

Charlton Neighbourhood Plan Examination

Response to the Examiner's Clarifying Questions from Charlton Parish Council and Test Valley Borough Council

Note: Charlton Parish Council response is in **Blue** and TVBC response is in **Red**

EQ1. Dates of designation of the Neighbourhood Area are inconsistent across various documents. It would appear that the application was made on 20/3/14 and the designation of the NA was made by the Borough Council on 8/8/14. Is that correct?

Correct

EQ2. There should be a formal minute of the Parish Council approving the neighbourhood plan for submission. Although the Basic Conditions statement states this was done there is no minute to that effect as far as I could ascertain. It is possible there was a minute from the December 2019 meeting of the Parish Council but I could not find these online. As this is a matter of challenge in a representation at the Regulation 16 stage I need to see the minute that cleared the plan for submission.

The consultation Statement should be amended to state the following:

"CHARLTON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17th MARCH 2020

Present: Cllr J Smith (Chairman), Cllr C Ward (Vice Chairman), Cllr I Smale, Cllr P Wylde & Cllr M Bonarius.

In attendance: Mrs H Bourner – Clerk

1 member of public

15) Neighbourhood Plan Resolution

Cllr Smale proposed the Parish Council formally resolve the Neighbourhood Plan be submitted to TVBC for the formal regulation 16 procedure to commence. Cllr Bonarius seconded. All in favour."

Parish Council Minutes are available here:

<http://www.charltonvillage.org.uk/community/charlton-parish-council-12680/council-minutes/>

- EQ3. The site assessment is referred to in the plan but is not available in online documents. I need to see a copy of this to understand the rationale for selecting site CHA1 over any other site.

The link to our evidence base should have been made available on the TVBC website, this has now been rectified.

<https://www.testvalley.gov.uk/consultations/charlton-neighbourhood-plan>
and

<http://www.charltonvillage.org.uk/community/charlton-parish-council-12680/neighbourhood-plan/>

The evidence base documents have been available on the Charlton NP website upon submission of the Reg 16 documents.

- EQ4. What is the intention with the phrase 'starter homes' in paragraph 8.3.8? Is it simply smaller homes for first time buyers or is it the very specific definition set out in Sections 2 and 3 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 which is referenced in the NPPF?

This should be amended to 'smaller homes' i.e. up to 3 bedroom to allow for first time buyers and for downsizing in line with the HNA findings, this would ensure that there is no confusion with NPPF terms.

- EQ5. Looking at the Views Assessment, although the plan supporting text states that only views of moderate and high significance were selected for protection by the policy, it appears that some views of slight significance have been included. This may be a result of the fact that the colouring on the plan in the Views Assessment is very difficult to distinguish. Please confirm that only views of moderate and high significance are actually included in the list in the policy. If this is not the case please indicate which views should be deleted.

The views of slight significance were removed from the list and these related to 17, 18, 19 and 21.

- EQ6. In policy CNP10 iii) - is there 'scrubland' in the plan area or should this simply read 'habitat'?

In policy CNP 10v) are there any 'culverted water courses' in the plan area?

iii) there is some scrub vegetation in the parish, but agree that habitat may be more appropriate

v) Culverted watercourses – it is understood that there are some on the edge of the Parish, but this is a minor issue and could be removed

EQ7. In paragraph 8.20.1 – is there a list missing that should be included to make sense of the sentence?

The Parish survey and public consultation events have resulted in a number of clear concerns and requirements for the future needs of Charlton. These include:

- *Lack of superfast broadband*
- *A Community Hall*
- *Enhanced accessibility to Charlton Lakes*
- *Maintain and enhance beauty and habitat of riverbank through Charlton*
- *Maintain and enhance heritage sites – burial ground, Coffin Route*
- *Sympathetically maintain and enhance Charlton Lakeside*
- *Insufficient off-road parking*
- *Speeding and inappropriate traffic through Charlton*
- *Maintain current bus routes*

Test Valley Borough Council

EQ8. The matter of the SEA screening and the lack of a full SEA has been challenged by a representation at the Regulation 16 stage. In the light of this I would like to see the actual screening opinion following the format set out in the Regulations. I have only been able to locate the determination statement online. This is necessary to understand why SEA was screened out when there is a housing allocation proposed in the plan.

The steering group are happy to provide all of the information as sent through to TVBC which included the questionnaire, supporting information regarding previous screening of the site and our Evidence Base review.

TVBC Please find attached the full screening opinion.

EQ9. The Natural England response to the screening opinion refers to the fact that if waste water from the neighbourhood area and its development ultimately drained into the Solent (via the Rivers Anton and Test) this could potentially affect European Sites on the Solent and in these circumstances Natural England would require an Appropriate Assessment to be carried out. As far as I can ascertain no response is made to this point from TVBC and no HRA screening was carried out presumably because the plan area is more than 10Kms from any European Site. Please set out the Council's position in this respect.

TVBC Please see the HRA SCREENING OPINION at paragraph 3.2 of the attached report which states that :

As a result of the above assessment, it is considered that the policies of the draft Charlton Neighbourhood Plan are in general conformity with those contained in the TVBC Local Plan. With this in mind, alongside the TVBC Local Plan AA and the fact

that the draft Charlton Neighbourhood Plan does not allocated more development than the Local Plan, it is concluded that the draft Charlton Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to have a negative impact on any internationally designated wildlife sites within the locality and as such, the recommendation is made that a full AA is not required.

EQ10. Is the Borough Council generally satisfied with the scale of housing development proposed in the neighbourhood plan?

TVBC Yes.

EQ11. Para 8.2.4 of the plan would suggest further discussion took place on the housing requirement. Did the Council share a requirement with the Parish Council as part of the plan preparation?

The steering group would like it noted that prior to commissioning the HNA, the Steering Group approached TVBC and asked as to whether or not they had a specific housing requirement for the Parish. At that stage, no number was envisaged/ confirmed.

Following the AECOM recommendations the parish discussed the contents and conclusions of their report with TVBC with a view to agreeing and formulating draft housing policies. A meeting took place with Neighbourhood Planning Officers, where it was agreed that further more localised data was required to supplement the AECOM HNA. This work was undertaken and forms part of the evidence base.

The Plan and proposed allocation and numbers was shared with TVBC (via email) throughout the process (including pre-submission stage) and at no point was it ever raised that the number was not agreed. Comments on housing numbers have only been formally received at Reg 16 stage.

The figure set was considered to balance the findings of the surveys, views of TVBC, local residents, relevant stakeholders, site constraints and capacity. It also reflected the change from Charlton being considered as a ward of Andover to being a separate parish.

This can be evidenced by email chains/ meeting notes and the Consultation Statement can be updated in this regard to reflect this as required.

TVBC The Parish Council did not formally request a housing figure. Therefore without this request, no figure was given, in line with NPPF paragraphs 65 and 66.

EQ12. One of the Regulation 16 representations argues that references to Local Green Spaces d) and e) should make clear that they are village green. Can it be confirmed from the Register of Common Land whether this is in fact the case or is it simply that

these area were formerly part of a village green in Charlton? Unregistered land formerly part of the village green.

The steering group have tried to make it clear that spaces d) and e) were historically part of a wider village green. This was never a formal designation and recent modern development at Carters Meadow has degraded and prevented public use for recreation under village green designation criteria. It should be noted however that areas d) and e) are still considered smaller areas of important open space which have been put forward as Local Green Spaces.

We have tried to accommodate the wishes of residents where possible, but this area cannot be formally designated as a village green nor does the parish wish to apply for this, as this would not be an accepted application. Instead the parish would like to support any proposals to further enhance this area and reveal its historical importance in the future.

TVBC The Council are awaiting the information from the Register of Common Land from Hampshire County Council, who are aware of the deadline. As soon as the information is received, it will be passed to the Examiner for his consideration.