

Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan 2022 - 2029

**Report by Independent Examiner to Basingstoke
and Deane Borough Council**

Janet L Cheesley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

CHEC Planning Ltd

13 June 2022

Contents	Page
Summary and Conclusion	4
Introduction	4
Legislative Background	5
EU Obligations, Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA)	6
Policy Background	7
The Neighbourhood Plan Preparation	8
The Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan	9
Landscape Policy L1: Landscape Character	10
Landscape Policy L2: External Lighting	11
Natural Environment Policy NE1: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment	12
Natural Environment Policy NE2: Trees and Hedgerows	12
Heritage Assets Policy HA: The Protection of Heritage Assets	14
Local Valued Facilities Policies (LVF)	16
Local Valued Facility Policy LVF1	16
Local Valued Facility Policy LVF2	17
Local Green Space Policy (LGS): Local Green Spaces	17
Provision of Community Facilities Policy (PCF)	20
Housing and other Development Policy HD1	20

Housing and other Development Policy HD2: Mix and Tenure of New Residential Development	22
Housing and other Development Policy HD3: High Quality Design of New Development	23
Housing and other Development Policy HD4: Infrastructure considerations	24
Local Employment Policy LE1: New and existing employment	25
Local Employment Policy LE2: Development on Farms	26
Transport, Traffic and Public Rights of Way Policy TTP1	27
Transport, Traffic and Public Rights of Way Policy TTP2	27
Transport, Traffic and Public Rights of Way Policy TTP3	29
Referendum & the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan Area	29
Appendix 1 Background Documents	31

Summary and Conclusion

1. The Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan has a clear vision supported by a list of objectives. Policy HD1 does not allocate sites for housing. It seeks to concentrate new development within a settlement boundary, with the area outside being considered as countryside.
2. I have recommended modification to some of the policies in the Plan. In addition, I have recommended that Policies LVF and LVF2 are deleted.
3. In the latest revision of the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 131 makes it clear that it is the Government's intention that all new streets include trees unless in specific cases there are clear justifiable and compelling reasons why this would be inappropriate. Therefore, to have regard to national policy I have recommended the inclusion of such a requirement in Policy NE2.
4. My reasons with regard to all the suggested modifications are set out in detail below. None of these significantly or substantially alters the intention or nature of the Plan.
5. **Whilst I have set out my reasoning under individual policies, my overall conclusion is that, subject to my recommendations, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. It is appropriate to make the Plan. Subject to my recommendations being accepted, I consider that the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan will provide a strong practical framework against which decisions on development can be made. I am pleased to recommend that the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan, as modified by my recommendations, should proceed to Referendum.**

Introduction

6. On 1 December 2017 Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC) approved that the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Area be designated in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The Area covers the whole of the Parish of Ashford Hill with Headley.
7. The qualifying body is Ashford Hill with Headley Parish Council. The Plan has been prepared by a Steering Group on behalf of the Parish Council. The Plan covers the period 2022 to 2029.
8. I was appointed as an independent Examiner for the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan in March 2022. I confirm that I am independent from the Parish Council and BDBC. I have no interest in any of the land affected by the Plan and I have appropriate experience to undertake this examination. As part of my examination, I have visited the Plan area.

Legislative Background

9. As an independent Examiner, I am required to determine, under Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, whether:
- the policies in the Plan relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004;
 - the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the 2004 PCPA where the plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area; and
 - that the Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under the Localism Act 2011 and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.
10. I am obliged to determine whether the Plan complies with the Basic Conditions. The Basic Conditions are:
- having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan;
 - the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
 - the making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the Development Plan for the area of the authority; and
 - the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations and human rights requirements.
11. *The Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018* came into force on 28 December 2018. They state:
- Amendment to the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.*
- 3.—(1) The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012(5) are amended as follows.*
- (2) In Schedule 2 (Habitats), for paragraph 1 substitute:*
- “Neighbourhood development plans*

1. *In relation to the examination of neighbourhood development plans the following basic condition is prescribed for the purpose of paragraph 8(2)(g) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act(6)—*

The making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017(7).”

12. Since 28 December 2018, A neighbourhood plan is required to be examined against this extra Basic Condition. I will make further reference to this matter under EU Obligations.
13. Subject to the modifications I have recommended in this report, I am content that these requirements have been satisfied.

EU Obligations, Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA)

14. Directive 2001/42/EC and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (as amended) (EA Regulations) set out various legal requirements and stages in the production of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).
15. BDBC prepared the *Neighbourhood Planning Screening Report – Ashford Hill with Headley Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment Final Version following consideration by consultation bodies* in March 2020, together with a formal screening opinion in a letter dated 26 March 2020. The report concluded that significant effects on the environment are not likely and hence an SEA is not required. Whilst the Environment Agency was not in a position to provide a detailed response, both Natural England and Historic England agreed with this conclusion.
16. Based on the screening determination and consultee responses, I consider that it was not necessary for the Plan to require a full SEA Assessment. The SEA screening accords with the provisions of the European Directive 2001/42/EC.
17. As regards HRA, the report concluded: *the draft plan is not proposing to allocate any development sites and includes policies to protect the natural environment therefore, it is considered that there are not likely to be significant effects on any European sites flowing from the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan. Accordingly, an Appropriate Assessment is not required.* Natural England has not raised objection to this conclusion.
18. Based on the screening determination and consultee response, I consider that the Plan does not require a full HRA under Articles 6 or 7 of the Habitats

Directive. I am satisfied that the Plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017(7).

19. A Neighbourhood Plan must be compatible with European Union obligations, as incorporated into UK law, in order to be legally compliant. I am satisfied that the Plan is compatible with EU obligations and does not breach the European Convention on Human Rights obligations.

Policy Background

20. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) (2021) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The *Planning Practice Guidance* (2014) (PPG) provides Government guidance on planning policy.
21. At the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 sets out the three overarching objectives which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways. The three overarching objectives are:
- a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;*
 - b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and*
 - c) an environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.*
22. Ashford Hill with Headley Parish is within the local authority area of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (BDBC). The development plan for the Neighbourhood Plan Area includes the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (BDLP) (2011 to 2029) adopted on 26 May 2016. The Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan was prepared in the context of this Local Plan. The strategic policies in this Local Plan include policies regarding housing, the environment and the economy.

The Neighbourhood Plan Preparation

23. I am required under The Localism Act 2011 to check the consultation process that has led to the production of the plan. The requirements are set out in Regulation 14 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
24. Discussions on whether to prepare a neighbourhood plan were held in 2016, with a formal decision in 2017. After the formation of the Steering Group, it had a stand to publicise the Plan at the Parish fete in May 2019. A questionnaire was sent to all residents with the Parish magazine in June 2019. Drop-in sessions were held in July 2019. Local businesses were sent a questionnaire in September 2019.
25. The Consultation period on the pre-submission draft of the Plan ran from 22 June 2021 to 6 August 2021. Flyers were delivered around the Parish. The draft Plan was available on both a dedicated website and the Parish Council's website. Hard copies of the Plan were also made available. Newbury Weekly News advertised the consultation details. Two drop-in sessions were held on 19 July and 20 July 2021.
26. I am satisfied that the pre-submission consultation and publicity has met the requirements of Regulation 14 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The consultation and publicity went beyond the requirements and it is clear that the qualifying body went to considerable lengths to ensure that local residents and businesses were able to engage in the production of the Plan. I congratulate them on their efforts, especially during the challenging period of the pandemic.
27. BDBC publicised the submission Plan for comment during the publicity period between 14 March 2022 and 3 May 2022 in line with Regulation 16 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. A total of 15 responses were received. I am satisfied that all these responses can be assessed without the need for a public hearing.
28. Some responses suggest additions and amendments to policies. My remit is to determine whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. Where I find that policies do meet the Basic Conditions, it is not necessary for me to consider if further suggested additions or amendments are required. Whilst I have not made reference to all the responses in my report, I have taken them into consideration. I gave the Parish Council the opportunity to comment on the Regulation 16 representations.

The Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan

29. Background information is provided throughout the Plan. A clear vision for the Parish has been established and is supported by a list of objectives.
30. Policies in a neighbourhood plan can only be for the development and use of land. Where there are community aspirations (identified as Community Projects in this Plan) these have to be clearly differentiated from policies for the development and use of land.
31. Paragraph 16 in the NPPF requires plans to be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable; and serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area. In addition, paragraph 16 in the NPPF requires plans to contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals.
32. 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).
33. I do refer to clarity and precision with regard to some recommendations to modifications to the Plan. Where I do so, I have in mind the need for clear and unambiguous policies, thus ensuring that the Plan has regard to national policy in this respect.
34. It is not for me to re-write the Plan. Where I have found editing errors, I have identified them as minor editing matters and highlighted these as such. These have no bearing on whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.
35. The last line on page 4 of the Plan state that Policies in the Local Plan take precedence over policies in this Plan. That is not correct and thus should be deleted. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**
36. The fourth paragraph on page 7 refers to the current surplus in housing provision, as a result of the Oakfield Lane development, will satisfy any updated Local Plan. I suggest that this sentence is deleted as until such time as the Local Plan is updated, no such assumption can be made. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**
37. The paragraph at the top of the table on Page 10 under 'what this means' for an ageing population is written as a policy. I suggest this is deleted as this is not the policy section. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**

38. There are references to paragraphs in the NPPF (2019) on pages 18 and 25 the Plan. These and any other such references in the Plan need to be changed to the relevant sections of the revised NPPF (2021). This is necessary to ensure that the Plan has regard to national policy.
39. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend that all references to paragraphs in the NPPF (2019) in the Plan are revised where necessary to refer to the relevant sections of the revised NPPF (2021).**
40. For ease of reference, I have used the same policy titles as those in the Plan. I have briefly explained national policy and summarised main strategic policies where relevant to each neighbourhood plan policy. I have tried not to repeat myself. Where I have not specifically referred to other relevant strategic policy, I have considered all strategic policy in my examination of the Plan.

Landscape Policy L1: Landscape Character

41. The NPPF, in Paragraph 174 requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. This includes protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity. This is relevant to Policies L1, L2, NE1 and NE2.
42. BDLP Policy EM1 seeks to protect and enhance the character and visual amenity of the landscape. This is a detailed policy which lists criteria against which development proposals are considered. It includes the requirement for a comprehensive landscaping scheme for development proposals, with the assessment of character and visual quality and the provision of a landscaping scheme being proportionate to the scale and nature of the development proposed.
43. Policy L1 seeks to protect landscape character. It lists details to be considered in a landscape strategy for all major development proposals. Not all of these details will be appropriate for each development proposal. Therefore, I suggest that 'where appropriate' is included at the end of the second sentence.
44. Policy L1 requires consideration of the assessment of near and strategic views of the development from principal vantage points. The scale of Figure 3 is such that it makes it difficult to accurately determine where these principal vantage points are located. In addition, some of the strategic views identified in Figure 3 extend beyond the Parish. Control over development outside the Parish is not possible in this Plan. In the interest of precision, Figure 3 should be modified at an appropriate scale on an ordnance survey

base, to precisely locate principal vantage points and exclude areas beyond the Parish in the strategic views. This could include inset maps.

45. Subject to the above modifications, Policy L1 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, particularly the environmental objective and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy L1 meets the Basic Conditions.
46. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend:**
- 1) modification to Policy L1 by the inclusion of ‘where possible’ after ‘which includes’ in the second sentence.**
- 2) modification to Figure 3 at an appropriate scale on an ordnance survey base, to precisely locate principal vantage points and exclude areas beyond the Parish in the strategic views.**

Landscape Policy L2: External Lighting

47. Paragraph 185 in the NPPF seeks to limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.
48. BDLP Policy EM1 requires development proposals to have regard to intrinsic dark landscapes. BDLP Policy EM12 seeks to ensure that new development does not lead to pollution. Pollution includes light pollution.
49. Policy L2 seeks to ensure lighting schemes are sensitive to the local environment. It refers to a 2011 Guidance Note published by the Institute of Lighting Professionals. However, the latest guidance was published in 2021. In the interest of precision, I suggest that this part of Policy L2 simply refers to the latest guidance published by this Institute.
50. Subject to the above modification, Policy L2 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, particularly the environmental objective and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy L2 meets the Basic Conditions.
51. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend modification to the first sentence in Policy L2 to read as follows:**
- Development proposals that include external lighting which requires planning permission must be accompanied by a lighting scheme that has regard to the latest national design guidance published by the Institute of Lighting Professionals.**

Natural Environment Policy NE1: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

52. Paragraph 180 in the NPPF lists principles to be applied when determining planning applications, with regard to habitats and biodiversity. These principles include: *if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.*
53. The Environment Act 2021 makes provision for achieving at least 10% biodiversity net gain to be a condition of receiving planning permission. Various parts of this Act, including this biodiversity net gain requirement, are yet to come into force. At a local level, a higher minimum level of biodiversity net gain would require justification in local plans.
54. BDLP Policy EM4 is a policy regarding biodiversity, geodiversity and nature conservation. This is a long complex policy setting criteria to ensure that: *development proposals will only be permitted if significant harm to biodiversity and/ or geodiversity resulting from a development can be avoided or, if that is not possible, adequately mitigated...* BDLP Policy EM4 goes on to specify the criteria for circumstances where compensatory measures are a last resort.
55. Policy NE1 seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment, recognising compensatory measures for unavoidable loss.
56. To ensure that regard is had to national policy, particularly in the Environment Act, I have suggested revised wording to Policy NE1 to explain that the extent of net gain should be in accordance with national policy. Subject to this modification, Policy NE1 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, particularly the environmental objective and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy NE1 meets the Basic Conditions.
57. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend modification to the first bullet point in Policy NE1 to read as follows:**
- they should protect existing biodiversity and their design should provide net gains in biodiversity, for example by planting trees and hedgerows, creating meadows and ponds and leaving un-cropped arable margins and headlands. The extent of any net gain in biodiversity should be in accordance with national policy;**

Natural Environment Policy NE2: Trees and Hedgerows

58. One of the principles in paragraph 180 in the NPPF is that *development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient*

woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.

59. BDLP Policy EM1 specifies the need to have regard to existing trees, ancient woodland and hedgerows, when considering the effect of new development on the character or visual amenity of the landscape.
60. BDLP Policy EM5 supports proposals that improve links and remedy identified deficiencies in the green infrastructure network.
61. Policy NE2 seeks to protect existing trees and enhance the green infrastructure network. In the interest of precision, I have suggested revised wording that ensures the need for a *satisfactory* Arboricultural Impact Assessment. In addition, reference should be to BS5837 (2012) rather than BS583, with regard to such assessments.
62. In the latest revision of the NPPF, paragraph 131 makes it clear that it is the Government's intention that all new streets include trees unless in specific cases there are clear justifiable and compelling reasons why this would be inappropriate. Therefore, to have regard to national policy I have recommended the inclusion of such a requirement in Policy NE2.
63. The supporting text for Policy NE2 refers to the 'requirements of BDBC's Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees Supplementary Planning Document'. In the interest of precision, as that document is guidance rather than policy, the supporting text should be modified to refer to 'guidance' in that document.
64. Subject to the above modifications, Policy NE2 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, particularly the environmental objective and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy NE2 meets the Basic Conditions.
65. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend:**

1) modification to Policy NE2 to read as follows:

Natural Environment Policy NE2: Trees and Hedgerows

Development proposals will only be permitted where:

- **they retain veteran and other important trees, groups of trees, woodland, and hedgerows on site. All applications where there are trees on or adjacent to the site will need to be supported by a satisfactory Arboricultural Impact Assessment in accordance with BS5837 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – recommendations'(2012);**
- **they provide a survey and satisfactory protection plan in all cases where there are trees on the site, not only if they are affected. Where loss of trees or hedgerows is unavoidable, replacement planting of**

equivalent species and amenity value should be incorporated into the application;

- opportunities are taken for the planting of additional native trees and hedgerows that contribute to the green infrastructure network, character and biodiversity of the Parish, and appropriate provision is made for the long-term maintenance of trees and hedgerows within the site**
- they include tree-lined streets unless in specific cases there are clear justifiable and compelling reasons why this would be inappropriate.**

2) modification to the last sentence in the supporting text on page 19 to read as follows:

Development proposals will be expected to have regard to guidance in BDBC’s Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees Supplementary Planning Document 2018.

Heritage Assets Policy HA: The Protection of Heritage Assets

66. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes duties requiring special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
67. The NPPF advises at paragraph 199 that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. At paragraph 203, a balanced judgement will be required when determining applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
68. BDLP Policy EM11 seeks to ensure that all development conserves or enhances the quality of the Borough’s heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.
69. Policy HA seeks to protect heritage assets. One of the requirements is for a Statement of Significance. BDBC already requires Heritage Statements to be provided with certain planning applications that relate to heritage assets. In the interest of clarity, I recommend the suggestion by BDBC to alter this bullet point to refer to the inclusion of a heritage statement including a statement of significance for any affected heritage assets.
70. Reference is made in Policy HA to non-designated heritage assets, but does not refer to the balanced judgement specified in the NPPF. To have regard

to national policy, I have recommended modification to this bullet point in Policy HA.

71. The Plan should be read as a whole. Therefore, it is unnecessary to include a cross reference to Policy HD3 in the last bullet point in Policy HA. This can be moved to the supporting text.
72. There are existing non-designated heritage assets identified in the BDBC *Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest* (Ashford Hill with Headley list 2009). The penultimate paragraph on page 21 in the Plan refers to non-designated heritage assets being identified as part of the planning application process. This is not a policy requirement in the Plan and thus I recommend deletion of this paragraph.
73. Subject to the above modifications, Policy HA has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, particularly the environmental objective and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy HA meets the Basic Conditions.
74. The supporting text refers to 'these policies' but there is only one heritage policy. Figure 12 refers to locally listed buildings. It should refer to listed buildings as these are different to buildings on a local list. **I see these as minor editing matters.**
75. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend:**

1) the deletion of the penultimate paragraph on page 21.

2) modification to Policy HA to read as follows:

Heritage Assets Policy HA: The Protection of Heritage Assets

- **Listed buildings and designated historic heritage assets in the Parish and their settings, both above and below ground, will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced for their historic significance and their importance to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place.**
- **Proposed development in the setting of designated heritage assets or their setting should not adversely affect the heritage asset or its context. Where harm is unavoidable, proposals must clearly demonstrate that harm is justified by provision of public benefit that could not otherwise be delivered.**
- **Proposals for development should include a heritage statement, including a statement of significance for any affected heritage assets to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of any heritage asset or their setting.**
- **Proposals for development that affect non-designated heritage assets (including non-designated archaeology) or their setting will be**

considered with a balanced judgement, taking account of the scale of harm or loss and the significance of the heritage assets.

• Developers will be required to submit an archaeological desk-based assessment and field evaluation where archaeological assets have been identified in any application site.

Local Valued Facilities Policies (LVF)

76. Paragraph 93 in the NPPF seeks to ensure that planning policies plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities and guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs.
77. BDLP Policies CN7 and CN8 list criteria against which the loss or provision of essential facilities and services, community, leisure and cultural facilities should be assessed and support improvement of existing facilities.
78. The above policies are relevant to Policies LVF, LVF1, LVF2 and PCF.
79. Policy LVF is not a land use and development policy, it is simply an explanation of how the following policies should be considered. In the interest of precision, I suggest that Policy LVF is deleted. The text can remain as background text preceding Policy LVF1.
80. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend the deletion of Policy LVF.**

Local Valued Facility Policy LVF1

81. Policy LVF1 seeks to retain and improve existing Valued Facilities identified in the table on page 25 and figures 20 and 21. It is clear that the local community values these facilities. In the interest of precision, Policy LVF1 should be modified to ensure that any development proposals are appropriate in design terms and do not harm the amenities of any adjoining residential properties. I have suggested revised wording taken from Policy PCF.
82. The supporting text refers to a requirement for a planning application to provide supporting evidence to show the need for improvement of a Valued Facility. This is not a policy requirement in Policy LVF1. To avoid internal conflict within the Plan, the requirement in the supporting text should be deleted.
83. Subject to the above modifications, Policy LVF1 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, particularly the social

objective and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy LVF1 meets the Basic Conditions.

84. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend:**

1) modification to Policy LVF1 to read as follows:

Proposals to improve or assist in the continued availability of the Valued Facilities identified in Figures 20 and 21 and the Table on Page XX will be supported provided the development is of a scale and design that is in keeping with its surroundings and will not adversely affect the amenities of any nearby residential properties.

2) deletion of reference to supporting evidence being required as part of a planning application in the supporting text to Policy LVF1.

Local Valued Facility Policy LVF2

85. Policy LVF2 seeks to protect the identified Valued Facilities and lists criteria against which such a loss would be permitted. In doing so, it only reiterates part of the list of criteria in BDLP Policy CN8. I have no clear justified evidence before me to support such a departure from strategic policy. In the absence of the complete list from BDLP Policy CN8, Policy LVF2 is not in general conformity with strategic policy.
86. Usually, a neighbourhood plan policy should provide an additional level or layer of detail to national policy and the local planning authority's policies. If I were to recommend modification to Policy LVF2 it would add no local policy detail above that required under BDLP Policy CN8. It would not be a distinct policy that reflected and responded to the unique characteristics and planning context of the neighbourhood area. Therefore, to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend the deletion of Policy LVF2 and supporting text. This will not prevent BDBC from resisting the loss of Valued Facilities under the policy requirements of BDLP Policy CN8.
87. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend the deletion of Policy LVF2.**

Local Green Space Policy (LGS): Local Green Spaces

88. The NPPF in paragraphs 101 - 103 states: *the designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in*

sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.

The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:

a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;

b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and

c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

Policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts.

89. I have visited the Parish and seen the proposed Local Green Spaces. I have no evidence to suggest that these LGS are not capable of enduring beyond the end of the Plan period. All the LGS meet the criteria for designation.
90. My comments on each of the proposed LGS sites are set out below.
91. *Ashford Hill Recreation Ground.* This is a recreation ground that includes children's play equipment. It is in reasonable proximity to the local community. It is demonstrably special to the local community due to its recreation provision. It is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.
92. *Headley Recreation Ground.* This is a recreation ground that includes children's play equipment. It is in reasonable proximity to the local community. It is demonstrably special to the local community due to its recreation provision. It is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.
93. *Mill Green Common Land.* This common land is in reasonable proximity to the local community. It is demonstrably special to the local community due to its beauty, wildlife and informal recreation provision. It is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.
94. *Sports Pitches and Common Land to the North of Ashford Hill.* This area includes formal sports pitches and Common Land. It is in reasonable proximity to the local community. It is demonstrably special to the local community due to the beauty and informal recreation provision of the Common Land together with the more formal recreation provision of the sports pitches. It is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

95. *Oakfield Open Space*. These parcels of land are open areas on the edges of a modern housing development. As such they are demonstrably special to the local community as they provide informal recreation. They are in reasonable proximity to the local community. They are local in character and do not constitute an extensive tract of land.
96. *Headley Ford*. This area is demonstrably special to the local community because of its beauty and historic value. It is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. Whilst being outside the main built up area of Headley, in such a rural Parish of dispersed settlements, I consider it to be in reasonable proximity to the local community.
97. *Hollybush Small Open Space*. This small verdant area is demonstrably special to the local community because it is an open space within a residential area. As such it provides some form of informal recreation space. It is in reasonable proximity to the local community. It is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.
98. *Harrow Drive Open Space*. This open grassed area is demonstrably special to the local community because it is an open space on the edge of a residential area. As such it provides some form of informal recreation space. It is in reasonable proximity to the local community. It is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.
99. Following a Court of Appeal case with regard to the lawfulness of a LGS policy in a neighbourhood plan: (*Lochailort Investments Limited v. Mendip District Council and Norton St Philip Parish Council*, [2020] EWCA Civ 1259), I consider it necessary to modify this policy by simply listing the LGS sites. This will ensure that there can be absolutely no doubt regarding the lawfulness of the policy. The restrictions on development with regard to LGS designation will continue to apply through the NPPF. This will ensure that policies for managing development within a LGS are consistent with those for Green Belts. This ensures that the policy meets the Basic Conditions. Subject to the above modifications Policy Local Green Space Policy (LGS): Local Green Spaces has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, particularly the environmental objective, and is in general conformity with strategic policy.

100. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend modification to Local Green Space Policy (LGS): Local Green Spaces to read as follows:**

Local Green Space Policy (LGS): Local Green Spaces

The following Local Green Spaces are designated in this Plan and are identified in Figures 22-29:

Ashford Hill Recreation Ground

Headley Recreation Ground

Mill Green Common Land

Sports Pitches and Common Land to the North of Ashford Hill

Oakfield Open Space

Headley Ford

Hollybush Small Open Space

Harrow Drive Open Space

Provision of Community Facilities Policy (PCF)

101. Policy PCF supports new appropriate day nursery, church and village hall facilities, subject to a list of criteria. As such, it has regard to national policy, particularly in that it plans positively for the provision of community facilities. Policy PCF contributes towards sustainable development, particularly the social objective and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Policy PCF meets the Basic Conditions.
102. The supporting text refers to community facilities in general, but Policy PCF only refers to a day nursery, church or village hall. In the interest of precision, the supporting text should similarly only refer to these facilities.
103. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend modification to the supporting text to Policy PCF to read as follows:**
- There may be occasions during the life of the Plan where an opportunity for a new and improved or relocated day nursery, church or village hall comes forward. This policy seeks to ensure that any provision is appropriately located and of a high standard which does not have any detrimental impact on local residential amenities.**

Housing and other Development Policy HD1

104. Paragraphs 78 - 80 in the NPPF promote sustainable development in rural areas by locating housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Section 6 in the NPPF explains that planning policies should encourage sustainable economic growth.
105. BDLP Policy SS1 seeks to permit development within all defined Settlement Policy Boundaries, subject to criteria. It states that all land outside these boundaries is countryside.

106. BDLP Policy SS6 is a restrictive policy regarding new housing development in the countryside. BDLP Policies CN2, EP4 and EP5 allow some development in the countryside, such as rural exception sites for affordable housing and rural economic and tourism development in certain circumstances.
107. BDLP Policy SS5 supports the identification of housing sites through Neighbourhood Plans. Ashford Hill lies within a group of 13 settlements which are required to identify sites for a total of 150 homes between them. The exact split is not defined but BDLP Policy SS5 does specify that *it will be necessary to identify sites/opportunities to deliver at least 10 homes within and adjacent to each of the settlements with defined Settlement Policy Boundaries*.
108. BDBC has confirmed that the Oakfield Lane development of 35 dwellings in Ashford Hill allows for the Parish housing requirements of BDLP Policy SS5 up to 2029 to be met.
109. PPG advises that where there is a strategic housing requirement figure, this need not be retested as part of the examination of a neighbourhood plan. (Paragraph: 104 Reference ID: 41-104-20190509).
110. Policy HD1 seeks to concentrate new development within a settlement boundary, with the area outside being considered as countryside. Whilst only Ashford Hill currently has a settlement boundary, I note that there is a possibility that Headley may also have a settlement boundary as part of the review of the Local Plan. Policy HD1 specifically refers to 'any settlement boundary' to reflect this possibility. Figure 2 identifies the Settlement Boundary for Ashford Hill.
111. Representations have been received promoting two housing development sites within the Parish. The Plan period coincides with that of the current adopted Local Plan. The neighbourhood plan does not seek to identify further sites for residential development and there are no adopted strategic policies upon which to base a more significant growth strategy. As I have found that BDLP Policy SS5 is satisfied by an existing development, additional site allocations are not required. I note that BDBC cannot identify a five year housing land supply. In such instances, the NPPF at paragraph 11 indicates the application of a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
112. The housing and other development strategy outlined in Policy HD1 contributes to the achievement of sustainable development notwithstanding that further growth is being promoted and that the emerging Local Plan in the future might propose additional growth. In addition, Policy HD1 has regard to national policy, and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Policy HD1 meets the Basic Conditions.

Housing and other Development Policy HD2: Mix and Tenure of New Residential Development

113. Paragraph 60 in the NPPF states that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements need to be addressed, to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes.
114. Within the context of significantly boosting the supply of homes and determining the minimum number of homes needed at a strategic level, paragraph 62 in the NPPF explains that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies.
115. Paragraph 64 in the NPPF emphasises that the provision of 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 5 units or fewer). This post-dates BDLP Policy CN1, which requires 40% affordable housing on all market housing sites.
116. Paragraph 2 in the NPPF states: *Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.* Paragraph 218 in the NPPF confirms that the policies in the NPPF are material considerations. BDBC Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (July 2018) confirms that the NPPF thresholds now apply in the determination of planning applications. This supersedes the threshold requirements in BDLP Policy CN1. BDLP Policy CN3 seeks a housing mix for market housing with evidence proportionate to the scale of development proposed in order to justify a proposed mix.
117. Policy HD2 seeks a mix of housing size and tenure. Appendix 2 in the Plan indicates that the local community seeks affordable housing and small homes rather than large properties.
118. In the interest of precision, as the current BDBC affordable housing thresholds are in SPD, I have suggested revised wording to the first paragraph in Policy HD2 with regard to the provision of affordable housing.
119. Policy HD2 seeks to permit housing to meet local needs, then specifies a specific proportion of smaller dwellings. To ensure that local needs are continued to be met if there are changing circumstances, I have suggested wording for a more flexible approach. In the interest of precision, to aid in decision making, reference to a percentage of small dwellings should be as a proportion of the number of small units rather than the area of the units. I have no evidence before me to justify the alternative approach taken to this matter in Policy HD2.

120. Subject to the above modifications, Policy HD2 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy HD2 meets the Basic Conditions.

121. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend modification to Policy HD2 to read as follows:**

Housing and other Development Policy HD2: Mix and Tenure of New Residential Development

- **The provision of affordable housing must have regard to BDBC Housing Supplementary Planning Document (July 2018) and, where required, must include First Homes, part ownership tenures and units for rent to contribute to a mixed and balanced community.**

- **With open market housing, development will be permitted where it includes a range of types and sizes to meet local needs with normally not less than 70% comprising 1-3 bedroom units (such percentage to be determined by reference to the number of units).**

Housing and other Development Policy HD3: High Quality Design of New Development

122. Paragraph 126 in the NPPF states: *The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.*

123. Paragraph 127 in the NPPF states: *Plans should, at the most appropriate level, set out a clear design vision and expectations, so that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. Design policies should be developed with local communities so they reflect local aspirations, and are grounded in an understanding and evaluation of each area's defining characteristics. Neighbourhood planning groups can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development, both through their own plans and by engaging in the production of design policy, guidance and codes by local planning authorities and developers.*

124. BDLP Policy EM9 requires new homes to meet a water efficiency standard of 110 litres or less per person per day, with any new standards taking precedence. BDLP Policy EM10 seeks high quality development.
125. Policy HD3 is a broad ranging design policy seeking a high quality of design. The fourth bullet point in the second paragraph refers to views at the entrances into the village. These are not defined on a map. Therefore, in the interest of precision, this bullet point should simply refer to the strategic views identified in Policy L1 and Figure 3.
126. The last paragraph in Policy HD3 refers to a requirement for low carbon energy efficient design. In a Written Ministerial Statement of 25 March 2015 the Government announced that it is not now appropriate to refer to any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings in neighbourhood plans. Therefore, I recommend that the last paragraph in Policy HD3 refers to non-residential properties only.
127. Water efficiency standards are already stated in BDLP Policy EM9 and thus should be deleted from Policy HD3 as no additional layer of policy detail is achieved by repeating this requirement.
128. Subject to the above modifications, Policy HD3 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy HD3 meets the Basic Conditions.
129. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions I recommend:**
- 1) modification to the fourth bullet point in the second paragraph of Policy HD3 to read as follows:**
- strategic views valued by the public (as identified in Policy L1 and Figure 3).**
- 2) modification to the last paragraph in Policy HD3 to read as follows:**
- For non-residential properties, where practicable and viable, low carbon, energy efficient design should be employed and development should incorporate features that improve environmental performance and reduce carbon emissions in line with the National Design Guidance and the energy hierarchy such as ground source heat pumps, solar panelling and grey water harvesting.**

Housing and other Development Policy HD4: Infrastructure considerations

130. Paragraph 8 in the NPPF explains that the economic objective of sustainable development is to ensure that: *sufficient land of the right types*

is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure.

131. Section 14 in the NPPF explains the importance of flood risk management.
132. BDLP Policy CN6 supports appropriate contributions towards infrastructure. BDLP Policy EM7 seeks to manage flood risk.
133. Policy HD4 seeks to ensure that utility infrastructure meets local needs and is concerned with the prevention of flooding. Policy HD4 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Policy HD4 meets the Basic Conditions.

Local Employment Policy LE1: New and existing employment

134. *The NPPF supports a prosperous rural economy. Paragraph 84 states: Planning policies and decisions should enable:*
 - a) the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings;*
 - b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses;*
 - c) sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside; and*
 - d) the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.*
135. BDLP Policy EP4 supports the rural economy and lists criteria for economic uses in the countryside. These include that all development proposals must be well designed and of a use and scale that is appropriate to the site and location.
136. The above policies are relevant to both Policies LE1 and LE2.
137. Policy LE1 supports new or extended employment premises subject to a list of criteria that includes the development being appropriate to the surroundings. In addition, it encourages access to high-speed broadband and mobile signal. This is not a precise requirement for development control purposes, especially as it is not the responsibility of the developer to provide the infrastructure. Thus, I suggest this sentence is deleted in Policy LE1.

138. Subject to the above modification, Policy LE1 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, particularly the economic objective and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy LE1 meets the Basic Conditions.
139. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend the deletion of the last sentence in the first paragraph in Policy LE1.**

Local Employment Policy LE2: Development on Farms

140. Policy LE2 supports increased commercial or recreational activity on farms. In such a rural community, such opportunities will help strengthen the rural economy. In the interest of precision, the bullet points should relate to both development on farms and conversion of redundant farms and buildings. Otherwise, with no restrictions on development on farms, this could lead to development that would not contribute towards sustainable development. I have suggested revised wording.
141. The last sentence in the supporting text lists some, but not all, of the criteria in Policy LE2. In the interest of precision, this sentence should be deleted.
142. Subject to the above modifications, Policy LE2 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, particularly the economic objective and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy LE2 meets the Basic Conditions.
143. As there is only one Heritage Assets policy in the Plan, the first criteria in Policy LE2 regarding Heritage Assets policies should be singular. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**
144. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend:**
- 1) the deletion of the last sentence of the Supporting Text to Policy LE2 on page 37.**

2) modification to Policy LE2 to read as follows:

Local Employment Policy LE2: Development on Farms

Proposals for development on farms (including farm diversification proposals) which increase commercial or recreational activity and conversion or diversification of redundant farm and rural buildings to commercial use will be supported provided that proposals:

- comply with the Heritage Assets Policy in this Plan;**
- comply with Local Plan policy EM4.**

- respect the surrounding landscape and are sensitive to the amenities of neighbouring residents and other users and their setting in regard to size, light pollution, noise, dirt, loss of wildlife habitat.
- will not have any unacceptable impact on the local road network.

Transport, Traffic and Public Rights of Way Policy TTP1

145. Paragraph 111 in the NPPF states: *development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.*
146. An extract from BDLP Policy CN6 states: *new development will be required to provide and contribute towards the provision of additional services, facilities and infrastructure at a rate, scale and pace to meet the needs and requirements that are expected to arise from that development.* Infrastructure includes transport matters.
147. BDLP Policy CN9 seeks to promote a safe, efficient and convenient transport system. Measures include the provision of appropriate parking provision in accordance with adopted Parking Standards. BDLP Policy EM10 seeks appropriate parking provision to achieve a high-quality development.
148. Policy TTP1 seeks to ensure that new development has no adverse impact on highway safety and provides adequate parking. As BDBC Parking Standards set standards rather than a policy requirement, Policy TTP1 should reflect this. I have suggested revised wording. Subject to this modification, Policy TTP1 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy TTP1 meets the Basic Conditions.
149. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend modification to the second sentence in Policy TTP1 to read as follows:**
- New development should have regard to BDBC’s Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document.**

Transport, Traffic and Public Rights of Way Policy TTP2

150. At paragraph 100, the NPPF seeks to protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users. Paragraph 104 in the NPPF promotes opportunities for walking as

- part of sustainable transport initiatives. These are relevant to both Policies TTP2 and TTP3.
151. BDLP Policy CN9 seeks the provision of coherent and direct cycling and walking networks.
152. Policy TTP2 seeks to ensure new development provides safe pedestrian and cycle access and that it links up with existing rights of way. The definition of development in planning policy encompasses a wide range, including change of use and there may be many instances where small scale development does not necessitate any additional pedestrian or cycle access, such as for extensions to dwellings. Whilst there should be safe pedestrian and cycle access, this can only be required for relevant development proposals. Therefore, I have suggested the addition of 'where relevant' at the beginning of Policy TTP2. For the same reason, 'where relevant' should be included in the second paragraph with regard to vehicular access. There is no need for the repetition of safe pedestrian access in the second paragraph. I cannot see how new development can be expected to provide safe access adjacent to the development site. In the interest of precision, I have suggested revised wording to the second paragraph.
153. The last sentence in the Supporting Text is more of a policy requirement than explanation. Thus, in the interest of precision I recommend deletion of that sentence.
154. Subject to the above modifications, Policy TTP2 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy TTP2 meets the Basic Conditions.
155. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend:**
- 1) modification to Policy TTP2 to read as follows:**
- Transport, Traffic and Public Rights of Way Policy TTP2**
- Where relevant, new development should provide safe pedestrian and cycle access and link up with existing rights of way (Figure 32) and pavements (Fig. 33) ensuring residents can walk or cycle safely to existing or new amenities. Additionally, where relevant, all new developments will be expected to provide safe vehicular access.**
- 2) Deletion of the last sentence in the Supporting Text to Policy TTP2.**

Transport, Traffic and Public Rights of Way Policy TTP3

156. BDLP Policy EM5 seeks to protect and enhance the quality and extent of public rights of way. BDLP Policy CN9 seeks to ensure that development protects and where possible enhances access to public rights of way.
157. Policy TTP3 seeks to ensure that new development does not hinder access to Public Rights of Way, protects their setting and not block views from them. This goes further than Policy L1 with regard to views. In the interest of precision and to avoid internal conflict within the Plan I recommend that the last sentence in Policy TTP3, with regard to views is deleted. In the interest of precision, the supporting text to Policy TTP3 should be similarly modified. In addition, as Figure 32 identifies the Rights of Way, this should be referred to in Policy TTP3.
158. Subject to the above modifications, Policy TTP3 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development, and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Modified Policy TTP3 meets the Basic Conditions.
159. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend**

1) modification to Policy TTP3 to read as follows:

Transport, Traffic and Public Rights of Way Policy TTP3

New developments should not hinder access to Rights of Way as defined by the Hampshire County Council Definitive Maps of Public Rights of Way and identified on Figure 32.

2) modification to the supporting text to Policy TTP3 to read as follows:

The Parish is fortunate in the extent of Public Rights of Way it contains which are very much appreciated by the local residents and visitors and access to them should not be hindered by any new development.

Referendum and the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan Area

160. I am required to make one of the following recommendations:
- the Plan should proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it meets all legal requirements; or
 - the Plan as modified by my recommendations should proceed to Referendum; or

- the Plan does not proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it does not meet the relevant legal requirements.

161. **I am pleased to recommend that the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan as modified by my recommendations should proceed to Referendum.**

162. I am required to consider whether or not the Referendum Area should extend beyond the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan Area. I see no reason to alter or extend the Neighbourhood Plan Area for the purpose of holding a referendum.

Minor Modifications

163. The Plan is a well-written document, which is easy to read. Where I have found errors, I have identified them above. It is not for me to re-write the Plan. If other minor amendments are required as a result of my proposed modifications, I see these as minor editing matters which can be dealt with as minor modifications to the Plan. In particular, the Executive Summary will need to be updated.

Janet Cheesley

Date 13 June 2022

Appendix 1 Background Documents

The background documents include:

The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) (2021)
The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
The Localism Act (2011)
The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012)
The Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations (2015)
The Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations (2016)
The Neighbourhood Planning (General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations (2017)
The Neighbourhood Planning Act (2017)
The Planning Practice Guidance (2014)
The Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018
Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Character Assessment (May 2021)
BDBC Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees Supplementary Planning Document (December 2018)
BDBC Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (July 2018)
Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest (Ashford Hill with Headley List 2009)
Ashford Hill with Headley Village Design Statement (March 2004)
BDBC Parking Supplementary Planning Document (July 2018)
Regulation 16 Representations
Examination Correspondence (on the BDBC web site)