

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Environment Agency	Comment	General	We note that there are no site allocations coming forward as part of this plan. Therefore, based on the information currently available, the proposed NP raises no environmental concerns for us.
Environment Agency	Support	AM2	We are supportive of and commend the inclusion of policies AM2 - Green and Blue Infrastructure, Landscaping and Planting, AM2.1 - Protection of Pillhill Brook, and AM6 - Biodiversity and Habitats.
Environment Agency	Support	AM2.1	We are supportive of and commend the inclusion of policies AM2 - Green and Blue Infrastructure, Landscaping and Planting, AM2.1 - Protection of Pillhill Brook, and AM6 - Biodiversity and Habitats.
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	Vision	<p>2.1 The Foreword to the draft Neighbourhood Plan identifies that the plan seeks to create a thriving, safe, sustainable and friendly community; and that the rural character of the area will be enhanced whilst absorbing some further housing development</p> <p>2.2 Section 4.1 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan identifies the Vision for the Parish as: This Neighbourhood Plan promotes a harmonious and vibrant community across the Parish of Amport, respecting its rural origin, preserving its natural status and adapting to the needs of its inhabitants. This is achieved through a strategy that balances small-scale housing development to meet local need, combined with environmental protection, heritage conservation and community enrichment.</p> <p>2.3 This Vision is supported, with the exception of it explicitly restricting development to only being small scale to meet local needs. The NPPF is clear that Neighbourhood Plans should support strategic policies in Local Plans and should not promote less development or undermine such policies (paragraphs 13 and 30). This matter is dealt with further below.</p> <p>2.4 The plan period for the Neighbourhood Plan is 15 years up to 2040. It is essential that the plan therefore looks forward through to the end of the plan period and, as much as is known or possible, plan for any likely changes or matters of land use. Whilst it is recognised the emerging Local Plan is yet to be examined, the direction of travel is clear for a strategic expansion of Weyhill, required to meet the latest objectively assessed housing need. Part of this expansion will be located within the Amport Neighbourhood Plan area. Whilst this change in approach for the Local Plan is recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan, the plan appears to be proceeding on the strategy for the old Local Plan. Whilst the adopted Local Plan is part of the development plan, its strategy is out of date.</p> <p>2.5 The extent to which the draft Neighbourhood Plan complies with the Basic Conditions is considered below. Notwithstanding this, if the Neighbourhood Plan were to be made based on its current approach, it would very quickly become out of date with the need to undergo an immediate review to take account of the new Local Plan strategy, which goes to the heart of the Neighbourhood Plan and its Vision. Whilst the Parish Survey asked questions about the need for housing (as also considered below), with comments to the questions asked resisting large-scale development, the impending new Local Plan strategy doesn't go away and should be addressed in the plan-making process to enable the plan-led system to work effectively.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	Objectives	<p>3.1 The Parish-wide objectives are set out in Section 4.2 of the Neighbourhood Plan. The majority of these objectives are supported in principle.</p> <p>3.2 However, Natural Environment Objective 10 relates to discouraging inappropriate housing development outside of the settlement area to preserve the character of the natural environment. Unfortunately, "inappropriate" is not defined; inferring there could also be appropriate development outside of the settlement area.</p> <p>3.3 Built Environment Objective 8 also explicitly restricts development to be "small-scale".</p> <p>3.4 As noted above, if the Neighbourhood Plan does not take account of the forthcoming strategic expansion of Weyhill proposed in the emerging Local Plan, such development would fall outside of the settlement area and be defined as both "inappropriate" and not of a "smallscale"; such proposals thereby being in conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan. Any decision-maker would then be faced with a very clear conflict between the more up to date Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>3.5 It is also suggested in Built Environment Objective 2 that large scale development would be detrimental to the feel and character of the Parish. The Parish is diverse in character and geography, as addressed in Section 4 below. Therefore, whilst large-scale development could change the character of certain parts of the Parish, it would not necessarily be detrimental to the Parish as a whole, this being dependent on the scale, its location, form, impacts and its design.</p> <p>3.6 Built Environment Objective 10 suggests that to recognise the needs of the ageing population, the plan will advocate for improved public transport. It is suggested that opportunities should be sought for improved public transport for the whole community, not just the elderly population.</p> <p>3.7 It is worth noting that the concept for the expansion of Weyhill, identified in the Vision document attached to these representations, complies with all the other objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For the Natural Environment Objectives: the proposed development would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maintain and enhance key landscape features; • protect gaps between settlements; • provide new green spaces; • conserve / enhance wildlife habitats, corridors and vegetation; • protect dark skies; • protect and enhance views from rights of way; • protect and enhance footpaths and cycleways; and • improve access to green spaces. o For the built environment: the proposed development would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and enhance heritage assets; • minimise disruption, pollution and harm from development; • respect the character of the area (aligned with the Design Code); • enhance local services / facilities; • enhance public transport; • provide water / waste infrastructure to support new development; and • manage surface water.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
			3.8 It is only the quantum of the proposed development that would be in conflict with the draft objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan. It is therefore suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan takes account of and reflects the draft Local Plan strategic allocation for the expansion of Weyhill.
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	6.1 Landscape Character	<p>4.1 As noted above, Ampport Parish is varied in its character – Weyhill is very different in character to Cholderton. Indeed, the relationship of Weyhill to Andover appears to be down-played in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>4.2 In considering the Weyhill area of the Parish, paragraphs 6.1.19 – 22 rightly recognise the different character of this area compared to the other landscape character areas identified in Figure 13; this being where ribbon development and employment punctuates large fields and substantial gaps in development, in some areas being a transition zone between more urban areas to the east into the rural character of the Parish. The Neighbourhood Plan identifies this area as largely devoid of woodland, containing large arable fields with small pockets of trees and a particularly limited hedgerow structure.</p> <p>4.3 Paragraph 3.1.5 also recognises that the community across the Parish differs and is not homogenous. The plan goes further in flagging the poor relationship with the Borough Council. As an aside, it is our genuine belief that better places can be created when communities, Councils, landowners and developers work collaboratively.</p> <p>4.4 Whilst paragraphs 6.1.19-20 recognise the different character of areas within the Parish, paragraph 3.1.2 suggests that all of the settlements in the Neighbourhood Plan area contribute to the rural character of Ampport, each being enveloped in a picturesque, green landscape, providing a calm and peaceful historic environment. That, in our opinion, would not accurately reflect the character of Weyhill. It is suggested that the different characters should be reflected through the Neighbourhood Plan, including at paragraph 3.1.2.</p> <p>4.5 It is suggested therefore that the Neighbourhood Plan makes the differing characters across the Parish more explicit and provides policies which also reflect these differences. What may be acceptable or needed for Weyhill may not be for Cholderton; and vice versa; each having their own character, needs and issues needing to be addressed through the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM1	<p>Policy AM1 (Landscape Character and Settlement Identity):</p> <p>5.8 This policy is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.9 It is worth noting that the proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill would align with Policy AM1 insofar as it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve and enhance the distinct character of the landscape, taking account of the Ampport Character Appraisal and Design Code; • Protect the key valued characteristics that contribute to the Parish's character; • Prevent merging of fields and loss of landscape features; • Limit noise polluting development; • Preserve views and respect the open rolling character; • Conserve and enhance the open parkland character of Ampport House and Cholderton Downs; • Maintain the Parish's strong rural character and individual qualities of the settlements and their landscape setting; and • Would not lead to coalescence between settlements, maintaining the identity of each area.
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM2	<p>Policy AM2 – Green & Blue Infrastructure, Landscaping and Planting</p> <p>5.10 This policy is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.11 The proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill would align with Policy AM2 in that it would be landscape-led and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand the network of green and blue infrastructure; • Preserve, enhance and maintain existing green and blue infrastructure; • Survey and assess all landscape features; and • Provide extensive new planting using native and wildlife-rich species.
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM2.1	<p>Policy AM2.1 – Protection of Pillhill Brook</p> <p>5.12 This policy is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.13 Through careful assessment, design and mitigation, the proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill would not have an adverse impact on Pillhill Brook.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM3	<p>Policy AM3 – Flooding and Drainage</p> <p>5.14 This policy is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.15 The proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill would incorporate a sustainable and integrated approach to the management of flood risk, surface water and foul drainage, taking account of climate change. The proposed development is located in an area of lowest flood risk. The planning applications will be accompanied by the necessary risk assessments. Sustainable Drainage Systems would be employed and designed as part of the green infrastructure and street network, maximising opportunities for biodiversity gains.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM4	<p>Policy AM4 – Local Green Spaces</p> <p>5.16 The proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill would not affect the identified Local Green Spaces.</p>

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM5	<p>Policy AM5 – Important Views and Vistas</p> <p>5.17 This policy is not supported.</p> <p>5.18 The Neighbourhood Plan identifies a total of 38 important views in Figure 30, requiring under Policy AM5 that development proposals should preserve or enhance the local character of the landscape; and through design, height and massing, recognise and respond to the various important views.</p> <p>5.19 The supporting text to the policy (at paragraph 6.5.4) states that development proposals must include careful consideration of the potential impact on the identified views. Importantly, it is noted that the policy does not seek to prevent any development within the view, but to ensure that the scale, massing and height of proposals do not result in the integrity of the view being undermined. Paragraph 6.5.5 goes on to emphasise the aspiration to preserve the important views by maintaining native hedgerows.</p> <p>5.20 Whilst such areas may be cherished or have some emotional attachment by the local community, in a small area that is not protected by any landscape designation (for example National Landscape), not all views can carry the same weight or determined to be “important”. It is suggested that a Landscape Institute recognised methodology be utilised to identify those views worthy of protection, with a hierarchy or prioritisation of views identified within the Neighbourhood Plan, considering matters of landscape quality, historic significance, public access etc.</p> <p>5.21 It is therefore suggested that the policy be amended to make clear that the important views identified are not a barrier to development, but seek to ensure that a landscape assessment is undertaken for any development proposal, with schemes being designed in a landscape-led way so as to enhance natural landscape features, enhance public access and only limiting development where the landscape impact of the proposed development would be significant.</p> <p>5.22 The proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill has been subject to a landscape assessment; and the form of development influenced by a landscape-led approach. Important views have been identified and proposed to be utilised for green infrastructure, public access and enhanced landscape planting. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would accord with the principles underpinning this draft policy. However, the inclusion of “important views” in this location are not considered to be justified and would potentially be a barrier to otherwise acceptable forms of development.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM6	<p>Policy AM6 – Biodiversity and Habitats</p> <p>5.23 This policy is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.24 The proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill would protect and enhance local biodiversity by providing areas for biodiversity, new landscape planting, integrating sustainable drainage systems designed for ecological habitats, whilst protecting and enhancing existing landscape features. The proposed development would provide for a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>5.25 The proposed development therefore be in accordance with this draft policy.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM6.1	<p>Policy AM6.1 – Protection of Amport Fen</p> <p>5.26 This policy is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.27 The proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill would not have an adverse impact on Amport Fen.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM6.2	<p>Policy AM6.2 – Hawk Conservancy Trust</p> <p>5.28 This policy is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.29 The proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill would not have an adverse impact on the flight zone radius of the Hawk Conservancy Trust.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM7	<p>Policy AM7 – Dark Night Skies</p> <p>5.30 This policy is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.31 Figure 39 and Paragraph 6.7.3 of the Neighbourhood Plan identify the level of radiance and light pollution in the Parish, which is highest in Weyhill, coinciding with the Mayfield Avenue Industrial Estate and Weyhill Business Park. The level of light pollution in this area is noted as of concern to local residents, particularly if these business operations expand.</p> <p>5.32 The proposed development complies with the requirements of Policy AM7 in that they would not adversely affect the relative tranquillity of the Weyhill area. Lighting assessments, strategy and mitigation would ensure any adverse impacts would be avoided.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM8	<p>Policy AM8 – Historic Environment</p> <p>5.33 This policy is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.34 There are no designated heritage assets with the area of the proposed development at Weyhill. A Heritage Assessment will be undertaken to consider any heritage assets and to minimise harm. Nearby listed buildings and heritage assets, including their setting where appropriate, would be protected so as to not result in substantial harm and to minimise potential impacts.</p> <p>5.35 In this regard, the proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill would comply with draft Policy AM8.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM9	<p>Policy AM9 – Design principles</p> <p>5.36 The Neighbourhood Plan policy references the Parish Character Appraisal and the Design Code, requiring that all development will be expected to refer to these documents as well as the Building for a Healthy Life Toolkit, showing how careful consideration has been given to the design, scale, height, massing, layout, landscaping and appearance. The policy also requires consideration of any heritage assets, the use of traditional materials and local building styles, provision of amenity space and retaining and enhancing native and natural landscape features.</p> <p>5.37 This policy is supported in principle. However, care should be given to ensure it does not conflict or duplicate national or Local Plan policies.</p> <p>5.38 It is also worth noting that the Parish is varied in character, some of which may not wish to be used as a guide for new development. Scope should also be allowed for design innovation, ensuring good design is not thwarted by detailed Design Codes or policy requirements which only seek to replicate a more historic or traditional form.</p> <p>5.39 The proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill will be designed so as to adopt high standards of design. The promoters would wish to work with the local community in creating a Design Code for the expansion of Weyhill, so as to consider and reflect those aspects of character in the area that are cherished.</p>

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM10	<p>Policy AM10 – Housing, Infill and Redevelopment</p> <p>5.40 This policy is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.41 The proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill would not conflict with this draft policy.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM10.1	<p>Policy AM10.1 – Development of Housing to Meet Local Need</p> <p>5.42 As noted above, the basis for determining housing need in the draft Neighbourhood Plan is questioned, having been based on a Parish survey which only received limited responses, whilst also considering the local Housing Register in terms of affordable housing need. This is considered further below.</p> <p>5.43 Paragraph 7.3.11 of the Neighbourhood Plan states explicitly that the Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing large scale development, but instead is supportive of a modest development which would meet “local identified needs” and potentially deliver some form of community benefit. The motive for this (as suggested in paragraph 7.3.12) is that it is a priority for the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure future development would be in keeping with the rural character of the area.</p> <p>5.44 Whilst acknowledging at Paragraph 2.43 the strategy in the emerging Local Plan and its higher housing requirement (circa 1,250 homes at Weyhill, some of which falls within the Amport Neighbourhood Plan area), the Neighbourhood Plan effectively ignores the emerging Local Plan by stating that: “notwithstanding the issues around housing, it is understood that the main focus of the emerging Local Plan will likely remain the same” (Paragraph 2.44).</p> <p>5.45 The housing requirement in the emerging Local Plan is based on the latest objectively assessed housing need for Test Valley. The Borough Council has undertaken an extensive exercise considering all options for accommodating housing across the Borough and determined that the expansion of Weyhill offers a sustainable and appropriate location for much needed homes.</p> <p>5.46 It is well known that the UK continues to be in a housing crisis, with access to homes for sale and rent, as well as affordable housing, at a critical stage.</p> <p>5.47 It is also worth highlighting the Neighbourhood Plan’s own assessment of the Parish, where Weyhill is seen to be of a different character to the more rural areas to the south and south-west.</p> <p>5.48 Whilst the concerns over new development, identified through the Parish survey, are understood, at a time when the emerging Local Plan has clearly suggested that 1,250 homes should be allocated at Weyhill, the current approach of the Neighbourhood Plan of planning for significantly less than the identified housing need, relying on the out of date policies in the adopted Local Plan, leaves the Parish and Neighbourhood Plan at risk of being sidelined or derailed in the planning process.</p> <p>5.49 Question 16 of the Parish Survey 2023 asked the question whether the Parish should rely on Test Valley Borough Council or local landowners / developers to chose housing sites. 80% stated “No”. There is therefore a clear mandate for the Parish to take the lead in planning for growth and housing through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>5.50 It is therefore suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan works with the Borough Council, adjacent Parishes, landowners and developers, so as to plan effectively for the homes identified for the area in the emerging Local Plan. Such an approach would ensure the Parish shapes, directs and helps deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan, as advocated in the NPPF (paragraph 30); as well as realising community benefits.</p> <p>5.51 As noted through this assessment of the proposed development against the draft policies within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, the vast majority of the objectives and aspirations can still be met and realised.</p> <p>5.52 In this regard, we would welcome the opportunity to meet with the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan group to discuss how we could work collaboratively, drawing on experience of working with Neighbourhood Plan groups in this manner elsewhere.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM11A	<p>Policy AM11A – Community</p> <p>5.53 This policy is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.54 It is worth noting that the emerging Local Plan identifies the requirement for a primary school alongside the delivery of 1,250 homes at Weyhill.</p> <p>5.55 The development proposals for the expansion of Weyhill indicated in the attached Vision document make provision for extensive publicly accessible green infrastructure and play spaces alongside the delivery of the school, a pre-school and much needed new homes, including affordable housing.</p> <p>5.56 Furthermore, the additional population living as part of an expanded Weyhill community would provide much needed support for existing facilities.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM11B	<p>Policy AM11B – Local Economy</p> <p>5.57 This policy is supported in principle.</p>
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	AM12	<p>Policy AM12 – Accessibility, Road Safety and Sustainable Transport</p> <p>5.58 The concerns over traffic, including HGV movements, across the Parish are highlighted in the Parish Survey and draft Neighbourhood Plan, with particular concerns over the business parks at Weyhill.</p> <p>5.59 Policy AM12 is supported in principle.</p> <p>5.60 The proposed development for the expansion of Weyhill, identified in the attached Vision document, would comply with this policy. In particular, through a robust transport assessment, highway, pedestrian, cycle and public transport improvements and associated travel plan, the proposed development would provide safer places and routes for pedestrians and cyclists. Indeed, the proposals include enhancements to the A342 through Weyhill so as to provide enhanced and more attractive routes and crossings for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	Basic conditions	<p>6.0 Compliance with Basic Conditions</p> <p>6.1 Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, requires Neighbourhood Plans to meet certain “basic conditions”, as follows:</p> <p>a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order,</p> <p>b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, it is appropriate to make the order,</p> <p>c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area, it is appropriate to make the order,</p> <p>d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development,</p> <p>e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area),</p> <p>f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with any compatibility with EU and human rights obligations, and</p> <p>g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order.</p> <p>6.2 Paragraphs 69 – 70 of the NPPF state that strategic policy-making authorities should establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area; and for designated neighbourhood areas to reflect the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development and any relevant allocations. In addition, paragraph 11a of the NPPF requires that all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change and adapt to its effects.</p> <p>6.3 Paragraph 13 of the NPPF requires that Neighbourhood Plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans. Paragraph 30 of the NPPF states that it is the responsibility of Neighbourhood Plans to not promote less development than identified in Local Plans: “Neighbourhood plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies”</p> <p>6.4 Unfortunately, the Basic Conditions Statement does not appear to consider the above policy requirements. Whilst a housing requirement may not have been given by the Borough Council for the Neighbourhood Plan to accommodate, the recent draft Local Plan consultation provides a very real basis for the expansion of Weyhill, a proportion of which falls within the Amport Neighbourhood Plan area. This is as a result of the change to the housing requirement for the Local Plan area, for which it is necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to shape, direct and help deliver.</p> <p>6.5 The Basic Conditions above require the Neighbourhood Plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan. The Basic Conditions also require the Neighbourhood Plan to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>6.6 The draft Neighbourhood Plan effectively relies upon Policy COM1 of the adopted Local Plan, which identifies the housing requirement for the Borough. However, that policy is deemed to be out of date, being based on a superceded housing requirement for the Borough.</p> <p>6.7 In terms of the wider objectives, the Local Plan seeks the delivery and strengthening of sustainable, cohesive and healthy communities. The Amport Neighbourhood Plan therefore has a role in making Weyhill more sustainable, cohesive and healthy. The Local Plan also seeks the provision of a range of homes, including affordable housing. Currently, the draft Neighbourhood Plan only makes provision for 20 homes, thereby not meeting these requirements.</p> <p>6.8 This is founded upon what is considered to be “local needs”, based on a limited survey of existing residents: Q10 to the Parish Survey asked if there is a need for more housing in the Parish. The Neighbourhood Plan also doesn’t currently define what it means by “local needs”.</p> <p>6.9 Whilst the survey may helpfully identify the preferences of existing residents, it does not override the requirement to support the Local Plan and its statutory requirements. The strategy of the emerging Local Plan therefore needs to be accommodated within the Neighbourhood Plan, as considered above.</p> <p>6.10 Policy COM2 of the adopted Local Plan identifies the settlement hierarchy. Whilst the settlements within the Amport Parish fall at the lower end of the hierarchy, this policy is also out of date as it will need to be reviewed to reflect the strategic policy for the expansion of Weyhill, which would identify Weyhill as a much higher order in the hierarchy.</p> <p>6.11 Policy LE10 of the Local Plan identifies the strategic employment at Weyhill, which again the Neighbourhood Plan should consider in its strategy for housing.</p> <p>6.12 It is therefore suggested that the draft Neighbourhood Plan would not comply with the Basic Conditions. Whilst the emerging Local Plan does not yet form part of the development plan, the draft Local Plan provides a robust and clear direction of travel. The failure to plan for the latest housing need for the area would not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In considering Policy AM10.1 of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Basic Conditions Statement does not fully consider the social, environmental or economic implications of not providing for a higher quantum of housing.</p> <p>6.13 As identified above, even if the Neighbourhood Plan were made, it would immediately be rendered out of date upon adoption of the Local Plan, requiring it to be reviewed or a conflict created with the Local Plan. This would be contrary to the NPPF requirements outlined above, in particular undermining strategic policies by planning for less development than the Local Plan required. At the very least, the Neighbourhood Plan would not be able to influence or shape the Local Plan strategy for Weyhill.</p> <p>6.14 As noted above, it is the aspiration of community to be in control (response to Parish Survey). If the Neighbourhood Plan does not plan for the emerging Local Plan strategy for Weyhill, the community will be at risk of not being able to influence future development through the plan-led system, potentially being at risk of speculative development.</p> <p>6.15 Relying on the out of date adopted Local Plan strategy is therefore considered to be short-lived and not a sound basis for delivering much needed new homes.</p>

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Land & Partners Ltd and Obsidian Strategic	Comment	General	<p>7.0 Conclusion and Recommended Approach</p> <p>7.1 It is acknowledged that the Neighbourhood Plan is at a very difficult stage, with a significant change in housing requirement resulting in a large-scale allocation being indicated in the emerging Local Plan that was not envisaged until recently. The implications on the Neighbourhood Plan process are no doubt incredibly frustrating, when so much time and effort has been put into the Neighbourhood Plan up to this point. The concerns over such development are also understood.</p> <p>7.2 That said, in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan, it is necessary for it to fulfil its purpose and comply with the NPPF requirements and Basic Conditions.</p> <p>7.3 The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group therefore has a number of options to consider:</p> <p>1. Proceed with the current housing provision in the Neighbourhood Plan: This avoids delays to the plan-making process and allows the plan to proceed to Examination quickly. However, there is a very real risk that the draft plan will not be found to be in accordance with the Basic Conditions, meaning that the Neighbourhood Plan would need to go back to an earlier stage and the process repeated. Even if the plan proceeds to Examination and succeeds in being “made”, the time taken for this would mean that the emerging Local Plan would be adopted very soon after. This would mean that the Neighbourhood Plan would be deemed to be out of date at a very early stage in the plan period and need to be reviewed immediately so as to reflect the more recent Local Plan. At the very least, if this option is pursued, it is recommended that the Neighbourhood Plan is revised to reflect the emerging Local Plan and its strategy for the large scale allocation at Weyhill, for which the Neighbourhood Plan will be reviewed to take account of once confirmed.</p> <p>2. Abandon the Neighbourhood Plan and rely on the Local Plan to allocate land for development and include policies for design, heritage, transport, the natural environment etc: This option would mean that the significant efforts and work undertaken on the plan to date would be of no benefit. Furthermore, it would go against the very clear mandate for the Parish to take the lead in the planning of the area.</p> <p>3. Pause the Neighbourhood Plan until discussions have been held with the Borough Council, adjacent Parish Councils, landowners and developers. Following these discussions, a housing requirement figure can be identified for the Neighbourhood Plan to plan for, a concept and form of development agreed through a genuinely collaborative process and policies crafted for the Neighbourhood Plan. It would be hoped this process could be achieved within 12-18 months. This approach would ensure the Parish and Neighbourhood Plan is leading the process and maximises the opportunity for community benefits to be secured.</p> <p>7.4 It is therefore recommended that Option 3 is pursued, allowing the objectives in the Neighbourhood Plan to be achieved whilst planning collaboratively for the emerging Local Plan strategy and creation of a sustainable, cohesive and healthy expanded community at Weyhill.</p> <p>7.5 As identified in Section 5 above, the Vision for the expansion of Weyhill, as set out in the Appendices to these representations shows how a scheme can be devised which complies with the majority of the policies in the draft Local Plan; thereby demonstrating how a larger scale development need not necessarily conflict with the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan and provide the opportunity to deliver the aspirations of the community.</p>
Mr C Harris	Support	General	I wish to endorse the Ampport Parish Neighbourhood Plan currently with you for consultation.
Mr H Dix	Support	General	I wish to express my support for the Ampport Neighbourhood Plan. It accurately reflects the community's aspirations, protects the parish's heritage, and establishes a sound framework for the future. I recommend that it advances to referendum.
Mr J Harwood	Support	General	I support the Ampport neighbourhood plan to be in keeping with the rural aspect of Weyhill and the surrounding area and not spoiling it with too much development. I therefore urge that it be taken forward to referendum.
Mr S Coke	Support	General	The Ampport Parish Neighbourhood Plan and all associated documents has been produced by the people and communities who live within the Ampport Parish. Much work has gone into this by the parishioners who live in the parish and the Ampport Parish Neighbourhood Plan represents the views and wishes of those residents. So it has my full support and should be approved and “Made” as soon as possible.
Mr S Robinson	Support	General	I fully support the Ampport Neighbourhood plan. There has been an engaging and thorough process of negotiation with views being collected across the community. There is a willingness to accept new house building but on a scale that retains the integrity of our rural communities. I believe the Neighbourhood plan should now proceed to a referendum.
Mrs C Harwood	Support	General	I support the Ampport Neighbourhood Plan. It shows Yeats the views of the community are not adverse to a small amount of development in keeping with the rural area. I urge that it be taken forward to referendum.
Mrs D Stephenson	Support	General	I heartily endorse the Ampport Neighbourhood plan. It represents what we want to preserve in our village .
Mrs S Dix	Support	General	I would like to express my support for the Ampport Neighbourhood Plan. It represents the community's vision, preserves the parish's distinctive character, and offers a well considered framework for the future. I recommend that it move forward to referendum.
Ms R Redpath	Support	General	I fully support the Ampport Neighbourhood Plan which was created through consultation with local residents and communities. Much time and thought was given to the process and it should be adhered to.
National Highways	No Comment	General	We will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the A303. We have reviewed the above consultation and have 'No comments'.
Natural England	No Comment	General	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information.
Southern Water	Comment	Objectives	<p>11. On site provisions to be made for the management of surface water, to avoid run off from new development into a foul or combined public sewer network.</p> <p>Thank you also for including the following recommendation made in our pre-submission consultation response.</p> <p>If there were to be a significant increase in the number of dwellings proposed, Southern Water should be asked to assess the capacity of the sewer network once a planning application has been submitted.</p>

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Southern Water	Comment	6.2.12	<p>Pillhill Brook</p> <p>We welcome the additional wording in this section that recognises the work undertaken by Southern Water in the area to reduce the volume of ground water and surface water entering the foul sewer network. Thank you for including this recommendation.</p> <p>6.2.12 Southern Water recognises the risk of pollution to the brook during heavy rainfall periods and have undertaken a significant amount of work in the area to reduce the volume of ground water and surface water entering the foul sewer network. This has included the sealing of 2.5km length of public sewer and 2.5km length of private sewer to stop groundwater infiltration, and the sealing of over 70 manholes to stop surface water inundation during rainfall events.</p> <p>Tankers are still occasionally required to the Abbots Ann area to help the operation of the sewer when overwhelmed by rainfall, however the frequency of tankering is greatly reduced compared with previous winters, and over-pumping in the sewer catchment is thankfully now a thing of the past. The sewers will still become heavily surcharged during periods of heavy rain, which means that whilst the risk of pollution to the brook has been reduced, it cannot be said that the issue has been fully resolved. This will require a period of monitoring over winter periods to gauge the full benefits of the work that has been delivered.</p>
Southern Water	Support	6.3. Flooding and Drainage	<p>6.3. Flooding and Drainage</p> <p>Southern Water welcomes and supports the inclusion of a section on flooding and drainage, in particular paragraphs 6.3.6 and 6.3.7 and POLICY AM3 – FLOODING AND DRAINAGE. Neighbourhood and Local Plans can play a key role in preventing additional surface water entering wastewater sewer networks, and we are grateful that the underlined wording below has been included following our recommendation in the pre-submission consultation response.</p> <p><u>A surface water sewer should be seen as a last resort and no surface water will be permitted to enter the public foul sewage network.</u> Major developments must provide a SuDS Strategy and drawings showing all SuDS features. This must be supported with calculations showing how surface water flood risk will not increase. Areas already utilised for SuDS should be safeguarded from future alterations or development that would impede its effectiveness.</p>
Southern Water	Comment	6.3. Flooding and Drainage	<p>However, on reflection we feel this wording could be cleaner and more explicit in its direction, and we therefore recommend the following addition to this paragraph (existing wording ruled through and new wording underlined).</p> <p>A surface water sewer should be seen as a last resort and no surface water will be permitted to enter the public foul sewage network. <u>Discharging surface water to a surface water sewer should be seen as a last resort and surface water from new development will not be permitted to discharge to the foul or combined sewer network, to minimise the risk of sewer flooding and protect water quality.</u> Major developments must provide a SuDS Strategy and drawings showing all SuDS features. This must be supported with calculations showing how surface water flood risk will not increase. Areas already utilised for SuDS should be safeguarded from future alterations or development that would impede its effectiveness.</p>
Southern Water	Comment	AM9	<p>POLICY AM9 – DESIGN PRINCIPLES</p> <p>7.3. Housing, Infill and Redevelopment Extensions</p> <p>We would welcome design guidance that ensures that rainwater drainage on Extensions is not permitted to discharge to foul or combined sewers.</p> <p>We have had a number of instances where rainwater drainage for new Extensions has been connected to the foul sewer serving the property, which then drains to the main public foul sewer. This has often been done despite an inspection by Building Control as the lead authority.</p> <p>A discharge of rainwater into our 'foul only' or combined sewer network, either directly or indirectly via a drainage lateral at the property, is detrimental to our sewerage network and can be harmful to the environment. This includes where the surface water hierarchy has been followed and all alternative options have been exhausted.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Therefore, we would welcome additional guidance in the Design Guidance for Extensions that ensures that rainwater is not permitted to be discharged into a foul only or combined sewer.</p> <p><u>To minimise the risk of sewer flooding and protect water quality, rainwater drainage for the Extension will not be permitted to discharge to the foul or combined sewer network.</u></p> <p>The above is supported by our surface water management policy, which is available to view on our website.</p> <p>It is also supported by the National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) - GOV.UK which states the following in Standard 1: Run Off Destinations.</p>
Southern Water	Comment	AM9	<p>Note 2: for the purposes of this standard, a combined sewer is a sewer intended to receive both foul sewage and surface runoff and does not include a sewer intended to receive only foul sewage, even if it has the capacity to accommodate additional flows or has an element of surface water in it already.</p> <p>As stated on our website Building Over a Sewer - Southern Water if a developer is planning to build an Extension within three metres of a public sewer, they will need to submit a Build Over Application to Southern Water for approval, this is a mandatory requirement.</p> <p>If not considered, building an Extension near a sewer could cause it to collapse under the weight of the new structure. This could also damage the property, interrupt drainage for other properties, and increase the likelihood of sewer flooding. Submitting a Build Over Application allows us to check the necessary precautions are in place and that the sewer is in good structural condition.</p> <p>We'll also check that the design plans allow for 24-hour access to the sewer and any manholes. We need this to be able to carry out routine inspections, maintenance, and repairs. These are essential to help us protect the home and our pipes.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Therefore, we would welcome the following additional guidance in the Design Guidance for Extensions.</p> <p><u>If the Extension is within three metres of a public sewer, a developer will need to submit a Build Over Application to Southern Water for approval, this is a mandatory requirement and ensures that the necessary precautions are in place to protect access to the sewer and its operation</u></p>

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Southern Water	Comment	Water	<p>Infrastructure Delivery</p> <p>We could find no policies in the Plan to provide for new or improved water or wastewater infrastructure to support development, should that infrastructure be required at a future date. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) outlines the importance of achieving sustainable development and paragraph Paragraph 20 states 'Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places and make sufficient provision forb) infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);'</p> <p>Also, the National Planning Practice Guidance states that 'Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development'.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Therefore, we would welcome the inclusion of the following wording in the Plan in relation to utility infrastructure provisions.</p> <p><u>Proposals for new and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community.</u></p>
Southern Water	Comment	Water	<p>Fresh Water Scarcity</p> <p>Water is a finite resource and one of the key issues facing our environment is fresh water scarcity.</p> <p>The South East of England is classified as a seriously water stressed area by the Environment Agency as it has the lowest levels of rainfall and high population density. Southern Water are currently investigating ways to tackle leakage, targeting households to save water and investigating new areas of investment to safeguard future water supplies.</p> <p>This all comes at a time when climate projections point to drier and warmer summers with more extreme weather events and more frequent/severe droughts. These events are expected to result in a higher demand for water whilst adversely impacting supply.</p> <p>The more water that is abstracted from the ground to meet this growing demand the less water there is for rivers, streams and wildlife. This means that there are a number of competing demands on the use of water. This balancing act is anticipated to become even more challenging in the future, when taking into account an increased population (through additional development) and the likely effects of a changing climate on the availability of water resources. This means that Local and Neighbourhood Plans have a key role in ensuring that new development is designed to be water efficient.</p> <p>Water efficiency is regulated by Part G of the Building Regulations which require (section G2) that reasonable provision must be made by the installation of fittings and fixed appliances that use water efficiently for the prevention of undue consumption of water. For new dwellings, daily water use per person must not exceed 125 litres per person per day, with an optional tighter target of 110 litres per person per day where there is a clear local need.</p> <p>Southern Water had a 'T100 target' which is based on a maximum water capacity use of 100 litres per person per day whilst at the same time reducing leakage by 15% by 2025 and 40% by 2040.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Given that the South East of England is located in a water stressed area, we would welcome a target for water efficiency standards that reflects the challenges posed to water demand by climate change; we have provided recommended Policy wording below -</p> <p><u>Residential developments should be designed to meet either a water efficiency standard of 100 litres or less per person per day, or any future national standards, whichever is lower.</u></p>
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	General	Due to the forthcoming LGR, it would be helpful throughout the document, where appropriate, that the references to TVBC be amended to the Local Planning Authority.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	All policies	It would be helpful if the bullets were numbered, to aid their use in planning decision making.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	2.4	This section will need to be updated for the referendum version with the position at that time.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 3	The map is blurry and would benefit from being zoomed in showing a bit more detail. TVBC can assist with mapping if required.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	3.1.1	This will change due to LGR, so could just refer to Hampshire as a county
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	3.4.7 to 3.4.17	This section and all the figures should be removed to an appendix or the evidence base, as it will not be needed in the final plan.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	3.5.7 to 3.5.11	This section and all the figures should be removed to an appendix or the evidence base, as it will not be needed in the final plan.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Natural Environment Objective 8	"Protect and improve views" - Is this achievable?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Built Environment Objective 1	"Protect and enhance the significance" How will this be achieved?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Built Environment Objective 3	"Development which would change the character from rural villages towards a suburban area would not be supported" This is not an objective and is negatively worded. Suggest new wording to something that would maintain the rural character of the villages, or similar.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Built Environment Objective 5	"are properly maintained and repaired" How will the plan achieve this?

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Built Environment Objective 10	Reword objective 10 to read "Recognising the needs of our ageing population all residents to support we will advocate for improved public transport services."
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Built Environment Objective 11	Reword objective 11 to read "Further housing and business development within the Parish requires to ensure that new development delivers the appropriate additional infrastructure to minimise wastewater impacts including flooding, sewage/drainage capacity, open space/community facilities, communications, public transport and access and highway safety improvements."
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Built Environment Objective 12	Delete Objective 12 as these are addressed in the reworded objective 11 "On site provisions to be made for the management of surface water, to avoid run off from new development into a foul or combined public sewer network. "
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Built Environment Objective 13	Delete Objective 13 as this is addressed in the reworded objective 11 "Improve the availability of fast fibre throughout the Parish."
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Built Environment Objective 15	Delete Objective 15 as this is not an objective and is now covered in reworded objective 11.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	6.1.34	" Sarson Wood, Hurst Copse, Little Vinels Copse, Great Vinels Copse, Gollard Copse and Upper and Lower Amport Wood." It would be helpful if these were annotated on the map.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 19	This map difficult to read. A better map would add clarity.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM1	This repeats Local Plan policy E2 and does not need repeating in the plan. The NP could signpost to the LP for the relevant policy. Does the policy apply to a minor change, such as a conservatory? Suggest adding 'Where relevant' or similar.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM1	Bullet 4: This is addressed in Policy AM5 and does not need repeating here, as the plan should be read as a whole.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	6.2.2	"Cholderton Park, Victoria Copse, Cholderton Hill, Amport Wood, Furzedown, Sarson Wood, Gollard Copse, Little Vinels Copse, Great Vinels Copse and Hurst Copse." It would be helpful if these were annotated on the map.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 22	This map difficult to read. Pillhill Brook should be annotated. A better map would add clarity.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM2	This repeats Local Plan policy E6 and does not need repeating in the plan. The NP could signpost to the LP for the relevant policy.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM2	Bullet 4. What is the evidence to support this criteria?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	6.2.9	"the Brook runs from Mullen's Pond through East Cholderton " It would be helpful if these were annotated on the map at Figure 22
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	6.2.18	This is not relevant to the brook and should be deleted.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM2.1	<p>This policy will either need updating, or an additional policy added to address the issue of impacts on the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area and Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation to which the Brook flows into.</p> <p>New supporting text: The whole of the Plan 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 Plan Area will need to demonstrate they are nitrogen neutral in accordance with Natural England guidance. The Local Planning Authority 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</p> <p>Policy XXX Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Solent Maritime SAC 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 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 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 the Local Planning Authority 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
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM2.1	What is the evidence to support the 20m buffer when the EA buffer is 8m. This would also only apply to development what required Planning Permission, and not permitted development.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 24	better quality / larger maps are needed
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 25	better quality / larger maps are needed
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM3	This repeats Local Plan policy E7 and does not need repeating in the plan. The NP could signpost to the LP for the relevant policy.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM3	Paragraph 2. This is set out in the NPPF and does not need repeating here. This could be added to the supporting text.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM3	Paragraph 3. This may change over time, and while helpful, would better sit in the supporting text.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM3	Paragraph 4. This is set out elsewhere in National guidance, as does not need repeating in the policy. It could be added or signposted in the supporting text
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figures 26 to 29	These should be Policy Map 1, 2 etc rather than referred to as figures.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM4	Amendments to the wording for consistency with policies in other neighbourhood plans.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 30	This should be a policy map and not a figure. A larger map with the view numbers added would be helpful.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 36	The map is difficult to read and a better / larger map is required.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM6	This repeats Local Plan policy E5 and does not need repeating in the plan. The plan should signpost to the LP for the relevant policy. Bullet 3. This repeats policy AM2.1 and does not need repeating in this policy. Bullet 4. How / who will this be measured. What is the evidence for 20%?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM6.1	Amport Fen has been identified for a LGS designation which will give it the necessary protection, consider merging with Biodiversity policy above. "proximity to or affecting " How will this be assessed? . Bullet 4. How will this be assessed?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM6.2	It is acknowledged that this is a great asset in the parish, however the issues in the policy are not land use planning matters. This should be added to the community aspirations in the plan. How has the flight zone radius been defined? Paragraphs 3 and 4. How / who will assess this? Paragraph 5. How / who will assess this?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	6.7.4	How will this be achieved?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM7	How could development proposals enhance tranquillity and light pollution? Bullet 3. How will this be assessed? Bullet 4 How are these known? Bullet 5 How will this be measured? How far away in the landscape? What if it cant be avoided? Bullet 8. How will this be enforced?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figures 41 and 46	A better map is required.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM8	This repeats Local Plan policy E9 and does not need repeating in the plan. The NP could signpost to the LP for the relevant policy. The non designated heritage assets should be shown on a policies map, and numbered in the policy for ease of reference.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM9	The government have now published the National Design Model guidance, and therefore much of this does not need repeating if it is not locally distinctive to Amport. Character assessment work for the area is locally distinctive and should form the design principles for the Plan Area. Bullet 3 This is addressed in policy AM8 and does not repeating in this policy. Bullet 5 "adequate amenity space" How will this be assessed / measured? Bullet 6. "adequate amenity space" How will this be assessed / measured?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM10	Bullet 1. This is covered by other policies including Local Plan policy E9. This includes designated and non designated HA and so does not need repeating here. The supporting text could signpost to the LP policy or NPPF on this matter. Bullet 3 Will this achieve the intended outcome, as applicants will justify the repositioning of the replacement to overcome this criteria. Bullet 4. This is addressed in Local plan policy E1 and NP policy AM9 and does not need repeating here. Paragraph 2 For sites within the settlement boundary this repeats LP policy COM2 and does not need repeating in the NP. It is also addressed in policy AM9 and or could be added to policy AM9 and does not need repeating here. Paragraph 4. This is addressed in Local plan policy E1 and NP policy AM9 and does not need repeating here. Paragraph 5. This is covered by other policies including Local Plan policy E9.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM10.1	How will this need be delivered? The plan has missed an opportunity to allocate a site to meet the identified need which has the support of the community. Is there a reason the area of Weyhill has been identified and not Amport village? An allocation would have conferred some benefits in terms of the council not having a 5 year land supply and the allocation would have provided some protection from this. Bullet 3. How are these defined? Could this be a small grouping of a few homes? What about infilling? Bullet 6. Would it be reasonable and viable for a development of 20 homes to deliver this? Bullets 7 and 8. These issues are addressed through other polices in the plan and do not need repeating here.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 54	A better / larger map is needed, so that the facilities are easily located and identified. This also needs to be a policies map.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	7.41	This list should be honed into the key / important facilities that should be protected, such as the school, cricket ground, pubs, sea scouts, church and allotments. They will then be able to be protected in the policy.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM11A	The key facilities should be listed in the policy. Paragraph 4. This would sit better as a community aspiration.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM11.B	Bullet 1 How will this be measured? Bullet 2. This is addressed in Local Plan policy E8
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	AM12	This is addressed in Local Plan policy T1 and does not need repeating in the plan.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	General	There needs to be a monitoring section. Also any community aspirations should have a section here, and include who will be delivering the aspiration.
The Silverwood Partnership on behalf of The Dunning Family	Object	General	We represent The Dunning Family who own land in the Neighbourhood Area; SHELAA Ref 140, 143 & land at Dauntsey Lane (HMLR Title Plan attached). We wish to object to the Ampert Neighbourhood Plan (ANP) as it is unsound. A principle of neighbourhood planning is transparency; however, since the Reg14 Pre Submission Consultation to which we made a detailed submission with no response, there have been no meetings of either the steering or working groups on the ANP. The last meetings were Jan 24' & April 24'. All modifications to the Reg 14 Pre Submission have been made behind closed doors, resulting in a complete lack of transparency. On 18th June, well before publication of the Reg 18 version of the ANP, Test Valley Borough Council held an Extraordinary Council Meeting to agree a revised spatial strategy following the Dec 24' NPPF amended method for calculating housing need. This included a Northern Area Policy 16 (NA16): Expansion of Weyhill. The Reg 16 ANP ignores this draft policy and the NPPF revised housing number, making it unsound by not meeting the Basic Conditions of neighbourhood planning. Without consulting the landowners, contrary to the requirements in Section 5 of the attached Neighbourhood Plans Toolkit, the ANP working and steering groups decided behind closed doors that the Reg 14 ANP included part of SHELAA as an LGS (LGS15). This has continued unamended in the Reg 16 ANP, still with no consultation with the land owners; the proposed LGS designation is unsound again by not meeting the Basic Conditions of neighbourhood planning.
The Silverwood Partnership on behalf of The Dunning Family	Object	6.4. Local Green Spaces	1. Failure to comply with National Policy - Paragraph 102 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out three strict criteria for LGS designation: (a) The land must be in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; (b) It must be demonstrably special to the local community and hold particular local significance; and (c) It must be local in character and not an extensive tract of land. The proposed LGS15 designation fails these tests: The land in question is part of a working agricultural holding, privately owned and not publicly accessible. There is no evidence whatsoever that the land is demonstrably special to the community or possesses any of the cited qualifying characteristics (beauty, historic value, recreational use, tranquillity, or wildlife richness). The area identified comprises six acres of farmland, and as such constitutes an extensive tract of land, contrary to NPPF guidance and case law. The attempt to impose LGS status on this land is plainly inconsistent with national policy.
The Silverwood Partnership on behalf of The Dunning Family	Object	6.4. Local Green Spaces	2. Lack of procedural transparency - The absence of early and meaningful engagement undermines the legitimacy of the process. The Toolkit and national planning guidance make clear that a proportionate and transparent evidence base, including consultation with landowners at an early stage, must support LGS proposals. These requirements have not been met.
The Silverwood Partnership on behalf of The Dunning Family	Object	6.4. Local Green Spaces	3. Improper purpose – attempt to prevent future development - The land is in lawful agricultural use, and there is no history of an open space of community value. The absence of evidence supporting the site's "specialness" raises serious concerns that the LGS designation is being used improperly as a mechanism to frustrate future development of privately owned land. This would amount to a misuse of the planning system and is expressly cautioned against in both the NPPF.