

Summary of representations received by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council made in relation to the Regulation 16 version of the East Woodhay Neighbourhood Plan pursuant to Paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act

Introduction

1. This document provides a summary of the issues and representations submitted in relation to the submission version (Regulation 16) of the East Woodhay Neighbourhood Plan (EW NP). In accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) carried out a seven week period of public consultation from Monday 14 March 2022 to Tuesday 3rd May 2022 on the submission version of the EW NP.
2. At the request of the examiner a further consultation was held from Monday 18 July 2022 to Monday 5 September 2022 to allow further work to be undertaken in relation to the impact of the Plan upon protected nature conservation sites in the Solent.
3. A total of 14 representations were received through both consultations. All representations were submitted to the independent Examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. These are available on the Council's website at: <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/EWNP> .
4. Set out below is a summary of the issues raised by consultees during the consultations. Appendix 1 of this document provides a summary of the representations made by specific consultees. The borough council's comments (which includes a summary within the covering letter) provided during the consultation can be viewed in full in Appendix 2.

Summary of issues raised by consultees

General:

Some general comments were made including:

- Support for the plans objectives
- Whilst most of the parish is in the AONB and the policies are written this way, there should be some considerations for how policies can operate outside of the AONB.
- It is encouraging to see a design framework for the neighbourhood plan.
- A policy for new water/ wastewater infrastructure and a policy for surface drainage water.

Basic Conditions

Comments that the EWNP does not meet the basic conditions (a) and (e) because it does not have regard to national planning policy and guidance moreover it was stated that the EWNP is not in general conformity with strategic policies contained in the ALP. The reasons for this are due to the approach to the community facilities and Local Green Space designations are inconsistent with the NPPF.

There could be further refinement to ensure that the general conformity with national policy is enhanced.

Space between parishes is not supported by evidence and has the potential to undermine the strategic policies in the development plan.

Policy NE1 – Protecting the Landscape

It is reasonable for parts of the parish outside of the AONB to have due consideration for its importance of the location. For consistency with the NPPF there is also a recommendation that tree lined streets are referred to.

Policy NE3: Dark Skies

Promote a greater synergy with the wording outlined in the North Wessex Downs Guidance, which refers to 'no significant adverse impacts' on the character, whilst ensuring mitigation where harm is identified. Furthermore, some of the wording of the policy could be revised and it is noted that any development will give rise to some lighting impact, the current policy would not be permissible or consistent with National Policy, seeking to limit the impact of light pollution in dark landscapes.

Policy NE4- Trees and Hedgerows

The policy should reflect the NPPF with regards to the contribution trees can make to the urban environment and comments were made that the policy is quite restrictive.

Policy CF1: Community Facilities

Issue around the inclusion of the East Woodhay Cricket Club in the policy owing to the fact the club is privately owned and not serving the whole community. Moreover, membership of the club extends beyond the parish and is not considered to serve the local community in which the plan covers. The approach to the community facilities is inconsistent, and the facilities listed should be revised.

Consideration should be given for Sungrove Farm and how this fits in with the policy as the facilities it provides would be covered under the policy. In addition, it could be acknowledged that community facilities of this size can have a large impact beyond 'the amenities of adjoining residential properties'.

New facilities can be considered outside of SPBs 'where there is community need', further explanation in relation to how the 'need' can be demonstrated as there are no standards or criteria for identifying the need.

Remove East Woodhay Cricket Club from the community facility and the Local Green Space policies.

Policy CF3: Local Green Spaces

It is considered that the inclusion of land within both policy CF1 and CF3 is contradictory, the policies have slightly different purposes. As such the designations of Local Green Spaces is inconsistent with national policy, as sites allocated in both are subject to a permissive policy allowing development but simultaneously the Local Green Space policy which is akin to green belt designation.

Policy RC1 – Rural Character & Design

There should be enhanced consistency with the NPPF which requires that all decisions should contribute towards the natural and built environment by recognising the character of the countryside. Furthermore, references to car parking should be amended so that car parking can be screened by landscaping/design where it is appropriate to do so. Also amendments to wording were advised.

Policy HO2: New Housing in the Countryside

Concern around 'green gaps' and threads of greenbelt policy through HO2. Beyond the boundary change it is unclear if the policy introduces anything more than the existing development plan. Comments suggest Woolton Hill could have its own specific policy to capture the change and set out any additional parameters.

Policy HO4: Housing Mix – Provision of Smaller Homes

There is the opportunity to explore the future housing need as well as the past and existing housing need.

Policy HO6: Affordable Housing

The policy is a direct replication of the policy in the Local Plan and its inclusion has been questioned on this basis.

Appendix 1 – Summary of representations made by consultees in relation to the submission version (Regulation 16) of the East Woodhay Neighbourhood Plan (NP) (excluding comments from Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council)

Please note that the representations below are a summary of the representations made. The full representations made by respondents can be viewed here <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/page/71595/Representations%20received%20through%20the%20second%20consultation.pdf>
<https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/doclib/3499.pdf>

Respondent	Summary of comments
Second round of Regulation 16 consultation	
The Coal Authority (22 July) Deb Roberts	There is no requirement for the coal authority to be consulted however the representation can be used as evidence for legal and procedural requirements.
Historic England (26 July) Katie Rowden	There are no detailed comments, any further information to detailed advice on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into a neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/
Avison Young on behalf of National Grid (1 September) Tom Wignall	National Grid has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
Office for Nuclear Regulation (2 August) Vicki	Please note that ONR's land use planning processes published at http://www.onr.org.uk/land-use-planning.htm may apply to some of the developments within the East Woodhay Neighbourhood Plan.
Southern Water (30 August) Charlotte Mayall	No further comments
First Regulation 16 consultation comments	
M Bell	Basic Conditions: Oppose. The reason the EWNP does not meet these Basic Conditions is primarily because the EWNP's approach to community facilities and Local Green Space ("LGS") designations in Policies CF1 (Community Facilities) and Policy CF3 (Local Green Spaces) is flawed and inconsistent with the NPPF. Basic conditions (a) and (e) are not considered to be met. Amend policies listed (see further comments on the specific policies). CF1 Community Facilities: Oppose. The East Woodhay Cricket Club cannot be considered a community facility as it is private facility, with members beyond the parish boundary and the approach to designating the community facilities is inconsistent. There are also conflicts with the Local Green Space Policy. Remove East Woodhay Cricket Club as a community facility as it is flawed and, unlawful and contrary to the NPPF.

Respondent	Summary of comments
	<p>CF3 Local Green Space: Oppose Including land in both polices CF1 and CF3 is contradictory. It fails to properly distinguish between and actively plan for particular different time of provision and facilities essential facilities, community facility, recreational facilities and local green space. The NPPF criteria for Local Green Spaces have not been applied correctly. Remove East Woodhay Cricket club as a Local Green Space as it is contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>CF1 8.5 a) c) and d). Oppose. The retail social and community facilities at East End would meet the community facilities definition. Sungrove Farm should mention the facilities in its Community Facility list at 8.17 and 8.20.</p> <p>CF1 8.8 and 8.9. Oppose. The policy supports the expansion of community facilities with only restrictions being design and the impact on the amenities of adjoining residential property. The policy should be amended to reflect wider impacts. The policy should be amended to reflect the impact of any expansion on the wider community, the road network, safety of vulnerable road users, dark skies and the AONB.</p> <p>CF1 8.9. Oppose. There is no standard or criteria for identifying the community need and who decided if the need has been demonstrated. There needs to be something to apply a sense of proportion.</p>
Historic England (15 March) Katie Rowden	No comments to submit on this occasion.
Avison Young on behalf of National Grid (3 May) Matt Verlander	National Grid has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
Natural England (17 March) Sharon Jenkins	At this time, Natural England is not able to fully assess the potential impacts of this plan on statutory nature conservation sites or protected landscapes or, provide detailed advice in relation to this consultation. If you consider there are significant risks to statutory nature conservation sites or protected landscapes, please set out the specific areas on which you require advice.
RPS on behalf of Bewley Homes (3 May) Cameron Austin-Fell	<p>Policy RC1: 7.7: In respect of the overarching aim that <i>'all development will be required to respect the rural character'</i> (paragraph 7.7 refers), RPS considers that there needs to be a consistency with Paragraph 174(b) of the NPPF 2021. This requires that all decisions should contribute towards the natural and built environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. This is a small but important point here, though ensures adequate flexibility in the policy.</p> <p>RC1, 7.8: Noting that development including car parking should be screening by landscaping/boundary treatment. Whilst RPS agrees that there can be design-led solutions, the policy is framed as an absolute and in some circumstances where multiple houses are built, this might not be practical. The policy should therefore be amended to indicate that car parking can be screened by landscaping/design where it is appropriate to do so</p> <p>RC1 7.7: The policy requires that for development proposals, the rural character of the area is both preserved and enhanced. Whilst RPS understands the intention of this wording, a change in terminology would be recommended. Amend wording.</p> <p>RC2, 7.11(a)The Plan proposes that development proposals will be permitted where there is no adverse impact [of external lighting] on neighbouring uses or the wider landscape. It is noted that any development proposal is likely to give rise to some lighting impact and it should be for an applicant to</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments
	<p>demonstrate how the steps have been taken to limit this impact as much as possible. The policy as currently drafted would not be permissible or consistent with National Policy 185(c) of the NPPF 2021, which seeks to limit the impact of light pollution in dark landscapes. RPS would encourage the Parish Council to revisit the wording of this policy.</p> <p>NE1: There is land within the Neighbourhood Plan area that is not within the AONB and therefore it would be unreasonable to require proposals for development outside of the AONB to be made to follow the provisions within the AONB management plan that is required for land within the AONB. It is reasonable for proposals just outside of the AONB to have due consideration to the importance of the location. RPS therefore recommends that Policy NE1 be amended as follows <i>“As such, for land within the North Wessex Downs AONB, all relevant policies within the current North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan, 2019-2024 must be followed. Future equivalent and succeeding AONB management documents must also be followed (as the Neighbourhood Plan covers the period beyond the present AONB Management Plan period).”</i></p> <p>NE1: 8.11: Paragraph 8.11 of Policy NE1 which requires planting schemes to consist of groups rather than linear arrangements is in slight conflict with paragraph 131 of the NPPF which states that: <i>“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree lined”</i></p> <p>RPS therefore recommends that paragraph 8.11 be amended as follows: <i>“Planting schemes should reflect native species found locally within the Parish and consist of grouped trees rather than linear arrangements, with the exception of tree lined streets within new developments.”</i></p> <p>NE3: Clauses a) and d) have been amended through the NP revisions, at Regulation 14 RPS commented that clause a) should be amended to enable a permissible policy and for consistency with Paragraph 185c. Amend clause a.</p> <p>In relation to good external lighting, permissive principles are set out, and the reference to <u>no significant adverse effects</u> (RPS emphasis) to the character of the area, either individually or cumulatively. Beyond this, the recommended policy guidance advises that where adverse effects cannot be avoided, that suitable mitigation measures are put in place. RPS would endorse a greater synergy with the wording of the North Wessex Downs Guidance, which would make reference to ‘no significant adverse impacts’ on the character, whilst ensuring mitigation where harm is identified.</p> <p>NE4: RPS considers that the principle aim of Policy NE4 should be to reflect the provisions in the NPPF with regards to the contribution trees can make to the urban environment. RPS considers that Policy NE4 in its current form is quite restrictive and recommends that the policy is amended as follows: <i>“Development proposals should seek to protect hedgerows or trees that are of good quality or perform a wider ecological function. Proposals will be permitted as long as there is no damage or loss of important trees, copses and hedgerows, unless it was not possible to retain them and replacement planting is proposed for all that which has been lost, and is provided in visually prominent positions.”</i></p> <p>Clause HO2c) was previously concerned with the ‘stealthy’ expansion of the settlement boundaries, and sought to avoid coalescence of settlements. This policy objective has now been significantly amended as part of HO2d) which expands on this principle to an unacceptable degree. The current policy would see ‘green gaps’ indicating development in these areas would be resisted. The NP has not sought to define these green gaps, and as such, it is impossible to perceive spatially the extent of this area. Revert to the previous version of the policy which sought to avoid coalescence between settlements.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments
	<p>Whilst RPS supports the Council in choosing to amend the boundary for Woolton Hill, it is queried whether this additional tier of policy is required, or whether this change could be achieved in a different way. In this context it may, therefore, be more appropriate to have a specific policy for Woolton Hill, to capture the proposed change, and set out the policy parameters for development within or outside the settlement.</p> <p>HO4: The Parish could explore what the future needs for the area are. Considerations should be given to the councils Strategic Housing Market Assessment (“SHMA”). RPS would recommend that the policy is amended to indicate the 50% 1-3 beds should be the starting point for development, unless there is evidence to indicate otherwise.</p> <p>HO6: RPS queries the inclusion of a policy which is a direct transposition and whether this is a necessary inclusion within the Plan. Consider removal of the policy</p>
Sport England (16 March)	Map 19: It is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 98 and 99.
Thakeham (3 May) Lisa Probyn	We believe there is a minor drafting error with Map 20: “Green Spaces, general locations” which appears to show this extending beyond the school boundary, and within our Site known as Land West of Mount Road, Woolton Hill. This appears to be a drafting error and we would kindly request that Map 20 is updated to properly reflect Map 19 and to avoid any confusion.
Thames Water (23 March)	<p>In light of the comments and Government guidance we consider that Neighbourhood Plan should include a specific reference to the key issue of the provision of wastewater/sewerage [and water supply] infrastructure to service development proposed in a policy. We recommend the Neighbourhood Plan include the following policy/supporting text:</p> <p>“Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.” “The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.”</p> <p>The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states that a sequential approach should be used by local planning authorities in areas known to be at risk from forms of flooding other than from river and sea, which includes "Flooding from Sewers". With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan: <i>“It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.”</i></p>

Respondent	Summary of comments
Coal Authority (22 March) Deb Roberts	As Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council lies outside the coalfield, there is no requirement for you to consult us and / or notify us of any emerging neighbourhood plans.

Appendix 2: Full representation (including covering letter, which includes a summary of the comments, and appendix) from Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (as Local Planning Authority) on the Submission version (Regulation 16) of the East Woodhay Neighbourhood Plan



Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
Civic Offices, London Road,
Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 4AH
www.basingstoke.gov.uk | 01256 844844
customer.service@basingstoke.gov.uk
Follow us on [Twitter](#) @BasingstokeGov

Amy White,
Parish Clerk
East Woodhay Parish Council,
Via email

Your ref: Submission East Woodhay Neighbourhood Plan

Tuesday 3rd May 2022

Dear Amy,

Local Planning Authority response to the East Woodhay Neighbourhood Plan: Post-Submission Consultation (Regulation 16)

The Local Planning Authority (LPA) fully supports the initiative of East Woodhay Parish Council to produce a Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The LPA recognises that a significant amount of work has gone into the development of the NP, and that extensive community involvement has taken place. The Neighbourhood Planning Group are commended for all their efforts in order to reach such an advanced stage in the NP making process.

Following the submission of the East Woodhay Neighbourhood Plan (EW NP) on 1 March 2022, the LPA undertook a Legal Compliance Check. The LPA confirmed, via letter to the parish council on 10 March 2022, that it is satisfied that the EW NP and accompanying documents comply with the statutory requirements as set out in Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) and paragraph 6 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

The following comments have been made by the LPA and submitted as a formal representation on the Submission EW NP. These comments have been viewed by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Infrastructure and are currently subject to a formal sign off process. We will contact you if there are any issues with the formal sign off process if raised after the close of the consultation.

We are pleased to see that many of the LPA's comments on the Pre-Submission EWNP have been addressed. The LPA has identified a limited number of outstanding issues, but none of these go to the heart of the plan or affect its potential to meet the basic conditions.

Appendix 1 identifies these outstanding issues which mainly relate to specific issues regarding the drafting of the policies and potential issues with their interpretation and implementation.

For your information, attached is a schedule which records how the comments made through the course of the pre-submission consultation have been addressed in the submission version. This also sets out where outstanding issues/concerns remain.

I will write to you to let you know when the representations have been uploaded to our website and are available to view.

I hope that the comments provided are of use to you. If you require further information or clarification please do not hesitate to contact me on 01256 845175 or by emailing robyn.milliner@basingstoke.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely

Robyn Milliner
Senior Planning Policy Officer

CC: Paul Hurst – East Woodhay Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

How the LPA's comments on the Pre-Submission draft Plan have been addressed in the Submission Neighbourhood Plan and Remaining Issues.

The table below sets out the comments provided by the LPA in response to the pre-submission Regulation 14 consultation in 2021, and how these have been addressed by the submission version of the Plan.

Section/ Policy of the pre- submitio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
Natural Environment Policies					
Policy NE1: Protecting the Landscape , pg 28	Policy NE1: Protecting the Landscape, pg 24.	<p>The policy seeks to protect the historic and natural landscape and local character of the parish and references the North Wessex Downs AONB management plan and a number of important characteristics of the landscape that are found locally.</p> <p>Generally, the policy is supported. However, it is not clear how the historical aspects should be interpreted. While the concept of historic landscapes exists, it is not clear what it entails for the purposes of this policy or how the decision maker should assess this issue, which would make the policy difficult to interpret. This policy also applies a higher test to historic landscapes than to conservation areas i.e. the policy states preserve <i>and</i></p>	<p>PPG states: A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared. (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306).</p>	<p>Clarify the requirements in relation to the reference to <i>historic</i> within the policy.</p>	<p>Met, the policy has been amended and the reference to historic has been removed.</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		enhance, which seems inappropriate.			
Policy NE2: Key views, pg 28	Policy NE2, key views, pg 36	<p>The policy identifies a number of local key views.</p> <p>It is not necessarily clear from the neighbourhood plan and supporting text as to why these views are considered as important. It would be helpful to include justification as to how these views have been chosen and the reasons for doing so. The keys views seeking to be protected need to either be justified in the supporting text or within an evidence base document.</p> <p>The policy stipulation within paragraph 8.19 appears to seek to protect private views from buildings. This is not something which can be protected by the planning system and hence this policy requirement should be removed.</p>	Paragraph 31 of the NPPF: 'The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals'	<p>Include a table or some supporting text/evidence which justifies the inclusion of key views, see Burghclere Neighbourhood Plan Key Views Report evidence base document.</p> <p>Remove the policy stipulation covered by para 8.19 or amend to clarify this requirement in order to prevent the apparent implication that it is seeking to protect private views.</p>	<p>Met, reference has been removed in relation to views from existing buildings or structures.</p> <p>Since the pre-submission draft, new policy criterion has been included (para 7.18) which states that 'selected but not exclusive key views' are identified in maps 3 to 7. It then states that 'for further assessment of key view criteria see section 7.14 and 7.15'. It is not clear what the key views within the policy are and where these additional key views are to be found. If these other key views are from specific documents, they should be referenced so it is clear to the decision maker where they apply.</p> <p>If these selected but not exclusive key views are to be retained it is suggested that additional wording is added to the policy in order for the decision maker to be able to apply the policy. Some suggested wording is provided below:</p> <p>'A number of specific Key Views are identified in the Maps 3 to 7. Other views will be considered 'key' if they meet the criteria in EWNP para 7.15'</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
Policy NE4: Trees & Hedgerows , pg 44	Policy NE5: Trees and Hedgerows, pg 43	<p>The policy seeks to protect trees, copses and hedgerows within the parish. Where this is not possible, replacement planting is required which should be appropriate for the site and deliver a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The opening requirement of the policy should specify that the focus of the policy is on losses of vegetation which are important to the character of the area or for environmental reasons, as it would not be reasonable to refuse a planning application for the loss of a small non-native tree in a back garden for example.</p> <p>It is also not clear where the 4m separation distance is derived from and it may be helpful to include some information in the supporting text regarding this. It is also not clear what the separation referred to is from, for example is it other trees or buildings?</p>	<p>Paragraph 31 of the NPPF: 'The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals'</p> <p>PPG states: A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood</p>	<p>It may be appropriate to add some additional supporting text providing clarity for some of the requirements in the policy as per the comments box.</p> <p>These are considered to be drafting issues which would improve implementation rather than concerns regarding compliance with the basic conditions.</p>	<p>Met.</p> <p>Further information has been added to the policy which notes that the 4m separation distance is derived from the council's Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD.</p> <p>Further detail has also been added to the policy and the structure has therefore been improved.</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
			area for which it has been prepared. (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306).		
Historic Environment and Heritage Conservation Policies					
Policy HE1: Conservation Area and its setting, pg 63	Policy HE1: Conservation Area and its Setting, pg 62	<p>The policy requires development within the North End and East End Conservation Areas to demonstrate how they will retain, conserve and enhance the historic character of these hamlets and sets a number of criteria when development proposals would be acceptable.</p> <p>In relation to criterion a) design and materials could also be added to the list in the second sentence.</p> <p>In relation to criterion c) 'without the need to substantially rebuild the heritage asset' could be added to the end of the sentence.</p> <p>The Conservation Area Appraisals are not referenced within the policy and it may be helpful and consistent to</p>	Legislation requires planning polices to conserve or enhance, not both, this wording is reflected within the Local Plan Policy EM11 (The Historic Environment). If the NP requires development proposals to conserve and enhance the historic environment additional justification for this will be needed to justify as a special local circumstance.	<p>Suggest amending of wording to conserve or enhance to be in line with relevant legislation.</p> <p>Additional requirements could also be added to criterion a) and c).</p> <p>Reference the Conservation Area Appraisals within the policy.</p>	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The wording within the policy remains as 'retain, conserve and enhance' as per the pre-submission neighbourhood plan. It is suggested that this be amended to 'conserve or enhance' in line with relevant legislation.</p> <p>There have been a number of changes to the policy which are supported, including additional criterion to a) relating to design and materials. Furthermore, additional wording has been added to criterion c) as suggested.</p> <p>The Conservation Area Appraisals are now referenced within the policy as suggested in comments provided previously.</p> <p>In the supporting text it is recommended that the following amendments could be made for clarity: 'There are a number of non-designated Heritage Assets of historic and architectural merit across the Parish.</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		reference these within the policy.			These include those which have been formally placed on the Local List and others which are <i>may be</i> worthy of local listing but not yet identified. <i>These may be identified during the course of a planning application. Some of these structures are included in</i> The Local List. <i>Other structures have been identified as Notable Structures within conservation areas, this</i> is intended to recognise these buildings so that they can be properly considered when development proposals are submitted to BDBC.'
Policy HE2: Protecting and Enhancing Local Built Heritage Assets, pg 63	Policy HE2: Protecting and Enhancing Local Built Heritage Assets, pg 63	The policy seeks to protect and enhance local heritage assets. It is not clear how this policy could be applied consistently, and how development proposals should demonstrate the requirements within the policy, furthermore there is nothing in the supporting text to assist with this for instance should this be through a design and access statement? It may also be helpful to include a map showing local heritage assets or a list of these. It is suggested the title of the policy is amended to 'Protecting or Enhancing Local Built	Legislation requires planning polices to conserve or enhance, not both, this wording is reflected within the Local Plan Policy EM11 (The Historic Environment). If the NP requires development proposals to conserve and enhance the historic environment additional justification for this will be needed to justify as a special local circumstance. PPG states: A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be	Review the need for this policy in light of current adopted Local Plan policy and national guidance.	Partially met. A number of new criteria have been added to the policy and comments are outlined below: Para. 9.22, ' <i>and should not harm that significance</i> ' could be added onto the end of the paragraph. Para 9. 23, could be amended to ' <i>any proposals which impact the significance of a heritage asset</i> must confirm to BDBC's Local Plan Policy EM11 and the principles laid out in the Heritage SPD (March 2019). Para 9.24 (f) could be amended to read 'that any residual harm <i>to a designated Heritage Asset</i> is justified on the basis of

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		<p>Heritage Assets' to ensure it is in line with relevant legislation and the Local Plan.</p> <p>It is questioned whether this policy is needed as it is more lenient than the Local Plan policy and does not add any locally distinctive elements that reflect the neighbourhood area. Given the loose nature of the policy it could subsequently have a negative impact on the historic environment.</p>	<p>drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared. (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306).</p>		<p>public benefit that could not otherwise be delivered'.</p>
New Development and Housing Policies					
Policy HO1: Good Quality Design, pg 65.	Policy HO1: Good Quality Design, pg 66	<p>The policy permits planning applications where they have regard to the Village Design Statement, achieve high quality design and regard to the Conservation Area Appraisals.</p> <p>Criterion c) appears to duplicate the policies and requirements contained within HE1 and HE2 and it may not be necessary to have within this policy. If retained, the wording in criterion</p>	<p>Paragraph 16 of the NPPF: Plans should: f) serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant).</p>	<p>Ensure overlap or duplication between policies is limited.</p>	<p>Partially Met.</p> <p>The policy has been revised significantly from the regulation 14 consultation and has a substantial amount of new text.</p> <p>The transferral of Policy RC1 in the pre-submission document into a new Policy HO1 which addresses design for all types of development is welcomed.</p> <p>Criterion d) may provide some conflict between Policy NE2: Key Views.</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		<p>c) could be amended to 'comply with the advice in' rather than 'have regard to'.</p> <p>While this is not a requirement in order to meet the basic conditions, it may be worth considering combining this policy with RC1, as they are both seeking to address design issues.</p>			<p>It is suggested that criteria (g) of Policy HO1 which relates to Design and Access Statements is amended to require the development to demonstrate that it has been designed to comply with the requirements of the policy, rather than specifically refer to a Design and Access statement.</p> <p>In relation to criterion h) Planning Practice Guidance is clear that neighbourhood plans are unable to implement new standards for residential development through neighbourhood planning. However, it is acknowledged that Policy EM9 of the ALP does already include this standard, and although this would be duplicating the Local Plan this is not considered harmful as it is such an important local issue. The criterion should also be clear that this standard relates to residential development only.</p>
Policy HO2: Settlement Policy Boundary and Building in the	Policy HO2: Settlement Policy Boundary and Building in the Countryside, pg 68.	This policy specifies where development should take place within the parish, i.e. within the Settlement Policy Boundary, and sets out what exceptions to this principle are considered to be permissible.	Paragraph 16 of the NPPF: Plans should: d) contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision	Include reference within the policy wording to amending the settlement policy boundary, as at present there is no reference to amending the	Not met. Map 23 shows an extension to the Woolton Hill settlement policy boundary. However, this uses an old base map that does not clearly show that the land it is including is already developed.

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
Countryside, pg 67		<p>The first section of the policy refers to development within the Settlement Policy Boundary and states that this will be permitted as long as it complies with the design policies within the plan. From a drafting perspective this would helpfully refer to all relevant policies, not just design. However, even if amended accordingly, this is a questionable requirement, as non-compliance with a design policy does not render the whole principle of development unacceptable, it just means it would be contrary to a particular policy.</p> <p>The wording of criterion b) is considered to need amending. At the moment the exceptions referred to related mainly to policies in the current BDBC Local Plan. However, once those policies have been replaced via the LPU these policies would no longer have any force and hence would not provide any limitations, meaning this restriction would effectively fall away. Therefore, if the Parish Council would like</p>	maker should react to development proposals;	<p>current boundary.</p> <p>Provide clarity regarding criterion c) and consider how the decision maker would apply this when determining a planning application.</p>	<p>The council agrees that the SPB should be amended to reflect the development which has been completed at Meadowbrook and would be happy to provide an updated map which shows the development built out.</p> <p>A new criteria d) has been added in policy HO2 and the previous criterion c) has been removed. This new criterion reads that outside the SPB development and redevelopment proposals will be granted if 'they do not result in the SPB being joined to any neighbouring area, nor a loss of green space between settlements within the Parish, between the Parish and any neighbouring Parish, or between the Parish and Newbury'.</p> <p>The council is concerned that this criterion is not clear and would be difficult to implement.</p> <p>It is not clear how it would be determined whether a development resulted in Woolton Hill's SPB 'being joined to a neighbouring area' – as it is not entirely clear what scale of development is included in the term 'neighbouring area'.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is considered that <u>any</u> development in the countryside would</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		<p>the limitations in question to be retained in their policy then they need to set them out in full. Even if they did so this policy could be superseded by a subsequent BDBC Local Plan policy if there is a conflict, but that is probably preferable to the policy restrictions being relied upon being lost all together.</p> <p>In relation to criterion c) it is not clear what would be defined as 'stealthy expansion' as referred to in the policy. This is not considered to be appropriate wording for inclusion within a planning policy and needs to be amended.</p> <p>There is a map adjacent to Policy HO2 (of page 66) which shows an extension to the settlement policy boundary of Woolton Hill, however, this has not been referred to in the policy or the supporting text of the policy. Any extension to the Settlement Policy Boundary will need to be explained in the Plan itself and is likely to</p>			<p>result in the loss of green space between settlements (that would be contrary to this policy), and this would be stricter than the NPPF which does not support a blanket restriction on new development in the countryside. Although there may be locations where harmful coalescence between settlements could occur, it is not clear how such a broad restriction is justified.</p> <p>There are also wording difficulties with the policy because by their very nature there would not be green space between East Woodhay parish and neighbouring parishes (as they adjoin), and development between the Parish and Newbury would be outside of East Woodhay Parish within West Berkshire's administrative area, and so outside the control of this NP.</p> <p>There is no information within the supporting text or evidence base documents relating to how the policy would be implemented or why it is justified.</p> <p>Since, the designation of the neighbourhood plan area, the issue of nutrient neutrality has become apparent in the borough. This relates to the Solent, which is designated as a Special</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		require justification via an evidence base document.			<p>Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and a Ramsar site. There are high levels of nitrogen and phosphorus entering this water environment from a variety of sources and there is evidence that these nutrients are causing eutrophication.</p> <p>Following the receipt of advice from Natural England in October 2019, the council has not issued decisions for new residential development or overnight accommodation in the River Test and Itchen catchment area (which ultimately discharges into the Solent) unless it can be shown to be nutrient neutral. A very small section of the River Test catchment is located in the west of the Parish. It is therefore recommended that a map of the relevant area and an additional sentence is included within the policy referring to the issue. It is suggested that this wording is in line with that in the Local Plan Update:</p> <p>'New dwellings and development resulting in a net increase in population (including student accommodation, and tourist attractions and accommodation) served by a wastewater system that will discharge into the River Test and Itchen catchment will be required to demonstrate nutrient neutrality'</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
					<p>The supporting text of the policy should also refer to the advice which has been issued by Natural England.</p> <p>The proposed Local Plan Update wording for nutrient neutrality can be found on page 70 of this document.</p>
<p>Policy HO4: Housing Mix – Provision of Smaller Homes, pg 71.</p>	<p>Policy HO4: Housing Mix – provision of smaller homes, pg 71.</p>	<p>The policy seeks an appropriate housing mix for new residential development within the parish.</p> <p>The principle of this policy is supported and would add locally distinctive criteria which build upon Policy CN3 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The drafting could be clarified however, as currently it states that schemes should be 50% 1,2 and 3 bedroom (which would be 150%), where it no doubt means 50% of the market units should be a mix of 1,2 and 3 bedroom units, and should be amended accordingly if this is considered to be a clearer way of expressing the objective of the policy.</p>	<p>Paragraph 31 of the NPPF: ‘The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals’</p> <p>PPG states: A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning</p>	<p>Clarify the wording concerning the mix of market units (as per the comments box).</p>	<p>Not met.</p> <p>However, it is considered that this could be easily amended through a minor change to the policy through the use of ‘or’, in relation to 1, 2 or 3 bedrooms rather than ‘and’ which is currently used.</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
			applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared. (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306).		
Policy HO5: Housing replacements, extensions, annexes, garages and other incidental buildings in the countryside , pg 73.	Policy HO5: Housing Replacements, Extensions, Residential Garden Land and Annexes, pg 74	<p>The policy is for housing replacements, extensions, annexes, garages and other incidental buildings within the countryside providing they meet the appropriate criteria within the policy.</p> <p>The policy needs to be clearer that it is only applicable in the countryside as has been done in Policy HO2. Possible wording could be. 'Where the replacement or extension of a dwelling is located outside of the settlement policy boundary it will be permitted where it accords.'</p>	<p>Paragraph 16 of the NPPF:</p> <p>Plans should: d) contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals;</p> <p>PPG states: A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with</p>	<p>Improve clarity of the policy wording to make it clear that it is only applicable to planning permissions within the countryside.</p> <p>Add some supporting text explaining where would be considered a countryside location for the purposes of the policy.</p>	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The policy has been amended since Reg 14 and is no longer applicable to just the countryside.</p> <p>The text in para 10.52 of the policy has been amended and is weaker than the previous policy wording, as it refers to 'will likely be permitted in the SPB and countryside'. This does not provide sufficient certainty about how decisions will be made.</p> <p>A new set of criteria (10.54 a-f) have been introduced into Policy HO5. It is not quite clear as to precisely what types of development these criteria apply to. The phrase 'on residential garden</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		<p>It would also be helpful to define what the countryside is, i.e. in the Local Plan it is any land which is located outside of the designated settlement policy boundary and it is considered that this should be included within the supporting text.</p> <p>The policy also seeks to rely on requirements in policy SS6. If the Plan would be dependent on those requirements then they should be included within the policy in full, as they would not be applicable once the current BDBC Local Plan is replaced with the LPU.</p>	<p>confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared. (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306).</p>		<p>land' could apply to extensions and replacement houses but these are already addressed in criteria (10.52).</p> <p>If these criteria are intended to apply to new houses following the sub-division of a plot, then this should be clarified. In any event, this section (10.54) should include reference to how proposals should have regard to the prevailing plot characteristics in the area.</p>
Policy HO6: Affordable Housing, pg 74	n/a	<p>The policy seeks affordable housing contributions from development over specific thresholds as per the Housing SPD (2018).</p> <p>This policy repeats the current Local Plan policy CN1 and it is questioned whether the policy adds anything specific to the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>Furthermore, the council have recently changed their</p>	<p>The NPPF (2019) updates the threshold for the size of planning applications that can provide affordable housing. It requires that affordable housing 'should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of five units or fewer)'. Major</p>	<p>It is suggested that the policy is removed as it duplicates Policy CN1. Some supporting text could be retained for reference within the plan but the inclusion of the policy may be unnecessary.</p>	<p>This policy has been removed from the submission plan.</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		<p>approach which means it now collects off-site contributions within the AONB for all development. The policy approach is therefore now out of date and the wording should be amended to ensure the approach within the Neighbourhood Plan is in line with that of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>First Homes are a new type of affordable housing which will be implemented before the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted, in December 2021, and therefore this requirement could be referenced within the policy. If the policy is to be retained it could include reference to at least 25% of first homes being a requirement.</p>	<p>development, for housing, is defined as developments of 10 or more homes, or sites with an area of 0.5ha or more.</p> <p>Within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is a designated rural area, affordable housing (or an equivalent off-site contribution) will be sought on all developments providing net new dwellings (as of June 2021). This is because adopted Local Plan Policy CN1 (Affordable Housing) requires affordable housing on all market sites, and so establishes this threshold in the AONB.</p> <p>PPG states: A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it</p>	<p>However, if the policy is retained it should be amended to reflect lower affordable housing thresholds in the AONB and the council's approach since June 2021. It could also include reference to new legislation regarding First Homes which is due to become compulsory from December 2021.</p>	

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
			consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared. (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306).		
Local Employment and Business Policy					
Policy LB1: Supporting local employe nt and business, pg 77.	Policy LB1: Supporting Local Employment and Business, pg 78.	<p>The policy seeks to support local employment and businesses and supports the local rural economy in re-using existing buildings and supporting new buildings in the countryside.</p> <p>The first part of the policy is complicated and could be helpfully clarified. The process of clarifying this opening part of the policy may also address the points below.</p>	<p>Paragraph 29 of the NPPF: Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. 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</p>	<p>The policy needs to be amended in order to ensure that it supports all types of businesses in rural areas and allows for new buildings to support the rural economy, as per paragraph 83 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The first part of the policy has been amended and simplified and can now be applied to a wider range of employment uses rather than solely agricultural or small-scale enterprise.</p> <p>A number of criteria have also been removed from the pre-submission draft and this is welcomed.</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		<p>It is noted that the policy is seeking to support the rural economy and in a manner which is consistent with the NPPF. However, the policy appears to be more restrictive than is set out in paragraph 83 of the NPPF. In particular it is not considered to be consistent with the NPPF to restrict the scope of the support for the rural economy to “<i>agriculture or small-scale enterprise that meets community or other land based rural business needs</i>”. This is because the NPPF specifically states that all types of businesses should be supported.</p> <p>Similarly, the policy also needs to allow for new buildings, not just the conversion or replacement of existing buildings, again, as per paragraph 83 in the NPPF. This is referenced in the first part of the policy but not the criteria, so this may just be an issue of clarifying the policy wording.</p> <p>The policy also refers to matters which relate to Policy TT1</p>	<p>less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area or undermine those strategic policies.</p> <p>Footnote 16: 16 Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in any development plan that covers their area</p> <p>Paragraph 31 of the NPPF: ‘The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals’</p> <p>PPG states: A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient</p>		

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		including accessibility, rural roads and increased traffic, and this creates some overlap between policies. These issues may be more locally distinctive and relevant in another policy.	clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared. (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306).		
Traffic and Transport Policy					
Policy TT1: The traffic and parking impact of new development, pg 79.	Policy TT1: The traffic and parking impact of new development, pg 81	<p>The policy seeks to limit the impacts of development upon the local transport network.</p> <p>The policy requires all new developments to provide a parking statement setting out the approach to parking provision.</p> <p>The policy replicates a number of requirements which are already included within Local</p>	Paragraph 31 of the NPPF: 'The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals'	<p>The policy could be removed if it is considered that it is duplicating existing policies.</p> <p>If the policy is to be retained, more locally distinctive elements could</p>	<p>Partially met.</p> <p>The policy has been retained, with some additional detail added to the policy, particularly TT1(a). However, Policy CN9 notes development proposals that generate significant amounts of movement must be supported by a Transport Statement or Assessment. It is noted that the requirement in TT1(a) may be too onerous for small scale development i.e. for one dwelling located outside the SPB.</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		<p>Plan Policy CN9 and the parish council should consider whether this policy adds anything locally distinctive and whether it is needed within the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>If the policy is to be retained, more locally distinctive elements could be added and these could be sourced from the work already undertaken.</p>	<p>PPG states: A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared. (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306).</p>	<p>be added to the policy.</p>	<p>TT1(a) could also be interpreted as suggesting that if a significant development came forward within the SPB it would not need to provide an assessment for traffic generation and impact.</p>
Appendix A: Village Design Statement					
Appendix A: Village Design Statement	n/a	<p>The design principles in the appendix are not the same as those in the 2005 Village Design Statement and some appear to have been updated. This creates confusion over the relationship between the design</p>	<p>PPG states: A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it</p>	<p>Provide some clarity within the Policy and supporting text regarding how the Village Design</p>	<p>This has now been removed and no longer forms an appendix to the NP.</p> <p>There is now reference in Policy HO1(A) to the Village Design Statement which is much clearer.</p>

Section/ Policy of the pre- submissio n plan (Reg 14)	Section/ Policy of the submission plan (Reg 16)	BDBC comments in response to policy	Relevant National Guidance (NPPF and PPG)	Potential options/actions	Not met/ partially met/ comment at Regulation 16 (submission plan)
		<p>principles and the Village Design Statement.</p> <p>If the appendix is to be used, which includes a wider description than that which is included within the VDS, some supporting text should be added explaining that it has been revised and consulted upon through the regulation 14 consultation, and that this supersedes the previously adopted VDS.</p>	<p>consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared. (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306).</p>	<p>Statement and Appendix A should be used.</p>	

Annex A: Minor Changes suggested

Minor changes suggested to Neighbourhood Plan		Met?
Glossary of abbreviations and terms, pg 2-5.	<p>Many abbreviations are missing and could be inputted for instance Local Development Scheme is commonly abbreviated to LDS and Authority Monitoring Report to AMR.</p>	<p>Met. The following changes are suggested for clarity.</p> <p>Conservation Area <i>An area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance, designated <u>heritage asset</u> as such pursuant to the Planning</i></p>

		<p><i>(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</i></p> <p>Listed Building <i>A <u>structure or building which is a designated heritage asset</u> included in the statutory list of buildings of special architectural <u>and/or</u> historic interest</i></p>
Basic conditions, pg 11	The basic conditions need to be updated.	Met
General comment: Emphasising policy boxes	A border around the edge of the policy box would be helpful to demarcate between policies, this is particularly relevant on page 24/25 where the policy boxes merge for Policy RC1 and RC2.	Met
General comment on: Policies	There is no need for policies to have paragraph numbers, this can be confusing at times to differentiate between what is supporting text and what is policy wording.	n/a given the changes detailed above.
General comment: Maps	The quality of maps throughout the document could be improved and clarity enhanced, for example on Map 2 it is not clear which area of the Parish is not within the AONB.	Met
Policy HO1: Good Design Quality	In criteria (b) of Policy HO1, it should say 'complementary' with an 'e' rather than 'complimentary'.	n/a – this is a new comment.
Policy HO5: Housing replacements, extensions, residential garden land and annexes	Criteria (b) of Policy HO5 talks about replacement houses being “sympathetic to the appearance and character of the existing dwelling”. Perhaps this should be reworded as a replacement house need not be sympathetic to the appearance of the existing dwelling: rather there should be an emphasis on being sympathetic to the character of the surrounding area.	n/a – this is a new comment.
Policy RC2: Dark Skies	<p>Generally, the policy is supported. However, the policy requests that a 'lighting scheme' is submitted with all applications involving external lighting. However, it is not clear what a lighting scheme would entail, which makes the policy difficult to implement. Therefore, it is recommended that some clarification be incorporated into the supporting text.</p> <p>There appears to be some duplication between criterion d) and paragraph number 7.13 within the policy which both refer to glare and spillage being kept to a minimum.</p> <p>Provide greater clarity in terms of what a 'lighting scheme' would entail, in terms of what information would need to be provided with relevant planning applications.</p>	<p>This policy is now called Policy NE3: Dark Skies.</p> <p>Met. Development proposals are now required to meet the guidance within the 2021 publication of 'Dark Skies of the North Wessex Downs – A Guide to Good External Lighting'.</p>

Policy NE1: Protecting the landscape	In relation to paragraph 8.11 within the policy it may be helpful to include in the supporting text which native species are found locally. The Local Planning Authority have recently published a Landscape Character Assessment (May 2021) which will be relevant to the evidence base of the neighbourhood plan.	Met. The policy now includes reference to Oak and Beech trees.
Paragraph 9.16	This section is called 'built heritage assets' it is suggested this section is amended to name 'heritage assets'. It is suggested that the first line of the paragraph is amended for accuracy, some suggested wording has been provided below: 'Heritage Assets are non-renewable resources that are intrinsic to character and sense of place. As well as buildings within the Conservation Areas and Scheduled Monuments, there are two further types of Built <u>other Designated</u> Heritage Assets <u>are</u> : Listed Buildings <u>and Historic Parks and Gardens</u> . <u>Non-designated heritage assets can be identified during the course of a planning application and this includes archaeology, other non-designated heritage assets include</u> 'The Local List' <u>and Notable Structures within the conservation areas</u> .'	n/a – this is a new comment.
Policy CF1: Community Facilities	It is suggested that the significant of heritage assets is included within the policy and some suggested wording has been provided below: 'Proposals to extend or improve the viability of a community facility by way of an extension, partial replacement or redevelopment of buildings, structures and land, will be supported. This is provided the design of the scheme respects heritage features, the street scene and the resulting increase in use and will not have a negative impact on the <u>significance of heritage assets and the amenities of adjoining residential properties</u> .'	n/a – this is a new comment.
Policy CF2: Recreation	The wording 'from time to time' (as per paragraph 9.14) is not precise and it is suggested this is amended to 'or subsequent versions'. The supporting text could also make more reference to the Green Infrastructure Strategy and how play provision has been identified as low in the parish. This would also explain why this policy requirement is important locally.	Met.
Policy LB1: Supporting Local Employment and Business	It may be helpful to review the formatting of Policy LB1 as it appears that the first paragraph could benefit from some paragraph spacing.	Met.
Policy NE4: Trees and hedgerows	It may be helpful to review the formatting of Policy NE4 as it appears that the paragraph could benefit from some paragraph spacing or bullet points.	Met.
Para 10.8	It could be stated that, if there are any pubs or shops: "The variety of services and businesses present in the conservation area, interspersed with houses, contribute to aspects of the character of the conservation area such as vitality and vibrancy, and reflect the historic function of the settlement".	Not met.

Appendix 1, Village Design Statement	The two hyperlinks included within the appendix of the document don't work.	n/a.