

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Environment Agency	Comment	EN4	<u>Policy EN4: Flooding</u> The wording of policy EN4 is misleading, and not one we could support as currently written, we therefore find the policy unsound and would advise that the policy is amended to say something like "In line with the application of the Sequential Test any future development within the Chilbolton area will be directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding (Flood Zone 1). Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. The Sequential Test should be informed by the Local Planning Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) as well as other background documents such as the Council's Strategic Housing & Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)". <u>Supporting text.</u> In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) [paragraph 155] inappropriate development in locations at risk of flooding should be restricted. This should be done by directing development away from areas at highest risk (NPPF para. 155) through the application of the Sequential Test (NPPF para. 158). Paragraph 022 of the Planning Practice Guidance requires that through the Sequential Test and Sustainability Appraisal process that where other sustainability criteria outweigh flood risk issues, the decision making process should be transparent with reasoned justifications for any decisions to allocate land in areas at high flood risk given in the Sustainability Appraisal report.
Southern Water	Comment	EN6	Policy EN6 refers to renewable energy, but does not provide support the general provision of new or improved utilities infrastructure, such as water or wastewater. The NPPF (2019) paragraph 28 establishes that communities should set out detailed policies for specific areas including 'the provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level'. Also, National Planning Practice Guidance states that 'Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development'. Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to utilities development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system. <u>Proposed amendment To ensure consistency with the NPPF and facilitate sustainable development, we the following addition to Policy EN6: New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community subject to other policies in the plan</u>
Highways England	No Comment	General	We have reviewed this document and supporting evidence and have no comments. However, please do continue to consult Highways England as this Neighbourhood Plan progresses.
Hampshire County Council	Comment	HD6	Although the scale of development within Chilbolton is likely to be small i.e. max of 5 units, the Highway Authority would still recommend that new developments are supported by a transport assessment of an appropriate scale to demonstrate that safe access can be provided and that the impact of the development on the local highway network can be mitigated. Development proposals should also be looking to enhance and or make connections to the extensive rights of way network in / around the village to make provision for the use of sustainable modes of transport for local journeys within the village.
Hampshire County Council	Comment	HD7	As previously stated the County Council consider that the Parking standards proposed in this policy can be considered excessive.
Hampshire County Council	Support	Chapter 11	The County Council is pleased to see the Community aspiration section on flooding that describes an intended improvement in community communications with riparian owners regarding their responsibilities. This statement is welcomed.
Hampshire County Council	Comment	Page 34	On page 34 of the document, there is reference to 'surface flooding' (first sentence). The County Council would recommend that this is amended to 'surface water flooding' which is the recognised term.
Hampshire County Council	Comment	Page 34	A web link to the Village Emergency Plan would also be useful on page 34 of the document. The County Council would also recommend a web link to the Test Valley Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment would be useful in this section.
Hampshire County Council	Comment	Page 34	Page 34 references properties in 'the EA flood warning area'. This sentence needs to be more specific regarding what type of flooding it is referring to – is it groundwater flooding or fluvial flooding? If the Neighbourhood Plan is referring to fluvial flooding, it is recommended that the Neighbourhood Plan confirms which EA flood zones (2 or 3) this refers to.
Hampshire County Council	Comment	Page 34	It is also worth noting that when property occupiers move, the statement regarding connectivity to the flood warning system may no longer be accurate. This could potentially be a role for the Flood Action Group to keep the connectivity to the flood warning system updated.
Hampshire County Council	Comment	HD7	The County Council also recommend that it would be beneficial to see more detail on Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in developments (briefly referenced in Policy HD7 and in CIO09). It is recommended that the following text could be incorporated 'in line with best practice and the Ciria SuDS manual and the Lead Local Flood Authority's Flood and Water Management policies.
Hampshire County Council	Comment	General	Although a minor issue the County Council take this opportunity to also note that there is still some inconsistency within the document in the use of the terms 'ground water' vs 'groundwater'. It is recommended that a consistent approach to the use of this word is applied.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Contacts	It is suggested that this is reduced to the clerks e-mail address in the final version, as this information could date quickly.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Map 1	The map is very blurry – could this be improved in the final version?
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	General	The whole document would benefit from paragraph numbers, to aid in referencing the document in reports.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Page 3	The 'Submission draft' and 'next steps' paragraphs will not be needed in the final version.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Page 9	Reference to the location of the facilities on the map would be helpful, eg Number 1, Village hall, etc. These could also be referenced in Policy H2
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Chapter 4	This is very useful information on how the plan has been formed, but to aid the flow in the final document, this could be moved to the evidence base, or to an appendix at the back of the document.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Page 18/19	The SWAT analysis could be moved to an appendix, so that the vision and objectives are more prominent in the final document.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Page 20	Many of the objectives can be amalgamated for clarity.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	LE01	Preserve Conserve and enhance the landscape and its tranquillity , especially Cow Common, West Down, Test River valley, etc. Amend for clarity
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	LE02	Delete and add tranquillity to LE01
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	LE03	Protect views and open spaces in accord with TVBC Landscape Character Assessment. Amend for clarity
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	LE04	This is the role of the Local plan and does not need repeating here. Delete objective
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	LE07	Promote planting of indigenous trees and hedgerows. Manage existing trees and replace if they are diseased or unsafe —This would be better suited to the supporting text of policy EN2
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HE01	Identify, conserve, protect and enhance distinctive and historic buildings and features designated and non designated heritage assets . This is the correct terminology for these assets.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HE02	Delete HE02 as these are now addressed under the designated and non designated heritage assets referred to in HE01
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HE03	Delete HE03 as these are now addressed under the designated and non designated heritage assets referred to in HE01
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HO01	Support small scale residential development providing a mix of 1-3- bedroom homes within Settlement Boundary. Amend for clarity
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HO02	Protect distinctive qualities of built environment through high quality design . Amend for clarity
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HO03	Ensure adequate parking and forward exit of vehicles access and egress from new developments and for extensions . Amend for clarity
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HO04	Delete objective as this is the role of the Local plan and does not need repeating here.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HO05	Delete objective as this would be better suited to the community aspirations chapter as its not a land use planning matter.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CI01 - CI16	The rationale for these objectives is understood, but these are not land use planning matters and would be better suited to the community aspirations chapter.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	EO01 - EO02	Merge objectives to read: EO01: Maintain and support business including • EO02: Maintain and support agriculture and farming
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	EO03	This would be better suited to the community aspirations chapter as its not a land use planning matter.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	MAP 5	It would be clearer if the other parish boundaries are removed from the final maps to aid clarity.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	PAGE 26	<i>Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) Status by the then Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) in 1994 as part of the Test Valley'</i> Is this still in force and relevant?

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	MAP 7	13 a, b,, c and d as shown in the photographs should be added to the arrows on the map for clarity.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	EN2	For clarity, reword criteria c) to read: Existing trees and hedgerows should be integrated into the proposed landscape- ng schemes for any development and provide a management plan for their future care and maintenance, which clearly sets out the long term financial management and yearly annual maintenance of all trees and hedgerows., complete with a fully costed budget proposal for the management plan term, and to provide the finance in the form of an upfront payment to cover all works so as to ensure that the burden does not fall on the Parish Council.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	EN2	For clarity, reword criteria e) to read: New high close boarded timber fences or walls will not be permitted supported in the plan area unless there is an overriding reason (e.g. security) and in such cases the street scene must should be softened by planting in front of the fence/wall to ameliorate the visual impact.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	MAP 8	A map showing the boundaries of the LGS is required.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	EN3	Delete text after LGS 15 as the circumstances that development will be permitted on LGS is set out in the NPPF and does not need to be repeated in policy.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	EN4	Delete policy EN4 as the government set out the requirements for land in the flood zones, and therefore a policy in not required.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	PAGE 35	<i>street lighting will not be permitted between 12 midnight and 6am and outside flood lighting must be minimal and, preferably, activated by proximity sensors for security and personal safety.</i> This is not a land use planning matter, and would be better dealt with in the community aspirations section. In any event, this is a matter for Hampshire County Council who as the highway authority are responsible for street lighting.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	PAGE 35	The heading <i>Utilities Infrastructure</i> should be renamed ' renewable energy ' as this is what the policy is addressing.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	EN5	Delete policy EN5 as this is not a land use planning matter, and would be better dealt with in the community aspirations section.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	EN6	For clarity, add the following to criterion c) Do not result in unacceptable loss of high quality agricultural land; and
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	MAP 9	Note on Map should be removed in the final version of the plan, as the opportunity to comment on the settlement boundary will be through the local plan review.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	H1	In criteria a) and b) replace preserve with Conserve
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	MAP 10	A clearer map is required in the final version. TVBC can assist with the mapping in the final document.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	PAGE 40	A map showing the archaeology would be helpful. TVBC can assist with the mapping in the final document.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	PAGE 41	A title of what these photos are showing and their location would be helpful.
	Comment	PAGE 42	Several buildings and features have been identified as Parish Assets of Community Value . Facilities, these include The following are Parish Assets of Community Value: • Chilbolton Stores and Post Office • St Mary-the-Less Church • Abbots Mitre public house • The Village Hall – this is also designated as an Asset of Community Value . On checking the register, only the village hall is on the ACV register. The others are all Community Facilities. I recommend that the term ACV is replaced with 'Community Facilities' .
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	H2	Amend title to read : Parish Assets of Important Community Facilities Value as this is what the policy is referring to. Delete first half of policy as this related to listed buildings and not to community facilities. Rewrite policy to read : The following have been identified as Important Community facilities and are shown on Map 11: 1 Chilbolton Stores and Post Office 2 St Mary-the-Less Church 3 Abbots Mitre public house 4 The Village Hall.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	MAP 11	Amend title to read: Chilbolton Assets of Community Value Facilities
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	PAGE 46	In the Housing scale and mix supporting text , in bullet 1 delete or alterations to existing dwellings . In Bullet 2 The supporting evidence suggests to this is that in general the kinds of sites in the Parish which may be suitable for development in accordance with CNDP policies are not large, may be in or adjacent to the Conservation Area or constitute infill within the Settlement Boundary. Any overdevelopment risks materially affecting the character of any one of these areas of the Parish.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HD1	Amend policy to read : a) Number of homes built within Chilbolton over the 10 year plan period, should not exceed be about 20 homes, in line with the Housing Need Survey findings; and b)The mix of any individual development should only be 1-, 2- & 3-bedroom units homes including , apartments, semi-detached, terraced or bungalow. This is to aid clarity and It is not possible to put a ceiling on development.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	PAGE 46	<i>planning conditions will be used to limit or remove relevant permitted development rights from new development.</i> What is the evidence for this. If PD rights are removed, it does not mean that houses can not be extended, but that permission will be required from the Local Planning Authority.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HD2	Amend policy to read : Residential developments of a group of 5 or fewer dwellings will be supported within the Settlement Boundary subject to meeting the requirements of other policies in the Development Plan. Such development must respond to the local need for smaller properties and should consist of a mix of 1, 2 and 3-bedroom dwellings. or less. An application within the settlement boundary is acceptable in principle and it will be for the applicant to demonstrate through applying the policies of the Neighbourhood plan and local plan that their proposal is acceptable. As currently worded, the policy is not in conformity with TVBC local plan policy COM 2
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HD3	on a very limited scale How will 'very limited scale' be defined? Sheltered housing schemes are normally of a certain size in order that they are financially viable. With the word 'preference', it will not be a requirement, therefore developers will not have to meet this policy.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HD4	Policy HD4 would be better if amalgamated with the design policy, as the issues covered in the policy are design oriented.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HD5	HD5 conflicts with policy HD1 and the key parts of this policy could be amalgamated with HD4 on design.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	PAGE 47	<i>Design of new development.</i> This could be split into its own chapter as design isn't only about new residential development.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HD6	The policy does not flow very well, and would benefit from being reordered. It could even be split into 3, with one design policy relating to residential development, another to cover commercial and other development a policy that deals with the conservation area. This would aid clarity and allow the policy to be implemented more easily.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HD6	Amend heading under criteria o) to read Within the Conservation Area all development proposals will be supported provided they must
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HD6	Amend criteria iii) to read : will only be permitted be supported and criterion iv). no fences or walls above 1 metre height facing the highway will be permitted not be supported. These are negatively worded. ' be supported' is more appropriate
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HD7	<i>In line with the NPPF, electric vehicle charging facilities should be encouraged'</i> this is already covered in policy HD6 o) and does not need repeating here.' The parking standards in the policy are not in conformity with the parking standards in the local plan. Unless there is local evidence to justify these higher standards, then they should be deleted.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	PAGE 52	The supporting text could be moved to the supporting text to policy HD6, as the issue of outdoor space is covered in the policy.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	HD8	Delete policy HD8 as this is covered in policy HD6 criteria d) and e) and doesn't need repeating here.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CI1	Delete policy CI1 as the policy repeats LP policy COM 14, and is therefore not required.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	CI3	This policy will only apply to those masts that require planning permission. Most masts are erected under the utility providers permitted development rights, and therefore this policy will not apply in those circumstances.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	EC1	For clarity Policy EC1 should be renamed Existing Employment Sites. First paragraph should be reworded: existing employment site boundaries the Business Areas What is the extent of the 'business areas'? This could be reworded to 'existing employment sites' for clarity.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	EC3	This is not a land use planning policy and would be better suited to the community aspirations section of the plan.
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	PAGE 64	This document could be removed from the final version as it is not needed.