

**Chilbolton Neighbourhood
Development Plan
2019-2029**

**Consultation
Statement**

December 2019



OUR PARISH IN BALANCE FOR THE FUTURE



INDEX

	Pages
Consultation Statement	3 - 6
TABLE 1 Consultations Undertaken	7 – 12
TABLE 2 Regulation 14 Consultees	13 – 18
TABLE 3 Responses to Reg. 14 Consultation	19 - 29
TABLE 4 Changes made to Pre Submission Draft	30 - 32

Introduction

This Consultation Statement accompanies the Submission Draft of the Chilbolton Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP) 2019-2019 as submitted to the Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) and has been prepared to fulfil the obligations in Part 5 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. A Consultation statement shall contain:

- Details of the people and organisations consulted about the proposed neighbourhood plan
- Explain how they were consulted
- Summarises the main issues and concerns raised
- Describes how these issues and concerns were considered and how addressed in the CNDP if considered relevant.

Background

At monthly meetings of the Chilbolton Parish Council (CPC) in early 2014 it was decided to prepare an updated Village Design Statement (VDS) or a Neighbourhood plan. This proposal was discussed at the Parish Annual Meeting on 7th April 2014, a Public meeting of all parishioners. After a slide presentation, questions and discussion it was decided to proceed with a Chilbolton Neighbourhood Development Plan(CNDP) and a Working Group (WG) was established to prepare the plan.

Designation

An application was made to designate the entire Chilbolton Parish as the designated area on 28th August 2014. After a public consultation between Friday 26th September 2014 and Friday 7th November 2014, the Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) approved the CPC application on 1st December 2014. This enabled the CNDP to go ahead.

Community Consultation

Throughout the process there were regular articles in the Village magazine, monthly reports to the Parish Council that were included in the published minutes and important documents were on the village website in a special section for the Neighbourhood Plan. A number of public meetings were arranged so that parishioners could be advised of progress and have an opportunity to ask questions. The Working Group (WG) was led by a parish councillor but at all times there were more ordinary parishioners than parish Councillors on the WG.

During 2015 and 2016 WG meetings were held about twice each month to establish the scope of the CNDP and the necessary actions. WG members attended training and orientation sessions and a training course that took place in February 2017.

Housing Need Survey

The first important action was to carry out a Housing Need Survey (HNS) and Action Hampshire was appointed to do this. The survey questions were prepared by the WG in

conjunction with Action Hampshire.

A public meeting was held on 9th September 2016 to launch the HNS. This was widely advertised using signs throughout the Parish, the village website and articles in the monthly village magazine. Questionnaires were delivered to every house in the parish and responses were by mail or internet to a Survey Monkey site set up by Action Hampshire. 216 of 450 households responded.

A report was prepared and approved by the CPC in May 2017.

In June and July 2017 the WG prepared a report on affordable housing in Chilbolton as part of the evidence base. The report on the results and a copy of the questionnaire are on the Chilbolton Village Website.

http://www.chilboltonandwherwell.info/images/Minutes/CPCMinutes/May_17_attachments/8517_12g_FINAL_Housing_Needs_Survey_Report_for_Chilbolton_-5th_May_2017.pdf

The Parish Survey

The WG then set about preparing for a Parish Survey to obtain the views of all parishioners on the wide aspects to be covered in the CNDP. This survey was widely advertised using signs throughout the Parish, the village website and articles in the monthly village magazine and survey questionnaires were delivered to every home in the parish with the village magazine at the beginning of December 2017. The survey closed in January 2018 and the WG prepared a report on the findings.

On 29th June and 14th July 2018 public report back meetings on the surveys and the proposed project plan were arranged for parishioners in the village hall. These were well attended and many questions were raised and answered.

The report findings are summarized in Section 4 of the NDP and the detailed responses and a copy of the questionnaire are available on the Chilbolton Village Website.

http://www.chilboltonandwherwell.info/images/Minutes/CPCMinutes/May_18_attachments/8518_26a_CNDP_Parish_Survey_Graphs_v6_280418_issue_1.pdf

Local Businesses

Since there had been no response from businesses it was decided to prepare a more targeted survey for businesses and to get responses in face to face meetings with the managers or owners of the businesses. These took place in April and May 2018 and a report was prepared. There are some 50 businesses located in the Parish excluding individuals working from home and 18 completed the Business Survey. Due to the small number of respondents the businesses expressed the wish that their names and individual responses should not be included in the report for reasons of confidentiality.

The Report on the Business Survey is available on the Chilbolton Village Website.

http://www.chilboltonandwherwell.info/images/CNP_Bus_Survey_Summary3438.pdf

First Draft

Using the information from the surveys the WG prepared a Strengths and Weakness analysis (SWOT), a list of Objectives for the Parish and first draft of the CNDP for discussion with the CPC. The draft NDP was agreed in a joint meeting that took place on 5th December 2018 when it was agreed to release the first draft to TVBC for informal comment. On 9th January 2019 Sarah Hughes joined the WG and made a number of suggestions to improve and formalise the CNDP.

A public report back meeting to parishioners was held on 16th February 2019. At this meeting the main draft policies and issues were presented and discussed leading to a very positive response.

Regulation 14 Consultation.

The WG then prepared to Pre Submission Draft CNDP that was approved by CPC on 3rd June 2019 and informally discussed with TVBC before proceeding with printing. The Reg. 14 consultation took place from 29th June 2019 to 12th August 2019.

During this period the consultation was widely advertised using signs throughout the Parish, the village website, articles in the monthly village magazine and the WG had a stand at the annual village fete on 29th June 2019 and drop in consultation and discussion sessions were arranged on most Saturdays during the consultation period in the Village hall or Abbots Mitre local pub.

The CNDP process had evolved slowly over some 5 years during which time everyone in the Parish became aware of the project and many were involved. Practically all parish respondents agreed and supported the proposed CNDP and their kind and positive remarks are evidence of the overall support.

Requests for comment were sent to 65 statutory consultees on 6TH and 7TH July 2019. Please see Table 2 for the list.

10 were rejected and referred back to Sarah Hughes at Test Valley BC.

15 were acknowledged.

There were 5 responses including an extra general notice from TVBC to all Neighbourhood Plan Groups.

There were 10 responses from Parishioners on the plan .

The responding statutory consultees were:

- Hampshire County Council - Three responses received relating to Hampshire Highways, Flood Authority, and as Land owner
- Natural England
- Test Valley Borough Council
- Hassocks Parish Council
- Highways England.

Parishioners

Apart from comments relating to grammar and factual errors that were corrected in the submission draft, the only adverse comments related to the extension of the Village Settlement Boundary in the 2011-2029 Local Plan but this issue is outside the scope of the CNDP so will be raised separately by the CPC. There were relatively few responses from the statutory consultees, mostly advisory in nature and no objections.

Every comment from parishioners and consultative bodies was carefully considered by the WG to decide whether an amendment or other action was necessary. Following changes to the CNDP it has been submitted to TVBC in compliance with Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Regulation 15.

The detailed responses are in table 3 below.

Racial and ethnic groups

There are only one or two parishioners of ethnic minority and no racial or ethnic representative groups. These persons were consulted as part of the consultation process and through the various public meetings.

Religious groups

The only formal religious group is the Church of England. The chairman of the Parochial Church Council was a member of the CNDP working group and thus involved throughout the process. The local vicar was given a copy of the printed plan and made no comment apart from compliments on comprehensive document.

Disabled groups

There are only very few parishioners with disabilities and no representative groups. These persons were consulted as part of the consultation process and through the various public meetings.

Conclusion

The publicity, engagement and consultation undertaken to support the preparation of the Chilbolton Neighbourhood Plan has been open and transparent, with many opportunities provided for those that live, work, and do business within the Neighbourhood Area to contribute to the process, make comment, and to raise issues, priorities and concerns. All statutory requirements have been met and additional consultation, engagement, and research has been completed.

This Consultation Statement has been produced to document the consultation and engagement process undertaken and are considered to comply with Part 5, Section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Table 1
Consultation undertaken

Event	Timing	Purpose of Event	Method of response collation	Outcome	Further information and details
Chilbolton Parish Council (CPC)	14 th February 2014	CPC monthly meeting	Agenda and Minutes	Resolution to appoint WG to formulate a Chilbolton Parish Plan.	CPC minutes
First meeting of Working Group (WG)	28 th February 2014	Meeting to discuss Terms of reference and membership of WG	Agenda and Minutes	WG formed	WG minutes
WG Meeting	4 th March 2014	First WG meeting	Agenda and Minutes	WG operational	WG minutes
WG Meeting	11 th March 2014	Presentation by TVBC officers Graham Smith and Andrew Pilley.	Agenda and Minutes	Explanation of Neighbourhood Plan, Village design Statement and parish Plan.	WG/CPC minutes
WG meeting	17 th , 27 th , March and 1 st April 2014	WG meetings to prepare for presentation to Parish	Agenda and Minutes	Different areas delegated and event planning. Overhead slides prepared.	WG minutes
Annual Parish Meeting – Public Meeting	7 th April 2014	Presentation using slides. Explanation of NP process.	Notes of verbal comments and “postcard” submissions	Highly successful meeting with good attendance	WG minutes

Event	Timing	Purpose of Event	Method of response collation	Outcome	Further information and details
CPC meeting	7 th April 2014	Discuss and Approve TOR of WG	Agenda and Minutes	TOR of WG formally approved by CPC	CPC minutes
WG meeting	13 th May 2014	Initial Meeting of WG	Agenda and Minutes	Planning for creating NP	WG minutes
Presentation by Phil Turner of Planning Aid.	November 2014	WG training	Status of Neighbourhood Plans in Planning Hierarchy.	Advice from Planning Aid	WG minutes
TVBC Meeting	1 st December 2014	Designation as a Neighbourhood Area	Letter to Chilbolton PC.	Advice and evidence for WG	PC and WG minutes
Launch Housing Need Survey	9th September 2016	Public Meeting in Village hall	Notes of verbal comments	Well attended meeting	WG minutes
Training on NPs delivered by Donna Moles PhD, MRTPI.	February 2017	WG Training	Training of WG members	Training of WG members	WG minutes
Housing Need Survey Report.	March/April 2017 ?	Carried out by Action Hampshire	Surveys delivered to every residence in parish with written and internet responses using Survey Monkey	Surveys collated	Village website WG minutes
Housing need Survey report. Electronic and hard copy to CPC	May 2017	Discussion and approval by PC	Adopted by CPC	Evidence for CNDP	Village website

Event	Timing	Purpose of Event	Method of response collation	Outcome	Further information and details
Interim Report	May 2017	Planning Policy ideas and problems encountered by Parish Planning Committee	Adopted by CPC for guidance.	Information and guidance for CNDP WG	CPC minutes
Report on affordable housing in Chilbolton	July 2017	Prepared for CPC	Evidence for CNDP	Adopted by CPC for guidance.	CPC minutes
Parish Survey	December 2017 – January 2018	Surveys delivered to each home and business in the Parish	Hand written responses and entries on Survey Monkey	Response rate of 47% 216 responses from 432 residences No responses from businesses	Village website WG minutes
Parish Business Survey	April and May 2018	Face to face interviews with larger businesses	Entered on SurveyMonkey by WG members	Report on Business Survey	Village website WG minutes
Report back meetings	29 th June 2018 and 14 th July in Village hall	Presentation of results of Residents' and business surveys Explanation of project plan.	Minutes of meetings and record of questions and responses	1st draft of CNDP prepared Sarah Hughes attended WG meeting in advisory capacity	WG minutes

Event	Timing	Purpose of Event	Method of response collation	Outcome	Further information and details
Draft CNDP	24 th November 2018	Issued to CPC members for comment and questions	Electronic and CPC minutes response	2 nd draft of CNDP prepared	WG minutes
Combined meeting of WG and CPC	5 th December 2018	Discussion of draft document	Positive response by CPC members	CPC agreed that the draft document could be released to TVBC for informal comment.	Electronic and hard copy sent to TVBC, Sarah Hughes
Meeting with TVBC NP Officer – Sarah Hughes	9 th January 2019	Feedback from Sarah Hughes	Need to formalise the document structure using templates from other local NPs.	Revised document to be prepared	WG minutes
Report back meeting	16 th February 2019	Village hall	Presentation and discussion of main proposals	Positive response from parishioners.	WG minutes
Approval of pre submission draft CNDP by Parish Council	PC meeting 4 th March 2019	Electronic copy to all parish councilors	Preparation of draft document	Pre Submission draft CNDP approved by CPC	PC and WG minutes
Informal review by TVBC	May Village Magazine	Electronic copy	Changes to hard and electronic copies Parishioners invited to comment	Changes to pre submission draft	WG minutes Village website
Reg. 14 Consultation on Pre Submission Draft	28 th June 2019 to 12 th August 2019	Electronic and hard copy	Pre submission draft presented at Village Fete June 29 th 2019	Positive response and comments noted	WG minutes

Event	Timing	Purpose of Event	Method of response collation	Outcome	Further information and details
Village Fete	29 th June 2019	NP stand to present and discuss plan	Notes of comments raised and formal responses to Consultation	Comments used for preparation of submission draft	Consultation report
WG meetings.	August and September 2019	Review of responses by WG	Changes to electronic copy of Submission Draft	Changes to electronic copy of Submission Draft	WG minutes
Changes made to pre submission draft	WG meeting August 28 th 2019	Electronic and hard copy	Changes to electronic copy	Changes to website	WG minutes
PC Meeting	7 th October 2019	Approval of Submission Draft	Electronic copy of Submission Draft	Submission Draft Approved	PC minutes
WG meetings and collaboration	November and December 2019	Preparation of Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement	Electronic copy of Draft Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement	Circulated to PC members	PC minutes
Special PC Meeting	December 2019	Approval of Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement	PC minutes	Submission to TVBC of Submission Draft, Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement	

Table 2
Regulation 14 Consultees

ORGANISATION	SENT	EMAIL REJECTED	EMAIL ACKNOWLEDGED	COMMENTS
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
British Gas	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
BT	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Bullington Parish Council	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Chilbolton Parish Council	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Cholderton & District Water Company	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Campaign to Protect Rural England (Test Valley Branch)	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Crawley Parish Council	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
E.ON Energy Solutions Ltd	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
East Hampshire District Council	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Eastleigh Borough Council	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Environment Agency	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Fareham Borough Council	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Gosport Borough Council	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received

Hampshire County Council - Enquiries	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Hampshire County Council Economy, Transport and the Environment	Sent 6/7/19			Comments received re flooding
Hampshire County Council Estates Practice	Sent 6/7/19			Comments received
Hampshire County Council Highways	Sent 6/7/19			Comments received
Hampshire County Council Property Services	Sent 6/7/19			Comments received
Hampshire County Council Transport Policy	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
HCC Development	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Hampshire County Council Economy, Transport and Environment	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Hart District Council	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Havant Borough Council	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Highways England	Sent 6/7/19			No comment
Historic England	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Homes England	Sent 6/7/19			No Response Received
Leckford Parish Meeting	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Mobile Operators Association	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received

National Grid Electricity Transmission	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
National Grid Property Holdings Ltd	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Natural England	sent 9/7/19			No comment
National Trust	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Network Rail	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
New Forest District Council	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
New Forest National Park Authority	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
New Forest National Park Authority	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
NHS West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
NTL	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
O2	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Orange	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Planning Advice for Developments Near Hazardous Installations PADHI+	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Rushmoor Borough Council	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Scottish & Southern Energy, Major Projects Group Southern	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received

Sembcorp Bournemouth Water Ltd	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Sembcorp Water	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
South Wonston Parish Council	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Southampton City Council	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Southern Electric	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Southern Gas Networks	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Southern Water Services Ltd	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
SSE Telecoms (Southern Electric)	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Test Valley Community Services	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Test Valley Association of Parish Councils	sent 9/7/19			Comments Received
Three	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
T Mobile	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
The Coal Authority	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Vodafone	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Virgin	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
West Berkshire Council	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received

Wherwell Parish Council	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Wiltshire Council - Directorate of Economy & Environment	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
Winchester City Council	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received
TVBC Councillor David Drew	sent 9/7/19			No Response Received

Table 3

Response to Regulation 14 Representations

Plan section	Consultee	Summary of comments received	Chilbolton response to the comments, and changes made to the plan
General	Local Resident	In general terms I agree to support this as it stands	Noted.
General	Local Resident	There should be no new buildings other than replacements. In stead of new buildings plant 10,000 trees	Noted
General	Local Resident	2 Pages – mostly editorial corrections	Noted.
General	Local Resident	Comprehensive report – thanks to all concerned	Noted.
General	Local Resident	Suggests carbon neutral houses re HD6 Remarks on bridleways maintenance Martin’s lane junction Paring on common Bridleway /footpath to Andover Ash tree decline Waterbutts	Noted
General	Local Resident	Good Plan No mention of disabled access – e.g. disabled toilet at pub Highlights problems re speeding .	Noted.
General	Local Resident	Well done – tremendous job Test Valley farm - extension of settlement boundary and proposed removal agricultural ties and is detrimental and questionable. Several supportive remarks	Noted
General	Local Resident	Policies look appropriate Many editorial / accuracy comments	Noted.

General	Local Resident	Excellent piece of work Several editorial / accuracy comments	Noted.
General	Local Resident	Serious concern about extension of Settlement boundary at Test valley farm and questions how changes were made.	Referred to CPC for discussion with TVBC.
General	HCC	The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) should reference, HCC Local Transport Plan and Walking and Cycling Strategies	WG feels that this is the remit of the Local plan. No action.
HD6	HCC	HCC would recommend that the NP state that new developments should be supported by a Transport Statement / Assessment and Travel Plan to demonstrate that safe access can be provided and that the impact on the development on the local highway network can be mitigated. Any development proposals should look to enhance and or make connections to the extensive rights of way network in / around the village and make provision for the use of sustainable modes of transport for local journeys within the village itself.	This will be required for large developments per TVBC planning policies. No action.
HD7	HCC	HCC consider that the Parking standards proposed may be considered excessive.	The WG disagree. The parking standards are designed to ensure that larger properties make adequate provision for resident and visitor parking off road.
CI2	HCC	HCC recommend that charging points in the village should be located so as not to cause an obstruction to the operation and safety of the local highway network and other road users.	WG agree but since it is rather obvious no action required.
CI4	HCC	HCC support this objective.	Noted.
General	HCC	HCC would encourage the parish to find suitable temporary parking arrangement for the summer months when visitors are drawn to the area. The parish may wish to consider participating in Community Speed Watch initiative or look into purchasing temporary SIDS to improve compliance with the 20mph speed limit through the village.	These matters are in constant discussion with HCC highways but there is no funding.

CI5	HCC	HCC support this objective.	Noted.
Community Projects and Aspirations	HCC	The parish may wish to consider applying to the HCC Community Funded Infrastructure Initiative as a means of delivering an enhanced village entrance / gateway. The County Council understand that the Traffic Management team have briefed the Parish on this previously.	Discussions are proceeding with CPC highways committee.
General	HCC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)	There is some inconsistency within the document with the terms 'ground water' vs 'groundwater' which HCC recommend should be reconciled.	Noted and changed.
General	HCC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)	On page 34 of the document, there is reference to 'surface flooding' (first sentence). HCC recommend that this is changed to ' <u>surface water flooding</u> ' for clarity.	Noted and changed.
General	HCC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)	Also, on page 34 of the document, there is a note under the box of Policy EN4 that references 'table 4' – it is not clear what or where table 4 is.	Changed to read Policy EN4
General	HCC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)	HCC as LLFA would suggest a hyperlink to the Village Emergency Plan (p.34) (is this the same as the Parish Emergency Plan (p.58)? – if so, consistency in terminology would be helpful).	Changed to read Parish Emergency Plan.
General	HCC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)	HCC suggest linking to the Test Valley Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for ease of reference.	Noted.
General	HCC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)	Page 34 references properties in 'the EA flood warning area' – this needs to be more specific regarding what type of flooding it is referring to – is it groundwater flooding? Fluvial flooding? If it is indeed fluvial flooding, it is worth confirming which flood zones (2 or 3) this is referring to. It is also worth noting that when property occupiers move, the statement regarding connectivity to the flood warning system may no longer be accurate – perhaps this is a role the Flood Action Group could have to ensure this information is passed on?	This is the role of the CPC Flood Action Group and they have been advised.

General	HCC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)	HCC as LLFA consider that it would be beneficial to see more detail on Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in developments (briefly referenced in Policy HD7 and in CIO09) within the Neighbourhood Plan.	Agreed but no action considered necessary.
Policy EN2	HCC Property	<p>Whilst Hampshire County Council as a public landowner supports the principle of the Policy EN2(b), it is thought that the requirement for “a full site survey including Ecological Impact Assessment” for any development proposals may not be effective as this could potentially pose unnecessary planning delay or challenges to small development. Thus, the Policy is not positively prepared.</p> <p>In response to the above, the County Council considers that the requirements for site survey and Ecological Impact Assessment in terms of their extent/ level of details for any proposals should be determined on a site-by-site basis. Any site survey and supporting evidence required should be proportionate and appropriate in relation to the type and scale of a proposed development. It is therefore recommended that additional supporting text is added to Policy EN2(b) to include a degree of flexibility in the requirements for providing supporting site evidence.</p> <p><i>b) Development proposals that affect existing trees and hedgerows include the planting of new trees and or hedgerows should demonstrate that they have been informed and guided by a full site survey, including Ecological Impact Assessment where appropriate.</i></p>	The WG decided not to change to CNDP.

Policy HD1	HCC Property	<p>Hampshire County Council in its role, as a landowner supports the principle of Policy HD1. Notwithstanding support for the policy overall, the County Council is concerned that Policy HD1(a) does not meet the tests of soundness as it is not sufficiently flexible to respond to unexpected changes during the plan period and so it is not positively prepared or consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Policy HD1(a) makes reference to a specific housing needs evidence document that sets the limit of the total number of dwellings allows to be built over next 10 years of the plan period. Given the single reference of housing needs evidence document in the Policy, this does not encompass any potential changes to future housing needs within the Parish, as well as the Borough wide needs within Test Valley from the perspective of strategic development planning. Based on the local plan process timeline for the emerging Test Valley Borough Local Plan, the housing needs set out in the draft neighbourhood plan will potentially be superseded by the Local Plan, or by subsequent housing evidence-based reports. In any regard the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) requires “neighbourhood plans be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in any development plan covers their area” (page 10, para. 29, footnote 16).</p> <p>As demonstrated above, it is therefore recommended that an element of flexibility is incorporated in the supporting text to ensure the allowance for the maximum number of new homes to be built can appropriately reflect and adjust to the possibilities of housing needs changes in the future over the plan period.</p>	<p>The WG decided not to change to CNDP because the parish wishes to restrict development to infill with small homes in the planning period in order to balance the housing stock.</p>
------------	--------------	--	--

Policy HD1	HCC Property	<p>Policy HD1(b):</p> <p>The County Council is aware of the Parish Council’s intention to provide smaller-sized dwellings to meet the needs of the local residents. However, it is thought that the current wording of the Policy HD1(b) is considered rather rigid and can potentially undermine the objective to achieve high-quality design based on assessment of the site context and surrounding character. Hence, it is suggested that supporting text can be added to the Policy to include the balance between meeting the needs of smaller-sized dwellings and the objective of delivering good design when there are special site circumstances.</p>	<p>The WG does not wish to have a more flexible policy because it wishes to meet the objective of balancing the housing stock in the planning period if possible.</p>
------------	--------------	---	---

Policy C11:	HCC Property	<p>Hampshire County Council in its role, as a landowner and service provider supports the principle of Policy C11. Notwithstanding support for the policy overall, the County Council is concerned that Policy C11 does not meet the tests of soundness as it is not sufficiently flexible to respond to unexpected changes during the plan period and so it is not positively prepared and may not be effective.</p> <p>The County Council as a public landowner and service provider, has been made aware that the draft Neighbourhood Plan has identified West Down Nature Reserve, which is within the County Council's landownership, as one of the Parish's community facilities.</p> <p>On this basis, the County Council wish to inform that whilst there should continue to be a presumption to retain existing community facilities and services for the benefits of local communities, the County Council has an on-going review process to assess the services it provides as part of strategy of service-driven improvements. This can sometimes result in the relocation and/or re-provision of services to an alternative location to continue to meet operation needs. It may also necessitate the rationalisation of surplus facilities for disposal whereby the proceeds of sale are re-invested to support the deliverability of the re-provision. This approach is supported by Circular 06/03: Local Government Act 1972 General Disposal Consent (England) 2003 – "best consideration for the disposal of land".</p>	<p>The WG considers that the suggestions would be appropriate in other places but not in a rural parish such as Chilbolton. In addition, the only land owned by Hampshire CC is Westdown Nature Reserve, an important part of Chilbolton Downs and a listed Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitat through which passes the Test Way, so this property is protected in many ways. It is on a 99 year lease to the Chilbolton Parish Council for use as a public recreation area until April 2113 so most of the suggested policies would not be necessary or applicable.</p> <p>No action.</p>
-------------	--------------	--	---

Policy C11:	HCC Property	<p>It is noted that in Policy C11(b)(i), an assessment is required to be undertaken to demonstrate that the facility is surplus to requirements. Whilst the Policy has not clearly defined what the “assessment” will entail, it is assumed that the Policy intends to be consistent with paragraph 5.141 of Policy COM14 Community Facilities in the adopted TVBC Local Plan 2011-2019. Paragraph 5.141 requires a market assessment for a 6-month period to justify the loss of a community facility.</p> <p>In relation to the above, the County Council thinks the proposed Policy C11 can be too stringent and could hinder public service providers, such as the County Council, in being effective in delivering and transforming community services and facilities. The requirement of a 6-month marketing assessment to prove that a facility is surplus to requirements can be inappropriate and impose unnecessary delay in securing or indeed spending, limited government funding for community service improvements. On this basis, the County Council would therefore recommend that an element of flexibility is incorporated in the emerging policy to enable public service providers to help deliver operational service changes (including the loss or disposal of a facility no longer needed). One such approach is to distinguish between commercial-run and publicly owned or managed community facilities. For instance, it is noted that Development Management Policy SD43: New and Existing Community Facilities in the Adopted South Downs Local Plan 2014-2033 recognises the difference between commercial and public facilities and requires a marketing exercise only for the former. It is therefore suggested that the draft Policy C11 looks to adopt a similar approach to this. Suggestions for the policy text are provided below:</p>	
-------------	--------------	---	--

Policy CI1:	HCC Property	<p>Policy CI1 (b):</p> <p><i>b) Development that results in the loss of key community buildings or facilities that serve the community will only be supported where:</i></p> <p><u>i. For commercially run community facilities, an appropriate marketing assessment has been undertaken which shows the facility is surplus to requirements and there is clear evidence that the community has no need for the existing facility, or an equivalent community use;</u></p> <p><u>or</u></p> <p><u>ii. For community or publicly-owned or managed facilities, robust evidence is provided to show the facility is surplus to requirements and there is a lack of need for the existing facility, or an equivalent community use;</u></p> <p><u>or</u></p> <p><u>iii. it can be demonstrated that alternative facilities of equal or better quality will be provided in an equal or improved location, or the service will be provided in another way following a service review;</u></p> <p><u>or</u></p> <p><u>iv. the development is for an alternative community facility, the need for which clearly outweighs the loss.</u></p>	
General	Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Noted. No action required.

General	TVBC	<p>The river Test and its major tributaries flow into the Solent. The water environment within the Solent region is one of the most important for wildlife in the UK. It is internationally important for its wildlife and is protected with Government Regulations and also has national protection for many parts of the coastline and the sea.</p> <p>As Neighbourhood Plans are able to allocate housing sites for development, this advice needs to be brought to the attention of Neighbourhood Plan Steering groups and those delivering community led housing schemes. If plans are proposing any new development, from a housing allocation or accepting that infill may deliver new homes within the plan area, then the issue of Nutrient Neutrality will need to be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>Noted. No action required because no large developments are proposed in the CNDP.</p> <p>The WG anticipate that TVBC will introduce suitable policies in due course.</p>
General	Hassocks Parish Council	<p>Suggests that we have a policy regarding housing energy efficiency in order to give us more control over developers and limit their ability to produce “conventional” building regs. compliant housing that is heavily insulated, stuffy and poorly ventilated and suggests policies to enable zero carbon.</p>	<p>No action. The WG consider that this subject is adequately covered for this CNDP and that National policies will be issued in due course.</p>

Table 4

**Changes made to Pre – Submission Draft
following the Reg. 14 consultation**

Plan Reference	Changes made	Reason for change
All references	Andover Town Council and Andover Rural District Council replaced by Andover Council to improve understanding.	Improve understanding
All Policies:	At the bottom of each policy "Table x" has been replaced with Policy EN1 etc. throughout the document.	Editorial accuracy
Frontpiece	Mandy's surname changed to Denyer.	Change of circumstances
Frontpiece	MAP 1 now titled Hand Drawn Map from Village Design Statement 2003	Editorial accuracy
Table of Maps	All the MAPS have been correctly numbered. "2003" added at end of Map 1 title.	Editorial accuracy
After Glossary	Duplicated "Community Projects & Aspirations removed "Notes" added Page 67 "Local Green Spaces Justification " Page 68 added.	Correct error
Page 2 Para 3.	Stop after 2014 in 3rd line. A map showing the Neighbourhood Plan Area / Parish Boundary Map 2 added with Chilbolton Parish highlighted.	Editorial accuracy
Page 4 Map	Title changed to " Chilbolton Designated Area and Parish Boundary" MAP 2 added.	Editorial accuracy
Page 10	Title added – MAP 3 Star indicating Cow Common moved to correct position.	Editorial accuracy
Page 14	Inserted after chart Scale of development over next 10 years. "In the Chilbolton Housing need Survey completed by Action Hampshire a majority of responders supported to building of up to 20 homes over the 10 year plan period."	Improve understanding
Page 24	Under Test valley and Chilbolton Common, Point 2, Community and Open Space Committee changes to Chilbolton Open Spaces Committee.	Editorial accuracy
Page 26	Policy EN1 point 13, Martin's Lane and Footpath changed to Brockley Warren Byway, looking North ...	Correct error

Plan Reference	Changes made	Reason for change
Page 28 Map 6	Arrows and numbers have been corrected.	Correct error
Page 30	Policy EN2 b) added at end “where appropriate” requested by HCC.	Requested by HCC
Page 31 MAP 8	Star indicating Cow Common moved to correct position.	Correct error
Page 34 Bullet point 3	Village replaced by Parish.	Editorial accuracy
Page 37 Map 9	Note added on map. “The CPC has requested an urgent review of the inclusion of portions of Test Valley Farm in the Village Settlement Boundary”.	Responding to Consultation response
Page 44, 5th Bullet point	Map 9 added to refer back to the Settlement Boundary map.	Include reference to map number
Page 45 Policy HD1a)	Remove wording and replace with “Number of homes built within Chilbolton over the 10 year plan period, should not exceed 20 homes, in line with the Housing Need Survey findings; and	Editorial accuracy
Page 45 Policy HD2	Change 10 to “a group of 5” in first line.	Editorial accuracy
Page 47	At end of 3rd bullet point add “2003”.	Clarity
Page 48 Policy HD6	The reference to M4(2) is explained on Page 46 in Bullet point 1.	Cross reference for clarity
Page 49 Policy HD7	HCC proposals re parking are not agreed and the WG considers that we should attempt to get our proposed policy accepted. No one else commented on this.	Policy designed to meet local need
Page 56	Chilbolton Observatory Bullet point 2. New wording to highlight the LOWFAR radio telescope.	Better understanding
Page 59	New Heading – Settlement Boundary that explains the position taken by the CPC on Test valley farm.	Responding to Consultation response
Page 65	Changes to correct errors in columns Tranquillity and Wildlife.	Editorial accuracy
Page 66	Second line changed to ... Designated area on MAP2, Page 4.	Editorial accuracy