to tie the use to a main house within the countryside is no longer used and has been superseded by the use of conditions to tie ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling. This part of the policy should either be removed or re-worded. Similarly to Policy HD2 above, the summary at the end of the draft NDP needs to mention Wiltshire Core Strategy saved policy H33:
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Policy HD4	(ii) The wording of "reused tiles in A1 condition" is unacceptable and would not be enforceable if this requirement is breached by a development. "A1" is generally regarded as brand new condition, which is surely not what is required, as old tiles are reused for the weathered texture and visual appearance. We suggest deleting "in A1 condition."
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Mottisfont Bats SAC	Due to there being no strategic allocations for the section of the NDP area that lies within Wiltshire, and no allocations proposed in the NDP, it is deemed likely that any forthcoming proposals for development would be relatively small-scale and would likely comprise windfall development or rural exceptions sites. Furthermore, on the basis that the recommendation set out below is incorporated within the NDP, it is considered possible to conclude, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that the NDP would not lead to adverse effects on the integrity of the Mottisfont Bats SAC or its qualifying features, alone or in-combination with other plans and projects. It is recommended that the dedicated bat conservation policy is supported by text explaining that the NDP area lies within the 7.5km consultation zone for Barbastelle bats associated with the Mottisfont Bats SAC and that applications for development will only be permitted by Wiltshire Council where it can be demonstrated that the proposals would not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC and would be compliant with the Habitats Regulations. It is suggested that explanatory text and the bat conservation policy is worded along the lines of the following: "Explanatory Text. The NDP area holds high potential for all species of bats due to its rural nature with interconnected woodlands and hedgerows. Of particular note is the potential for the area to support Barbastelle bats. This rare species breeds in woodlands near Mottisfont which are protected through the designation of the Mottisfont Bats Special Area of Conservation. The bats make use of a much wider area around the designated site and could potentially be foraging and breeding at satellite sites in the NDP area. Consequently new development will need to demonstrate that it has taken bats and this species in particular into account, identifying whether these bats may be using the development site and if so, the measures that will be put in place to protect and enhance their habitat. Bat Conservation Policy. 'Proposals for development shall be formulated with due regard to any relevant guidance such as the Bat Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) Planning Guidance for Wiltshire. Planning applications for development shall be supported by an appropriate level of ecological survey undertaken in accordance with best practice survey guidelines. This will establish the ecological baseline in respect of bats and thereby determine the need for, and inform the formulation of any avoidance, mitigation and where required as a last resort, compensation measures necessary as part of the project design, to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Mottisfont Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC) over the lifetime of the proposed development and to promote the conservation of bats generally. The above information will be required to enable the planning authority to assess planning applications under the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (or any subsequent amendments) and confirm there is no reasonable scientific doubt of any adverse effects to the SAC."
Wiltshire Council	Comment	New Forest SPA	In light of the Interim Recreation Mitigation Strategy and any subsequent reviews, Wiltshire Council is able to conclude there will be no adverse effect of residential and tourism development within the Wiltshire NDP area on the integrity of the New Forest SPA alone and in-combination with other plans and projects. However, as a financial contribution will be required from some developments through S106, it is advised the NDP should provide some details in explanatory text to ensure developers are aware of the implications the New Forest SPA may have for their development. It is suggested that the following explanatory wording is included in the NDP: "Explanatory Text. The New Forest Special Protection Area has been designated to protect certain bird species which occur frequently in the New Forest area but are otherwise rare or declining. Several of these species are however susceptible to recreational pressure. Consequently, the National Park Authority is working with authorities on its boundaries to address the impacts from walkers and dog walkers who arrive as day visitors and staying tourists. All development coming forward in the NDP area has the potential to increase the number of day visitors to the New Forest. Wiltshire Council and Test Valley Borough Council are therefore addressing this through their own recreation mitigation strategies. Residential and tourism developments will therefore be required to contribute to the relevant authority's strategy through the Community Infrastructure Levy or Section 106 Agreement."



Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Solent Region International Sites	The NDP does not allocate any sites for development and it is considered that policies EL1, EL2, EL8, HD1, HD2 and HD3 would not result in adverse effects upon the Solent region international sites, notably the Solent Maritime SAC and the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar site, alone. This is because any development coming forward as supported by these policies would likely be small-scale development that would not generate significant effects alone. Nonetheless, on the advice of Natural England, it must be assumed that any new development which generates a net increase in nitrogen within the catchment of the River Test, could give rise to significant effects on the integrity of the Solent region international sites when considered in-combination with other plans and projects. Provided the recommendation below is incorporated within the NDP and is adhered to at the planning application stage for any future proposals for development in the NDP area, it is considered possible to conclude, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that the NDP would not lead to adverse effects on the integrity of the Solent region international sites, notably the Solent Maritime SAC and the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar site, or their qualifying features, alone or in-combination with other plans and projects. It is recommended that a dedicated policy and relevant supporting text is included within the West Dean and West Tytherley NDP to highlight that the NDP area lies within the River Test catchment and that mitigation will be essential to ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulations. The recommended policy pertaining to the Solent regional international sites to be included within the NDP should make it clear that adherence with the policy will be essential. It may also be prudent for policies EL1, EL2, EL8, HD1, HD2 and HD3 to be amended to cross reference to the dedicated policy and the need to comply with it, although this is not necessarily critical given that any development proposals should comply with all policies within the NDP in any regard. Suggested explanatory text and policy wording to be incorporated within the NDP is as follows: "(Title) Solent Region International Sites and Nitrogen. Explanatory Text. The whole of the NDP area lies within the catchment of the River Test which flows into the Solent where wildlife of marine, tidal and intertidal areas is protected by a number of international designations. Natural England has advised these designations are being adversely affected by the nutrients associated with sewage and agricultural runoff and that the restoration of these sites partly depends on ensuring new development does not generate any additional nutrient inputs. Natural England is placing particular emphasis on nitrogen as this is considered to have an overriding impact in these saltwater habitats. Hence all development proposals in the NDP area will need to demonstrate they are nitrogen neutral in accordance with Natural England guidance[1]. Wiltshire Council and Test Valley Borough Council who will carry out the necessary assessment of developments under the Habitats Regulations, may require developers to demonstrate that Natural England has assessed and agreed their calculations and mitigation proposals prior to an application being submitted and/or determined. In due course strategic mitigation schemes may become available which enable developers to purchase nitrogen credits to the value of the increased nitrogen levels their developments are calculated to generate. Policy. Applications for development that will result in a net increase in nitrogen reaching the Solent Region International Sites through e.g. additional units of overnight accommodation or increased intensity of farming, shall be accompanied by pre-development and post-development nitrogen budgets and shall be required to demonstrate nitrogen neutrality in accordance with the relevant guidelines where these are available. A detailed mitigation strategy shall also be submitted to the local planning authority demonstrating how nitrogen neutrality shall be achieved prior to first occupation of the development, and how it will be maintained throughout the lifetime of the development and beyond, where the potential for effects would extend beyond the operational phase of the development."
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Landscape	Landscape The draft NDP is a very comprehensive document that provides clear guidance for landscape elements, landscape character, the protection of dark skies and important views.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Leisure and Recreation	The plan references the NPPF and the collection of financial contributions (S106 and CIL) from developers and that these contributions should be identified and provided for local needs. The document references the need to consult residents/the community and also notes that any new development must not adversely affect, but enhance community infrastructure. The plan references the importance of community facilities and promoting healthy and safe communities. It outlines the need to protect, sustain or enhance community facilities in both villages including recreation spaces, children's play areas, playgrounds and village halls. Green space protection is also outlined as sitting within a separate Green Infrastructure Strategy.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Heritage	Overall, the plan is well set out and clear in its objectives, refers to the relevant WCS policies and is to be commended. There is an interest in heritage and landscape character as set out in the 'History and Settlement' section (2.2) and in the 'Character' section (2.3). In addition, one of the key objectives of the plan is to 'Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment' and there are some detailed paragraphs concerning heritage and landscape in Section 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan. It was particularly pleasing to see that both designated and un-designated heritage assets were discussed – as there is a need to consider assets other than listed buildings and scheduled monuments.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Heritage	It is also clear to see that a number of policies set out by the draft NDP are intended to address heritage matters – in particular policies EL1, EL2 and EL4 which is welcomed. These seem to be based on a Historic Environment Report – which forms the key evidence base for these areas. However, the evidence base didn't seem to contain as much information from the Wiltshire and Swindon Historic Environment Record (HER) as might be expected. Nor is there any record of the Neighbourhood Planning Group having approached the Wiltshire Council Archaeology Service to obtain information from the HER. Whilst the evidence in the draft NDP is adequate, it would be good to see use/inclusion of the data held on the HER as this is best practice and the HER is the core evidence base for all heritage assets and historic landscape character in the county. Having this data would make the plan more robust and it may have an impact on the location and nature of future development. This is because heritage assets can provide both a constraint and an opportunity for development. It is also noted that while there is good consideration of the present day landscape character there is little consideration of the historic landscape character – i.e. elements of past land use that have impacted on the character of the present day landscape and can still be discerned. On this basis, it is recommended that the authors seek to obtain more information on heritage to supplement their plan. Information on Historic Landscape Character (HLC) can be requested from the Wiltshire Council Archaeology Service who produced a county-wide HLC dataset that is held as part of the Wiltshire and Swindon Historic Environment Record (HER). Similarly, the core HER has a wealth of data regarding archaeological heritage assets (both designated and undesignated) and this information would also be valuable. The Historic Environment Record (HER) should be listed as an evidence base for the plan and the raw data could easily form part of the draft NDP appendices. In addition, some elements of the data may merit inclusion in the plan proper – with some alterations/updates included in the sections that discuss heritage and landscape. This wouldn't require a major re-write or shift in emphasis – just the inclusion of some information to reinforce that historic landscape character and heritage assets are material concerns and ones which offers opportunities in the forward planning of West Dean and West Tytherley. Should the authors want to access the information from the Wiltshire and Swindon Historic Environment Record (HER) then they should contact the Wiltshire Council Archaeology Service at archaeology@wiltshire.gov.uk and our department would endeavour to provide enable this. However, overall, officers could accept the draft NDP in its current form but do think some alterations in line with these suggestions would be beneficial. With specific reference to Conservation, it is noted that the suggested changes to be made to the draft NDP at the Regulation 14 stage do not appear to have been taken forward. The suggested changes related to detailed wording of the policies and the text to provide greater clarity and accuracy.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Education	The draft NDP is supported. The Wiltshire side of West Dean is in the catchment area of West Tytherley Primary School and the plan references using Section 106 Agreements or Community Infrastructure Levy funds to provide additional school infrastructure if necessary.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Air Quality	The latest version of the NPPF now includes specific requirements for plug in vehicles and ULEV infrastructure consideration by LPAs'. We now ask developers to provide ultra low energy vehicle infrastructure which can take the form of EV charging points although other technologies are also out there now. We have succeeded in getting EV into various developments in Wiltshire and would like to see this and other alternatives promoted wherever possible, hence the opportunity that exists within Neighbourhood Plans.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Noise	Planning for noise control is an important part of any neighbourhood plan as the unintended consequences of development proposals often involve amenity impacts such as noise and also odour, vibration, smoke and fume.... Encouragement of development that is sympathetic to prevailing noise climates and receptors is something we would seek.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Community Led Housing Development	It is noted that the plan refers to community led development; should such a project come forward within the NDP area, it may be useful for the community to look at the resources and support available from Homes of Our Own, more details can be found here: - <a href="http://homesofourown.co.uk/">http://homesofourown.co.uk/</a> We would like to take the opportunity to advise that Wiltshire Council's Housing department is currently in the process of developing a strategy to deliver 1000 new affordable council houses across Wiltshire. Should the NDP Steering Group wish to discuss proposals for any sites in the future, we would be keen to see how we could potentially work together to deliver more affordable housing to meet the local need.
Wiltshire Council	Comment	Climate Change	The draft NDP is broadly supportive of renewable energy, and some forms of renewable energy such as ground mounted solar installations are compatible with land that may flood as the electrical installations can be up to 3.5m high. Policy HD6 could be amended to include suitable renewable energy provision.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 1.3	It would be helpful if a Planning Policy section was added here to set the scene in terms of the planning policy context for both Wiltshire and Test Valley plans. This could include more detailed text telling the story of how the NP has been derived in accordance with the strategic policy framework set by the WCS and TVBCLP and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 1.3.8	This paragraph will require an update in light of the updated HRA and SEA
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective EL1	Amend wording to read' <b>Conserve or Maintain</b> and if possible enhance the character of the two villages and their setting in a beautiful rural landscape.'
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective EL2	Preserve <b>or enhance</b> the historic environment.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective EL3	Preserve and enhance the <del>two</del> Conservation Areas.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective EL4	<b>Conserve or Protect</b> and enhance our distinctive landscape particularly <b>including open</b> views into and out of the villages which contribute to a sense of place and community.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective EL5	This is covered in EL4 and does not need repeating.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective EL6	Conserve and enhance the <del>ecosystem</del> and biodiversity of the <b>Plan</b> area ensuring that new development <del>protects</del> <b>does not significantly impact on</b> flora and fauna including habitats and movement corridors.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective EL7	This is addressed in TVBC local plan policy E5 and does not need repeating here.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective EL8	This is addressed in the local plans where there is a presumption against development within the open countryside therefore this is not needed in this plan. <i>'including the related public rights of way'</i> . This is covered in IC2 and does not need repeating here.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective EL10	Minimise light ( <del>protect our night skies</del> ) and noise pollution.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective HD1	<del>New residential</del> Development in and adjacent to the villages should be community led and support a mix of housing types including affordable homes that sustains the current and future needs of the community . The wording of the objective in the regulation 14 document is preferred to this wording. Suggest reverting to the original wording of: <i>Provide a mix of housing types, including affordable homes that sustains the current and future needs of the community.</i>
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective HD2	<del>Identify the characteristics of</del> Infill development <b>should be well designed to</b> and minimise the impact on immediate neighbours.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective HD3	These objectives relate to new housing and general design principles – why are business uses included

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective HD4	All <del>N</del> new development should be designed and built to a high quality, be energy efficient and support carbon emission targets while respecting the character of the rural villages.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective HD6	This is more onerous than guidance in the NPPF, which includes a sequential test to be applied to development in Flood Zones 2&3. This is also addressed in TVBC LP Policy E7 on water management, and therefore does not need repeating in this plan.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective IC1	<i>New development must not adversely affect'</i> How will this be measured? ' <i>Financial contributions to be used directly for local needs'</i> . Does this refer to the financial contributions that the Parish Council could receive?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective IC2	<i>Maintain or improve <del>safe use of</del> the public highways, bridleways, walkways and footpaths in the villages and through the open countryside.'</i> Who will deliver this?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective IC3	New development should avoid on-street parking, meet parking standards and provide <del>off-street electric</del> charging facilities <del>within its curtilage</del> . New development <del>must should</del> not adversely impact on the car parking and access to Dean Station, village halls, shop and school.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective IC4	Support public or community transport, in particular the train service at Dean Station, the rural and school bus services and community organised transport <del>for the elderly and infirm</del> . These groups do not need to be singled out, as this transport should be accessible to all residents.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective IC5	Introduce traffic calming and highway management to reduce <del>the risk of accident caused by increased traffic volume and</del> <b>traffic</b> speed, particularly at pinch points in the village centres.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective IC6	Infrastructure providers have a duty to provide these services to new development and therefore this does not need repeating here. It could be added to the community projects and aspirations section.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective IC7	The original wording of this objective in the Reg 14 plan is preferred to this wording: <i>Consider development opportunities and business premises to provide further employment within the villages while safeguarding existing employment provision for the community.</i>
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Objective IC8	Protect or enhance community facilities in <del>both villages</del> <b>the plan area</b> including the village halls, recreation spaces, playgrounds, school and other education facilities, the pub and the village shop in West Tytherley.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Section 5	The policy titles are the same as the objectives, which can cause confusion and have overly long titles. Suggest that they are all shortened to reflect the purpose of the policy.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.1.2	Although some reference is made to higher level policies of both adopted local plans such as in the footnotes, it would be helpful if more explicit / detailed linking of higher level policies to the Objectives and policies within the plan.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.1.3	The policies are set out in three groups as shown in the table below. <del>aiming to identify the planning criteria specific to the rural neighbourhood area.</del>
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy Code EL	Environment and Landscape covering the impact of any <del>planning application</del> <b>new development</b> on the natural environment.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy Code HD	<i>detail the <u>bounds</u> of any'</i> What does this mean?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.1.4	meet <del>certain</del> <b>the wishes of the local community</b> and the objectives in the Plan.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.2.1	The Neighbourhood area, across the southern county boundaries of Wiltshire and Hampshire is set in an <del>exceptional</del> <b>distinctive</b> landscape made up predominantly of mixed farmland and semi- natural woodland surrounding the two rural settlements of West Dean and West Tytherley both of which contain <del>bounded</del> CAs. There are outlying dwellings in Frenchmoor, Buckholt and Stony Batter and other open countryside.



Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy EL1	<del>Maintain and if possible</del> Conserve and enhance the character of the two villages and their setting in a beautiful rural landscape. Development proposals that conserve <del>and if possible, or</del> enhance the character of <del>both parishes and their settings</del> <b>the Plan Area</b> in a beautiful rural landscape will be supported. In particular development proposals should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. reflect settlement pattern of the neighbourhood (nucleated, lineated or dispersed)</li> <li>ii. retain ancient woodland, <del>its setting</del> or historic features within it and, where appropriate, <del>must</del> contribute to its on-going management.</li> <li>iii. conserve the ecology and productivity of fields, woodland, trees and hedgerows,</li> <li>iii.iv. <b>Retain</b> historic field boundaries, <del>and direct development away from medieval or earlier fields, especially where these form coherent field systems with other medieval features such as the Roman Road.</del></li> <li>iv.v. relate well to historic route ways and not divert them from their original course or damage their rural character by loss of banks, hedgerows, verges or other important features.</li> <li>v.vi. <del>consider Rural Exception Sites in open countryside in accordance with both Local Plan policies where there is a specific need. Any such development proposals need to strictly meet conform with other relevant all other NDP policies.</del></li> </ul>
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.2.3	<i>Treasured Assets.</i> These are not the same as heritage assets, and would be better renamed. The text on archeology at para 5.2.9 in the Reg 14 document would benefit from being added in this section. <i>Specific non designated sites which the community wish to be conserved are afforded, when appropriate, protection by registering as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) (See Community Assets (para 5.4.6 and 5.4.7) or classified herein as a Local Green Space (EL9). A Table identifying Heritage Sites and Treasured Assets with their level of protection are found at Appendix B4.</i> This is about community facilities, which is separate from heritage. This might benefit from having its own heading and section.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy EL2	<i>Preserve <b>or enhance</b> the historic environment.</i> i. Development proposals <del>must retain and, if possible,</del> <b>should preserve or enhance</b> the local distinctiveness and character of designated heritage assets such as ancient monuments, listed buildings, <b>and non designated heritage assets</b> <del>buildings of local interest (both the building and its location), whether for residential, community, or business purposes.</del> The policy could identify and list the non-designated heritage assets that the policy will refer – ie those that are listed in the CA Appraisal and shown on the maps below as buildings of local interest. Criteria ii) The language used should be consistent with the Local Plan and NPPF. This is the wrong test to apply. This is addressed in the TVBC LP Policy E9 on Heritage and does not need repeating here. Criteria iii) What is a historic building, is it a listed building and non-designated heritage asset or something else. Keep the language consistent. What is an “appropriate use for the building and its location”, what is the criteria to assess this? This is addressed in the TVBC LP Policy E9 on Heritage and does not need repeating here. Criteria vi) The language used should be consistent with the Local Plan and NPPF. What does the last sentence mean to a developer or the Council? Archaeological sites are designated heritage assets, therefore are covered in TVBC LP Policy E9 on Heritage and therefore this does not need repeating here.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.2.4	This could be added into the heritage paragraphs above.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy EL3	<i>Preserve <del>and</del> or enhance the <del>two</del> Conservation Areas.</i> Development proposals, including extensions and alterations to existing buildings and structures, located within or adjacent to the designated CAs <del>are required</del> <b>will be supported provided they</b> <del>to</del> preserve <del>and</del> or enhance the CA character and appearance. <b>New development</b> <del>and</del> should. This is covered in TVBC LP Policy E9, and as designated heritage assets is also addressed in policy EL2 above. This does not need repeating here and the policy should be deleted. Criteria i) Should the design also relate to the building itself if and extension or alteration? Criteria ii & iii) Should the design also relate to the building itself if and extension or alteration? Criteria iv) This is addressed in policy EL4 and does not need repeating here.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.2.5	<i>The Neighbourhood Area is <del>blessed</del> located within a distinctive rural landscape., which harks back to a bygone era.</i> It includes distinctive natural features ....
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy EL4	<i>Protect <del>and</del> or enhance our distinctive landscape including open views within and out of the villages. that contribute to a sense of place and community.</i> – How does a view contribute to a sense of place and community? <del>Any d</del> Development proposals (housing, commercial or agricultural) will need to ensure it protects and if possible enhances the important <del>natural and rural</del> views within <del>and on the fringes of the two villages especially those identified in the designated CAs.</del> the Plan Area. Views from green spaces and public rights of way across the entire neighbourhood should not be harmed or unduly spoilt by any development. <b>The</b> important views ...
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy EL5	i. Development proposals should, <del>where possible,</del> conserve <del>and</del> or enhance trees and hedgerows, and demonstrate that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable loss or damage to, existing trees, <del>or</del> woodlands or hedgerows during or as a result of development. ii. Wherever possible, development proposals must be designed to retain specifically identified trees and hedgerows of good <del>arboriculture</del> quality. Criteria iii) This criteria would be better suited to EL6 as it is an ecological requirement not a trees and hedgerow requirement. The two do go together but ecological protection is a standalone issue that’s can be impacted by a variety of things. Criteria iv) The Parish council will only be responsible for trees and hedgerows on its own land, therefore this will not be appropriate. This is usually dealt with by requiring applicants to demonstrate that development will not result in the loss of key landscape features either through direct pressure (siting) or indirect pressure (occupation) rather than costed management plans. Criteria d) This criteria sets out a requirement for an overriding need to be demonstrated for close boarded fences but it would be difficult to justifiably refuse close boarded fences within the settlement areas on principle alone. The approach would be to assess the potential landscape/visual impact on a case by case basis rather than an in principle resistance to this type of development. There are also PD rights for close board fences therefore this policy might not apply in any case. This would sit better within Policy HD3 or HD4.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy EL6	<i>Conserve and, <del>where possible,</del> enhance the local environment, <del>ecosystem</del> and biodiversity ensuring that new development protects flora and fauna including habitats and movement corridors.</i> Development should <del>preserve</del> conserve and if possible enhance <del>well established features of the environment, ecosystems, and biodiversity, including mature trees, species-rich hedgerows, watercourses, and other ecological networks, together with the habitats alongside them, including ponds.</del>



Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy EL7	This is addressed in TVBC local plan policy E5 and does not need repeating here, and therefore the policy should be deleted. The supporting text about could signpost to the relevant policies in the local plans.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy EL8	This is addressed in the local plans where there is a presumption against development within the open countryside therefore this is not needed in this plan. This is covered in IC2 and does not need repeating here. This is more onerous than either of the Local Plans. Development in the countryside is covered by the existing Local Plan policies of COM2 and CP2, and so does not need to be repeated here.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.2.9	<del>More widely Test Valley Borough Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy July 2014 sets out how to protect and enhance green infrastructure including through policies in NDPs.</del> This is not connected with the Local Green Space designation.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy EL9	<del>Retain and protect open spaces and dDesignated Local Green Spaces. Development proposals partially or wholly on the identified Local Green Spaces will only be supported when it is essential to meet necessary utility infrastructure needs and no alternative feasible site is available. The areas designated as Local Green Spaces, shown on the maps A2 and A3 and Appendix B1 are: designated as LGS3 West Tytherley Recreation Ground LGS2 West Dean Recreation Ground LGS1 West Dean Village Green (See Appendix B1 for definitive area)</del> <b>Development will be managed in a manner consistent with that applicable to designated Green Belt.</b> The test what is permitted in a local green space designation are set out in the NPPF under the Green Belt paragraphs 143 to 147 and don't need to be repeated in policy, but the additional wording at the end of the policy would address this matter. As written if an application came forward for a pavilion or play equipment on the recreation ground this it would be contrary to policy and would have to be refused
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.2.9	<i>Noise pollution.</i> Much of this is not a land use planning matter, as they can either be carried out under permitted development (eg air source heat pumps) or are not development (eg combine harvesters) There are other measures available to individuals if there is a noise nuisance, through the environmental health legislation.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy EL10	Should this be two policies one for dark skies and one for noise? What are 'the highest standard of light pollution restrictions in force at the time' as referred to in the policy? What is neighbourly in its use? What is the evidence for the bulleted list? These considerations would be addressed as part of a planning application, if it were to be deemed that these issued would arise. This would be supported from consultation with the Councils Environmental Health officers, and does not need repeating here. <i>Footnote 40 on Quiet times</i> What is the evidence for this?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.3.6	<del>• Modest and affordable Smaller homes (e.g. for young families and retired persons those looking to downsize) which are purchased on the open market. but below the average price for the area and • Housing that is unaffordable Affordable homes for those people identified from a "means tested" Housing Need Survey and listed on the LPA's Housing Registers who are unable to afford market homes.</del> The plan cannot influence the sales prices of the properties, and this text should be deleted.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy HD1	The wording of the policy in the regulation 14 document is preferred to this wording. Suggest reverting to the original wording of: <i>Provide a mix of housing types, including affordable homes that sustains the current and future needs of the community.</i> The heading of the policy is unduly restrictive and is not consistent with the NPPF or the Local Plan. For example how can an agricultural workers dwelling be a community led development? Development in settlements does not need to be community led in the LP it is as a matter of principle acceptable. The policy as written is also inconsistent with the NPPF. <del>Community led or community supported housing development within or adjoining the settlement boundary or built up area of the villages should include a range of house types (market and affordable) tenures and should be with the majority being one to three bedroom homes. All housing developments should provide accommodation to meet the local needs of downsizers and those with disabilities.</del> <i>Housing developments will need to comply with the affordable housing thresholds and requirements in force at the time of the application. Residential development should ensure: Adequate preference is given to anyone, regardless of age, with strong local connections. The criterion for 'local connections' in relation to affordable housing will be those people on the housing register who comply with the provisions of the relevant Councils Local Connection Housing Allocation Policy. Local needs, which cannot be met with existing affordable housing stock within or adjacent to the village, will be addressed based on a current HNS and the Housing Register in both LPAs. Development should include smaller affordable homes with tenure provisions to ensure that they remain affordable in perpetuity or, if for sale, with restrictions to ensure that they remain affordable to future generations. The needs of local retirees, the elderly and people with disabilities should be addressed, thus enabling them to remain independent within their community. Any Self-Build proposal, which is in principle encouraged, meets the requirements of The Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 and Housing and Planning Act 2016.</i> The policy needs to be clear on what would constitute a community-led scheme. The definition on pg. 56 is helpful but leaves open the interpretation on what would benefit the community. The policy seems to rely on the content of TVBLP policy COM9, therefore is there a need for a separate policy if COM9 is adequate? The allocation of affordable homes will be determined in accordance with each councils allocation policy at the time of letting. West Tytherley, Frenchmoor and Buckholt are all within the designated rural area. This ensures al AH is secures in perpetuity, and that owners of shared ownership homes cannot staircase their proportion of ownership up to 100%, therefore maintaining the AH stock. The text on self build could be added to the supporting text signposting to the relevant acts.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.3.7	<i>Significant garden space is also subjective but should be proportional on aesthetic social and habitable grounds.</i> What does this mean in practice? How would a Planning Officer determine this?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy HD2	Policies HD2 and 3 should be combined, as they cover the same issues. Most infill will be on land that is currently used as garden.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy HD2	<del>Within the settlement boundary of West Tytherley and the built up frontage of the Wiltshire part of West Dean two core villages (built up areas) and outlying settlements such as Frenchmoor,</del> further development will be considered on brownfield sites and suitable small infill sites (i.e. sites within a continuously developed road frontage, with direct but safe access to the road) for housing or small business needs. Infill is not permitted in Frenchmoor, as there is not settlement boundary and therefore is considered as countryside, where there is a presumption against development, other than for specific purposes as identified in TVBC LP policy COM 2. 'Sites within a continuously developed road frontage' What is the evidence for this definition. The local plan does not define this but in COM2 states: 'within the boundaries of the settlements .... The principle of development and redevelopment will be permitted provided its appropriate to the other policies of the local plan.' <i>All the Criteria in the policy.</i> This is addressed in TVBC LP policy LHW4 on Amenity, and as this does not add any additional locally distinctive criteria, does not need repeating in this plan. What is meant by overpowering structures, an aggravating boundary? Restricted access? Light blocking? All development will block light to some degree. (v) This is a building regulation matter (vi)What are other conflicting utility provisions and how would this be assessed?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.3.8	<del>The annex must be in the same ownership as the main dwelling and share utility services, access, vehicle parking and privacy amenity space. This requirement applies to dwellings both inside and outside the Conservation Areas.</del> There is various case law about what constitutes an annex, and these criterion do not all have to be in place. This wording is also more onerous than that of TVBC LP Policy COM11, and therefore should be deleted.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy HD3	Policies HD2 and 3 should be combined, as they cover the same issues. Most infill will be on land that is currently used as garden. This policy appears to provide support for new dwellings within the garden area of existing dwellings located in the countryside, which is contrary to the Local Plan.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment		<del>Development proposals for new dwellings on sites that form part of an existing residential garden, or group of gardens, must should:</del> i. <del>Conserve</del> <del>Respect</del> and compliment the character of the surrounding area. ii. Meet policy requirements for materials and design. iii. Provide garden space around all buildings <b>and where appropriate</b> including any trees that are identified in Policy EL5 <del>as appropriate to the area.</del> iv. Retain existing features such as trees, <del>valued</del> hedgerows and walls that are characteristic of the streetscape and the local area. v. Provide <del>amenity space,</del> vehicular access and onsite parking <b>both</b> for the new development <del>and existing dwelling (s) on the site. (See also policy IC3).</del> Parking standards are addressed in both Local Plans - please see comments on Policy IC3. Criteria vi and vii) This is addressed in TVBC LP policy LHW4 on Amenity, and as this does not add any additional locally distinctive criteria, does not need repeating in this plan. What do the words overdevelopment and 'cramping; mean and how would this be assessed? <i>Proposals to create separate unit accommodation for dependent persons or business use will be supported provided that:</i> This needs to be in a separate policy for businesses. <i>Criteria a, b and c)</i> This requires a design that will allow the annexe to be re-absorbed into the main dwellinghouse when no longer required as annexe, what is meant by this? How could this be achieved without moving the location of the annexe?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.3.11	<del>The NPPF emphasises the importance of the design of any new development which has to use high quality material and respect the character of the area acknowledges that the creation of of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. The need remains to protect wherever possible the environment and landscape (see EL policies above), listed buildings, heritage sites, agricultural, equestrian and Greenfield sites. There is a variety of different building mix of housing styles and ages periods in both parishes across the Plan Area, and within and outside the two Conservation Areas. It is recommended that the relevant parts of the WDVDS are included into the NP so that it is clear which elements of the plan are being incorporated into the document. in particular, the 'General Design of Buildings' on Page 14 would benefit from being added. This would add clarity to the text in the policy about the materials and types of features that are valued. <del>Developments with contemporary design appropriate to their location in or outside the conservation area and with access appropriate to their rural setting will be supported providing they are accompanied by an acceptable Design and Access Statement. A Design and Access Statement submitted with any planning application, for which the Parish councils and residents will be able to make representations on as part of the applications consultation process.</del></del>
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy HD4	<del>and those features and characteristics included in the WDVDS (They apply across the whole NDP area).</del> If the text of the VDS is added to the supporting text, then this text will not be needed and can be deleted. Criteria i) What constitutes a low roofline? How is it defined when determining a planning application? If this policy relates to an extension it will need to relate to the parent building. Criteria ii) <del>including reused tiles in A1 condition</del> Reused tiles are not always appropriate to use and how would A1 condition be assessed? Criteria v) would benefit from being split out. What does 'make use of' mean in planning terms? Reference to renewables and water is more aspirational rather than policy. What is the criterion trying to achieve, and how does this fit with national policy?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy HD5	<del>Maintain and or enhance the rural character of the two villages by integrating soft landscaping in new developments Criteria c)</del> This should be relocated to policy HD2. <del>Developers will be Where required to submit a landscape scheme will to accompany all development proposals., particularly those in sensitive locations.</del> This criteria may be unreasonable as there will be cases where a landscaping scheme is not required and can be dealt with by condition.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy HD6	<del>No development will be accepted in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</del> This is in conflict with and is dealt with in the NPPF and therefore does not need repeating in the plan. <del>Any development in areas adjacent to Flood Zones 2 and 3, whether from the River Dun or high groundwater levels throughout the NDP area should provide fully costed flood management measures to prevent harm to the blue infrastructure generally and avoid an increased risk of flooding throughout the two parishes and in particular in the two CAs.</del> The Environment agency up to date flood zone maps, or data from a SFRA is used to determine what is within the Flood Zones. This would not include land adjacent to the Flood Zones 2 and 3. The council cannot require the submission of fully costed management measures. The Council can seek flood mitigation measures where it is required but the cost is not a planning matter. <i>Systems that retain rainwater for domestic use are encouraged.</i> This is more of an aspiration rather than a policy and would be difficult to require.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.4.2	In this context, it's the Local Plans that will set out the contributions required. Both councils are CiL charging authorities, and therefore contributions towards infrastructure are dealt with via CiL
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy IC1	This is not a land use planning issue, as it concerns how the Parish Councils will spend any CiL monies that they receive. Therefore, this would benefit from being moved into the community projects as aspirations section. This is also addressed in both the Local Plans in policies CP3 and COM15 and as this is not adding any locally distinctive element, should be deleted or moved to the community projects as aspirations section.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy IC2	Bullet 1) This is addressed in TVBC LP policy T1 on Managing movement and WCS CP61 on transport and new development and does not need repeating here. It could be moved to the supporting text to signpost to both Local Plan polices on this issue. Bullet 2) This could apply to employment as well as housing, therefore 'all' development would be more appropriate
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy IC3	<del>All <b>n</b>New residential development including alterations and extensions which provide extra bedrooms will be required to must provide resident and visitor car parking in accordance with the standards set out in the relevant Local Plan. spaces on site and avoid on street parking especially that restricts free flow of traffic.</del> This is an unreasonable requirement for extensions and alterations. Car parking standards. What is the evidence for these standards? These are higher than the TVBC LP standards and the Wiltshire standards in LTP3, which are 1 space per 1 bed unit 2 spaces per 2 and 3 bed unit 3 spaces per 4 bed unit. The wording should be for infrastructure for electric charging rather than points as all providers have different charging points. Second paragraph. Not all developments will require a transport assessment. The governments guidance on Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements states that 'Where the transport impacts of development are not significant, it may be that no Transport Assessment or Statement or Travel Plan is required'. What does 'parking stress' mean and how would this be measured ?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy IC4	This is not a land use planning matter and therefore would sit better in the community aspirations section.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy IC5	This is addressed in Policy IC2 and does not need repeating, and can therefore be deleted. It is inevitable that additional dwellings will increase traffic and use of local facilities but those facilities have their own car parking provision. Applicants have no control over this the consequence being that no development will comply with policy. This is not acceptable and should be deleted.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy IC6	Utility providers have a duty to provide facilities and connections for new and existing premises. This Policy refers to the potential impact resulting from utility connections but this is not usually within the remit of the LPA. Policy also refers to the requirement for all development to provide infrastructure for broadband connection but not all development will be residential or commercial in nature. Also query whether this is reasonable to make development acceptable in planning terms. Bullet 1) This is addressed in policy HD2 and the Local plan policies and does not need repeating here. Bullet 2) <del>does not cause damage to, or reduce the effectiveness.</del> How will this be assessed? <del>or cause harm to the Conservation Areas or Heritage sites.</del> This would be assessed by the relevant policies in each Local Plan on Heritage and does not need repeating here. Bullet 3) This could be moved to Policy HD4 which covers design and energy efficiency, and does not need to be repeated here. Bullet 4) <del>Mobile connectivity, including 5G when introduced nationally, will be essential.</del> This is a matter for the Mobile Operators, which may be achieved within their permitted development rights. This could be moved into the supporting text. Bullet 5) <del>Particular care should be taken in any renewable project to mitigate the impact of power lines and pylons and sub stations on surrounding countryside and views.</del> There are no criteria for the siting of renewable energy projects, however this covers the power lines and pylons. This would be assessed as part of any application for a renewable project, and due to the absence of any criteria for the installation itself, therefore this element should be deleted.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy IC7	All of West Dean and outside the settlement boundary of West Tytherley is considered the countryside. Therefore TVBCLP policy LE17 on existing sites would apply, as would LE16 on the reuse of buildings. As would WCS CP35 on existing employment sites and CP48 on reuse of buildings. As this policy doesn't add any locally distinctive criteria and is covered by existing policies, it is not required and should be deleted. The local plan polices could be signposted in the supporting text. The policy covers all commercial development however the individual criterion need to have and/or as they will not all be relevant to every development. For example criterion (ii) requires development to support farming in agricultural areas. This policy is supporting new business development in the countryside which is not consistent with the LP. The first sentence of the policy is unclear, it would add clarity if the it referenced employment sites (i)how do we ensure a business employs local people? (ii)what does that mean? (iii)what does that mean and how do we ensure local people are involved (iv)what does that mean and ventilation is not a planning matter (v)what is a co working space? Where are 'new small-scale businesses' allowed to be located? I think this policy needs to link into and/or quote the more strategic policies to clarify.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.4.7	<del>Community Assets-Facilities Registering these assets as ACVs under the Localism Act requires a process under the aegis of the PC or voluntary body. ACV and other Treasured and Heritage Assets are identified herein but with the exception of Local Green Spaces, the NDP is not the primary route to registration. It adds support through its evidence base. Registration of an ACV acts as a flag and reinforces refusal for a change of use.</del> This is not the purpose of registering an asset of community value. If a facility has been registered, it ensures that the community are given a 6 month opportunity to purchase the asset for the benefit of the public. It does not reinforce the refusal for a change of use. Polices CP49 and COM14 in the local plans would be used to determine a loss of a community facility.



Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Policy IC8	This is covered by WCS CP49 and COM14 in the TVBC plan, and so a policy is not required. This is a statement of the mechanisms involved in securing Education contributions rather than a policy. This should be added to the supporting text and removed from the policy. Criteria (ii) is too restrictive - what happens if the business is unviable?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Section 8	<i>DELIVERY – Implementation, Monitoring &amp; Review.</i> This would benefit from being moved in the document, to before section 6
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Section 9	<i>GLOSSARY OF TERMS.</i> All references to be checked to ensure they are up to date, especially those that are from the NPPF which has now been updated.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Map A4	Blue Infrastructure including Flood Zones. This map is missing the data for West Dean. TVBC can help with updating the map to show all the data for the whole of the Plan Area.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Appendix B4	Heritage Sites Assets and Treasured Community Assets Facilities (Designated and Non-designated) The table would benefit from being split out into the Heritage Assets and Community Facilities.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Appendix C	Policy Evidence Table. All references to the NPPF will need to be updated to reflect the July 2021 version.