

Wellow Neighbourhood Development Plan

Decision Statement: May 2024

1. Introduction

1.1 Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), the Test Valley Borough Council has a statutory duty to assist communities in the preparation of neighbourhood development plans and orders and to take plans through a process of examination and referendum. The Localism Act 2011 (Part 6 chapter 3) sets out the Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under Neighbourhood Planning.

1.2 This statement confirms that the modifications proposed by the examiner's report have been accepted, the draft Wellow Neighbourhood Development Plan will be altered as a result of it; and that this plan may now proceed to referendum.

2. Background

2.1 The Wellow Neighbourhood Plan relates to the area that was designated by Test Valley Borough Council as a neighbourhood area in June 2016. This area corresponds with the Wellow Parish Council boundary that lies within the Test Valley Borough Council Area and within the New Forest National Park Authority Area.

2.2 Following the submission of the Wellow Neighbourhood Plan to the Borough Council, the plan was publicised and representations were invited. The publicity period ran from 10 November until 18 December 2023

2.3 David Kaiserman was appointed by Test Valley Borough Council with the consent of Wellow Parish Council, to undertake the examination of the Neighbourhood Plan and to prepare a report of the independent examination.

2.4 The examiner's report concludes that subject to making the modifications recommended by the examiner, the Plan meets the basic conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

3. Decision

3.1 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the local planning authority to outline what action to take in response to the recommendations of an examiner made in a report under paragraph 10 of Schedule 4A to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of the 2004 Act) in relation to a neighbourhood development plan.

3.2 Having considered each of the modifications made by the examiner's report and the reasons for them, and the modifications to reflect comments made Test Valley Borough Council and the New Forest National Park Authority in consultation with Wellow Parish Council have decided to accept all the modifications to the draft plan. Table 1 below outlines the alterations made to the draft plan under paragraph 12(6) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act (as applied by Section 38A of 2004 Act) in response to each of the Examiner's recommendations and the modifications required in response to comments made at the Regulation 16 consultation. This statement should be read alongside the Examiners report.

Table 1

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Section 2.3 and Para 2.3.1 Statutory Context - basic conditions	This information will not be needed in the final version of the plan and should be deleted.	38	<p>Bearing in mind the advice at paragraph 041 of the PPG in particular, I have concluded that substantial editing is required in order to improve the Plan's overall utility, and consequently recommend the removal from the plan document of material which is not necessary to provide a crisp context for, or explanation of, the policies. This information/comment should be moved to the evidence base (to the extent that it is not already included there or in the Basic Conditions Statement). I am content to leave the precise implementation of this recommendation to the Parish and Borough Council's discretion, but examples of where robust editing would be beneficial include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) lists of relevant NPPF and Local Plan policies (pages 24, 32, 63, 72, 90 ,111, 116 and 122) b) the introductory background to Policy WP-L7 c) much of the descriptive material in Section 5.11 d) the lengthy preamble to Policy WP-H1 dealing with housing need on pages 91 to 93 e) the extensive description of existing employment provision found between paragraphs 5.22.1 and 5.22.12. 	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Section 3.2 Parish Profile	This is background information used to inform previous drafts of the plan, but this should be deleted and added to the evidence base.	38	<p>Bearing in mind the advice at paragraph 041 of the PPG in particular, I have concluded that substantial editing is required in order to improve the Plan's overall utility, and consequently recommend the removal from the plan document of material which is not necessary to provide a crisp context for, or explanation of, the policies. This information/comment should be moved to the evidence base (to the extent that it is not already included there or in the Basic Conditions Statement). I am content to leave the precise implementation of this recommendation to the Parish and Borough Council's discretion, but examples of where robust editing would be beneficial include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) lists of relevant NPPF and Local Plan policies (pages 24, 32, 63, 72, 90 ,111, 116 and 122) b) the introductory background to Policy WP-L7 c) much of the descriptive material in Section 5.11 d) the lengthy preamble to Policy WP-H1 dealing with housing need on pages 91 to 93 e) the extensive description of existing employment provision found between paragraphs 5.22.1 and 5.22.12. 	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Section 5.8 Biodiversity	This section needs be slimmed down , as some is background evidence that doesn't need to be repeated.	38	Bearing in mind the advice at paragraph 041 of the PPG in particular, I have concluded that substantial editing is required in order to improve the Plan's overall utility, and consequently recommend the removal from the plan document of material which is not necessary to provide a crisp context for, or explanation of, the policies. This information/comment should be moved to the evidence base (to the extent that it is not already included there or in the Basic Conditions Statement). I am content to leave the precise implementation of this recommendation to the Parish and Borough Council's discretion, but examples of where robust editing would be beneficial include the following: a) lists of relevant NPPF and Local Plan policies (pages 24, 32, 63, 72, 90 ,111, 116 and122)b) the introductory background to Policy WP-L7c) much of the descriptive material in Section 5.11d) the lengthy preamble to Policy WP-H1 dealing with housing need on pages 91 to 93e) the extensive description of existing employment provision found between paragraphs 5.22.1 and 5.22.12.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Local Housing Needs - Test Valley Borough Para 5.14.1 to 5.15.16 Fig 5.29 to Fig 5-31 Table 4	Much of this section can be slimmed down in the final version of the plan, as its background information.	38	Bearing in mind the advice at paragraph 041 of the PPG in particular, I have concluded that substantial editing is required in order to improve the Plan's overall utility, and consequently recommend the removal from the plan document of material which is not necessary to provide a crisp context for, or explanation of, the policies. This information/comment should be moved to the evidence base (to the extent that it is not already included there or in the Basic Conditions Statement). I am content to leave the precise implementation of this recommendation to the Parish and Borough Council's discretion, but examples of where robust editing would be beneficial include the following: a) lists of relevant NPPF and Local Plan policies (pages 24, 32, 63, 72, 90 ,111, 116 and 122) b) the introductory background to Policy WP-L7 c) much of the descriptive material in Section 5.11 d) the lengthy preamble to Policy WP-H1 dealing with housing need on pages 91 to 93 e) the extensive description of existing employment provision found between paragraphs 5.22.1 and 5.22.12.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.10.4 to 5.10.9	This could be moved to the Glossary and definitions section.	38	<p>Bearing in mind the advice at paragraph 041 of the PPG in particular, I have concluded that substantial editing is required in order to improve the Plan's overall utility, and consequently recommend the removal from the plan document of material which is not necessary to provide a crisp context for, or explanation of, the policies. This information/comment should be moved to the evidence base (to the extent that it is not already included there or in the Basic Conditions Statement). I am content to leave the precise implementation of this recommendation to the Parish and Borough Council's discretion, but examples of where robust editing would be beneficial include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) lists of relevant NPPF and Local Plan policies (pages 24, 32, 63, 72, 90 ,111, 116 and 122) b) the introductory background to Policy WP-L7 c) much of the descriptive material in Section 5.11 d) the lengthy preamble to Policy WP-H1 dealing with housing need on pages 91 to 93 e) the extensive description of existing employment provision found between paragraphs 5.22.1 and 5.22.12. 	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.11.9 to 5.11.10	This background text is not needed in the final version of the plan, and can be deleted.	38	<p>Bearing in mind the advice at paragraph 041 of the PPG in particular, I have concluded that substantial editing is required in order to improve the Plan's overall utility, and consequently recommend the removal from the plan document of material which is not necessary to provide a crisp context for, or explanation of, the policies. This information/comment should be moved to the evidence base (to the extent that it is not already included there or in the Basic Conditions Statement). I am content to leave the precise implementation of this recommendation to the Parish and Borough Council's discretion, but examples of where robust editing would be beneficial include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) lists of relevant NPPF and Local Plan policies (pages 24, 32, 63, 72, 90 ,111, 116 and 122) b) the introductory background to Policy WP-L7 c) much of the descriptive material in Section 5.11 d) the lengthy preamble to Policy WP-H1 dealing with housing need on pages 91 to 93 e) the extensive description of existing employment provision found between paragraphs 5.22.1 and 5.22.12. 	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.15.17 to 5.15.27 Fig 5.32 and Fig 5-33	This is background evidence that does not need repeating in the final version of the plan.	38	<p>Bearing in mind the advice at paragraph 041 of the PPG in particular, I have concluded that substantial editing is required in order to improve the Plan's overall utility, and consequently recommend the removal from the plan document of material which is not necessary to provide a crisp context for, or explanation of, the policies. This information/comment should be moved to the evidence base (to the extent that it is not already included there or in the Basic Conditions Statement). I am content to leave the precise implementation of this recommendation to the Parish and Borough Council's discretion, but examples of where robust editing would be beneficial include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) lists of relevant NPPF and Local Plan policies (pages 24, 32, 63, 72, 90 ,111, 116 and 122) b) the introductory background to Policy WP-L7 c) much of the descriptive material in Section 5.11 d) the lengthy preamble to Policy WP-H1 dealing with housing need on pages 91 to 93 e) the extensive description of existing employment provision found between paragraphs 5.22.1 and 5.22.12. 	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.22.1 Organisations offering employment located in Wellow Parish	As in other sections, much of this information can be slimmed down in the final version.	38	<p>Bearing in mind the advice at paragraph 041 of the PPG in particular, I have concluded that substantial editing is required in order to improve the Plan's overall utility, and consequently recommend the removal from the plan document of material which is not necessary to provide a crisp context for, or explanation of, the policies. This information/comment should be moved to the evidence base (to the extent that it is not already included there or in the Basic Conditions Statement). I am content to leave the precise implementation of this recommendation to the Parish and Borough Council's discretion, but examples of where robust editing would be beneficial include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) lists of relevant NPPF and Local Plan policies (pages 24, 32, 63, 72, 90 ,111, 116 and 122) b) the introductory background to Policy WP-L7 c) much of the descriptive material in Section 5.11 d) the lengthy preamble to Policy WP-H1 dealing with housing need on pages 91 to 93 e) the extensive description of existing employment provision found between paragraphs 5.22.1 and 5.22.12. 	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.22.6	What is the relevance of this paragraph in this section	38	<p>Bearing in mind the advice at paragraph 041 of the PPG in particular, I have concluded that substantial editing is required in order to improve the Plan's overall utility, and consequently recommend the removal from the plan document of material which is not necessary to provide a crisp context for, or explanation of, the policies. This information/comment should be moved to the evidence base (to the extent that it is not already included there or in the Basic Conditions Statement). I am content to leave the precise implementation of this recommendation to the Parish and Borough Council's discretion, but examples of where robust editing would be beneficial include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) lists of relevant NPPF and Local Plan policies (pages 24, 32, 63, 72, 90 ,111, 116 and 122) b) the introductory background to Policy WP-L7 c) much of the descriptive material in Section 5.11 d) the lengthy preamble to Policy WP-H1 dealing with housing need on pages 91 to 93 e) the extensive description of existing employment provision found between paragraphs 5.22.1 and 5.22.12. 	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.4.1 Table 3	This does not need to be repeated in the plan, but should form part of the evidence base for the policy.	38	<p>Bearing in mind the advice at paragraph 041 of the PPG in particular, I have concluded that substantial editing is required in order to improve the Plan's overall utility, and consequently recommend the removal from the plan document of material which is not necessary to provide a crisp context for, or explanation of, the policies. This information/comment should be moved to the evidence base (to the extent that it is not already included there or in the Basic Conditions Statement). I am content to leave the precise implementation of this recommendation to the Parish and Borough Council's discretion, but examples of where robust editing would be beneficial include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) lists of relevant NPPF and Local Plan policies (pages 24, 32, 63, 72, 90 ,111, 116 and 122) b) the introductory background to Policy WP-L7 c) much of the descriptive material in Section 5.11 d) the lengthy preamble to Policy WP-H1 dealing with housing need on pages 91 to 93 e) the extensive description of existing employment provision found between paragraphs 5.22.1 and 5.22.12. 	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.4.4 to 5.4.9 Fig 5-7	This does not need to be repeated in the plan, but should form part of the evidence base for the policy.	38	Bearing in mind the advice at paragraph 041 of the PPG in particular, I have concluded that substantial editing is required in order to improve the Plan's overall utility, and consequently recommend the removal from the plan document of material which is not necessary to provide a crisp context for, or explanation of, the policies. This information/comment should be moved to the evidence base (to the extent that it is not already included there or in the Basic Conditions Statement). I am content to leave the precise implementation of this recommendation to the Parish and Borough Council's discretion, but examples of where robust editing would be beneficial include the following: a) lists of relevant NPPF and Local Plan policies (pages 24, 32, 63, 72, 90 ,111, 116 and 122) b) the introductory background to Policy WP-L7 c) much of the descriptive material in Section 5.11 d) the lengthy preamble to Policy WP-H1 dealing with housing need on pages 91 to 93 e) the extensive description of existing employment provision found between paragraphs 5.22.1 and 5.22.12.	Accept Examiners Modification
Examiner	Modification	List of policies		39	There is a useful list of the 28 policies on page 9, divided into the same seven groupings used in the body of the Plan. To aid the reader, I recommend that corresponding page numbers be added to this list.	Accept Examiners Modification
Examiner	Modification	Table of contents		40	Having these two differently structured lists is potentially confusing for users of the Plan. I therefore recommend that these inconsistencies be rectified. Again, I am content to leave the precise way in which this is achieved to the Parish Council's discretion, but one option would be to use the seven policy groupings (used in the body of the Plan and the list on page 9) as subheadings for the "Planning policies" section of the table of contents	Accept Examiners Modification. Chapter 5 PLANNING POLICIES , be renamed as PLANNING POLICY TOPIC AREAS , as the headings used cover more than the policies. This with the added page numbers to the policies will make this clear to the reader.

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Examiner	Modification	Para 5.14 and Table 1		41	The sustainability matrix (Table 1) on page 21 shows eight "topics" listed against the Plan's five main objectives. These topics are very similar to the seven policy groupings used elsewhere in the Plan, and this is potentially confusing. Since the matrix can be found in the evidence base (alongside its full context) and does not appear to be referenced again in the Plan, I consider that it could be removed without impacting on the user's understanding. I therefore recommend that Table 1 and paragraph 5.14 be deleted. If there is a strong argument for retaining them, they should be relocated to Section 4 (Vision and objectives).	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 2.5.2	This will need updating to refer to the December 2023 NPPF.	42	There are several references in the Plan to specific paragraphs of the NPPF as it was in 2021. I recommend that these all be updated to relate to the current version, which was published in December 2023. In that respect, introductory paragraphs 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 should also be revised.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 2.5.3	These will need updating to refer to the December 2023 NPPF paragraph numbers	42	There are several references in the Plan to specific paragraphs of the NPPF as it was in 2021. I recommend that these all be updated to relate to the current version, which was published in December 2023. In that respect, introductory paragraphs 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 should also be revised.	Accept Examiners Modification
Examiner	Modification	Para 5.2.1 to 5.2.13		46	This opening policy gives general support for renewable energy projects on suitable land, subject to their visual and amenity impact being assessed in visual terms, as well as the effect on the rural road network. The introduction to the policy (paragraphs 5.2.1 to 5.2.13) is a lengthy explanation of the various ways the Parish can move towards a more sustainable future (Section 5.2 being headed "sustainable development objectives"). This covers a wide range of issues, with only a limited reference to energy generation itself. As an example of the need for editing to which I have referred above, I recommend that only paragraphs 5.2.10 - 5.2.13 be retained as the introduction to Policy WP-S1.	Accept Examiners Modification
New Forest National Park Authority	Comment	WP-L1A	The Authority is content with this policy and considers it to be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the adopted development plan for the National Park; national policy in the NPPF, relevant sections of the accompanying NPPG resource and the extant National Parks Circular (2010); and primary legislation in the National Parks & Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as revised through the Levelling Up & Regeneration Act 2023). Given that the Wellow Neighbourhood Area includes part of a nationally designated landscape, we consider it appropriate that the plan includes policy coverage on this matter.	48	I nevertheless recommend that a brief reference to its relationship with relevant policies in the NFNP Local Plan be included in the introductory material to Policy WP-L1A.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
New Forest National Park Authority	Comment	Para 5.3.17	<p>Paragraph 5.3.17 states, "The community have expressed throughout the consultation process a strong desire for the Heritage Area to be reinstated. Given the Landscape Character Assessment, the National Park Local Plan Inspectors comments and the Landscape Assessor at the time, it is considered that this should be a realistic prospect."</p> <p>The New Forest Heritage Area was designated in the respective local plans for Test Valley Borough, New Forest District and Salisbury District (as was). It was not established by Government and therefore it is considered legitimate for local development plan documents to set out a landscape designation where justified. However, it is also noted that the Landscape Assessor's report for the proposed New Forest National Park designation is now 20 years' old and landscape character changes have occurred. The weight that can be afforded to evidence from the early 2000s is likely to diminish over time. Ultimately the Government's final decision was that land north of the A36 in the parish of Wellow did not meet the statutory criteria for inclusion in the National Park.</p>	51	<p>I therefore recommend that the supporting text to Policy WP-L1B be deleted and that the policy itself be amended to read "In line with Test Valley Local Plan Policy E2, development will be required to protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the landscape character of the Parish. Proposals will be required to demonstrate that they also have had regard to relevant guidance contained in the Wellow Character Appraisal and Design Code and the Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment".</p> <p>I note here that the NFNPA effectively defers to TVBC's position on this issue.</p>	Accept Examiners Modification
Gladman Developments Ltd	Comment	WP-L1B	<p>Gladman object to the designation of the New Forest Heritage Area as a valued landscape. This appears to be an attempt to extend the National Park to restrict development within the Parish. The WDCAG provides a useful summary of the area's previous consideration as an extension to the New Forest National Park but also sets out the reasons why they were discounted from consideration. There is therefore no evidence to support the designation of the area as a valued landscape in policy terms. Gladman are concerned that the proposed policy will seek to prejudice the delivery of sustainable development proposals from coming forward. The emphasis of this policy is on the 'protection' of the landscape of the surrounding area rather than seeking to integrate new sustainable development opportunities within the existing landscape and character of the local area. Furthermore, to be valued, a view would need to have some form of physical attributes demonstrating its significance. The policy must allow for a decision maker to come to a view as to whether particular locations contain physical attribute that would 'take it out of the ordinary' rather than designating vast swathes of land which may not have any landscape significance and are based solely on community support. Opinions on landscape are highly subjective and therefore without robust evidence to demonstrate why these areas are considered special beyond the fact that they are 'an area of attractive and unspoilt countryside,' Gladman recommend that this policy is deleted.</p>	51	<p>I therefore recommend that the supporting text to Policy WP-L1B be deleted and that the policy itself be amended to read "In line with Test Valley Local Plan Policy E2, development will be required to protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the landscape character of the Parish. Proposals will be required to demonstrate that they also have had regard to relevant guidance contained in the Wellow Character Appraisal and Design Code and the Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment".</p>	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.3.10 to 5.3.22	<p>This is interesting history of the National Park, with the decision as to what land met the criteria having been made when the NP was designated.</p> <p>The designation of land as a new landscape designation, is a strategic decision, that is not within the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan, and would sit with the Local Plan process. Therefore, the policy and supporting text should be deleted as the policy is not in conformity with the Local Plan.</p>	51	<p>I therefore recommend that the supporting text to Policy WP-L1B be deleted and that the policy itself be amended to read "In line with Test Valley Local Plan Policy E2, development will be required to protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the landscape character of the Parish. Proposals will be required to demonstrate that they also have had regard to relevant guidance contained in the Wellow Character Appraisal and Design Code and the Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment".</p>	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.3.23 to 5.3.31	<p>This is interesting history of the National Park, with the decision as to what land met the criteria having been made when the NP was designated.</p> <p>The designation of land as a new landscape designation, is a strategic decision, that is not within the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan, and would sit with the Local Plan process. Therefore, the policy and supporting text should be deleted as the policy is not in conformity with the Local Plan.</p>	51	<p>I therefore recommend that the supporting text to Policy WP-L1B be deleted and that the policy itself be amended to read "In line with Test Valley Local Plan Policy E2, development will be required to protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the landscape character of the Parish. Proposals will be required to demonstrate that they also have had regard to relevant guidance contained in the Wellow Character Appraisal and Design Code and the Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment".</p>	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-L1B	<p>The designation of land as a new landscape designation, is a strategic decision, that is beyond the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan, and would sit with the Local Plan process. It is addressed in Local plan policy E2 and does not need repeating in this plan.</p> <p>Therefore, the policy and supporting text should be deleted as the policy is beyond the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>What is the evidence for bullet b)?</p>	51	I therefore recommend that the supporting text to Policy WP-L1B be deleted and that the policy itself be amended to read “In line with Test Valley Local Plan Policy E2, development will be required to protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the landscape character of the Parish. Proposals will be required to demonstrate that they also have had regard to relevant guidance contained in the Wellow Character Appraisal and Design Code and the Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment”.	Accept Examiners Modification
New Forest National Park Authority	Comment	WP-L1B	<p>Approach to the former New Forest Heritage Area designation</p> <p>Land outside the National Park within the parish of Wellow falls within Test Valley Borough Council’s planning jurisdiction and so ultimately the Borough Council is best places to advise on the policy approach set out in draft policy WP-L1B. From the Authority’s perspective we would highlight the elements of national policy and statute that offer some broad support for the approach taken in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paragraph 176 of the NPPF (2023) states, “...the scale and extent of development within all these designated areas [National Parks and AONBs] should be limited, <i>while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.</i>” This confirms development within the setting of National Parks should be carefully considered. - Section 11A of the National Parks & Access to the Countryside Act 1949 sets out a statutory duty on relevant authorities to consider impacts on the statutory National Park purposes from decisions and has been strengthened through the Levelling Up & Regeneration Act 2023 to a duty to ‘seek to further’ the two statutory purposes. Relevant bodies covered by the duty include national and local Government and other relevant decision makers. The legal duty to ‘seek to further’ the National Park purposes is a higher legal test than the previous ‘duty of regard’ and recognises that a range of bodies have responsibility for the delivery of the National Park purposes. - Government guidance - Duty_of_Regard_Guide_Defra_2005.pdf(cotswolds-nl.org.uk) - confirms that statutory duty applies not only to decisions made within National Parks, but also where decisions are made outside them which could impact on the adjacent National Parks. This reinforces the wording in paragraph 176 of the NPPF. <p>It is understood that the proposed Wellow Landscape Heritage Area would not preclude appropriate development (development within National Parks and AONB is not precluded, with housing site allocations included in the adopted New Forest National Park Local Plan); and it may be beneficial for the Neighbourhood Plan to state this in the policy or supporting text. We acknowledge that Test Valley Borough Council will have a view on how appropriate the proposed Wellow Landscape Heritage Area is and how well evidenced the proposal is.</p>	51	I therefore recommend that the supporting text to Policy WP-L1B be deleted and that the policy itself be amended to read “In line with Test Valley Local Plan Policy E2, development will be required to protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the landscape character of the Parish. Proposals will be required to demonstrate that they also have had regard to relevant guidance contained in the Wellow Character Appraisal and Design Code and the Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-L1A	This is covered in the NFNPA plan and does not need repeating in this plan.	51	I therefore recommend that the supporting text to Policy WP-L1B be deleted and that the policy itself be amended to read “In line with Test Valley Local Plan Policy E2, development will be required to protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the landscape character of the Parish. Proposals will be required to demonstrate that they also have had regard to relevant guidance contained in the Wellow Character Appraisal and Design Code and the Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment”.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 5-4.1	The designation of land as a new landscape designation, is a strategic decision, that is not within the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan, and would sit with the Local Plan process. Therefore, the policy and supporting text should be deleted as the policy is not in conformity with the Local Plan.	51	I therefore recommend that the supporting text to Policy WP-L1B be deleted and that the policy itself be amended to read “In line with Test Valley Local Plan Policy E2, development will be required to protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the landscape character of the Parish. Proposals will be required to demonstrate that they also have had regard to relevant guidance contained in the Wellow Character Appraisal and Design Code and the Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 5-4.2 Para 5.3.32 to 5.3.34 Figure 5-5	This is interesting history of the National Park, with the decision as to what land met the criteria having been made when the NP was designated. The designation of land as a new landscape designation, is a strategic decision, that is not within the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan, and would sit with the Local Plan process. Therefore, the policy and supporting text should be deleted as the policy is not in conformity with the Local Plan.	51	I therefore recommend that the supporting text to Policy WP-L1B be deleted and that the policy itself be amended to read “In line with Test Valley Local Plan Policy E2, development will be required to protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the landscape character of the Parish. Proposals will be required to demonstrate that they also have had regard to relevant guidance contained in the Wellow Character Appraisal and Design Code and the Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-L2	This policy will only apply to proposals that require planning permission, and so may not address the issue of the change of character of the area. criterion I If planning permission was required, this would need to be addressed for any type of development, and does not need repeating in the policy.If planning permission was required, this would need to be addressed for any type of development, and does not need repeating in the policy. criterion ii If planning permission was required, this would need to be addressed for any type of development, and does not need repeating in the policy. criterion iv This is addressed in Policy L8 and does not need repeating here. criterion v This would be addressed through policy XXX and doesn't need repeating here. criterion vi This would have to be addressed in a TA and Local Plan Policy T1 and does not need repeating here. criterion vii This would not be enforceable and should be deleted.	55	I recommend that Policy WP-L2 be amended to read: “Where planning permission is required for new or additional equestrian-related development, this will be supported provided that it can be shown to satisfy other relevant policies in this plan, in the Test Valley Local Plan and in the New Forest National Park Local Plan, including (but not restricted to) those relating to the impact on nature conservation, the character of the landscape and highway safety and convenience”. It may be helpful if the introductory material to the policy noted the local plan policies which would be of relevance to any decision.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.3.39	This is a tricky area of planning, and what does and doesn't require planning permission , will vary depending on the proposal.	55	With these factors in mind, I recommend that Policy WP-L2 be amended to read: “Where planning permission is required for new or additional equestrian-related development, this will be supported provided that it can be shown to satisfy other relevant policies in this plan, in the Test Valley Local Plan and in the New Forest National Park Local Plan, including (but not restricted to) those relating to the impact on nature conservation, the character of the landscape and highway safety and convenience”. It may be helpful if the introductory material to the policy noted the local plan policies which would be of relevance to any decision.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.3.42	Fences to not need planning permission, and so smaller paddocks can be achieved without permission	55	With these factors in mind, I recommend that Policy WP-L2 be amended to read: “ Where planning permission is required for new or additional equestrian-related development, this will be supported provided that it can be shown to satisfy other relevant policies in this plan, in the Test Valley Local Plan and in the New Forest National Park Local Plan, including (but not restricted to) those relating to the impact on nature conservation, the character of the landscape and highway safety and convenience ”. It may be helpful if the introductory material to the policy noted the local plan policies which would be of relevance to any decision.	Accept Examiners Modification
Examiner	Modification	WP-L3		56	5Policy WP-L3 gives effect to NPPF paragraphs 105-106. I recommend that WNP paragraph 5.4.3, which refers to NPPF 99-101, be amended to reference paragraphs in the current version of the NPPF.	Accept Examiners Modification
Examiner	Modification	WP-L3		57	I recommend that the policy be amended to quote NPPF paragraph 107 verbatim, and that to aid public understanding the following explanation be included in the supporting material to the policy: “The National Planning Policy Framework states that (a) “inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances” (para 152); and (b) that “when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations” (para 153)”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-L3	The following sites as shown on Policy Maps 5.8 and 5.8.1 are designated as Local Green Spaces: The Local Green Spaces shown on the ‘Map of Local Green Spaces’ (figure 5-8 and detailed map 5.8.1) and in the list below will be protected for the benefit of the community. Development will not be permitted on Local Green Spaces except in very special circumstances. Development will be managed in a manner consistent with that applicable to Green Belt	57	I recommend that the policy be amended to quote NPPF paragraph 107 verbatim, and that to aid public understanding the following explanation be included in the supporting material to the policy: “The National Planning Policy Framework states that (a) “inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances” (para 152); and (b) that “when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations” (para 153)”.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Mr Ian Elkins	Comment	General	<p>I and co-owner of land (Mrs Margaret Francis) have since residential planning was refused for our land, considered alternative uses to ensure we create income. We will be considering various options once we know the outcome of the plan adoption but please be aware that in our opinion the adoption of our land as Green Space should be a non-starter as in no way does it fit the criteria for adoption. We must assume that all involved (Councils/planning/ Residents) hoped it could be pushed through quietly so locals would be happy their views would be protected. I will not accept any decision to make our land Green Space until it has been verified at a very high level of Government. If that does happen finally, we will endeavour to use our land for whatever is most profitable, which probably wouldn't be to locals choice Green space adoption in Neighbourhood Development Plans are quoted in various papers as "Of Historic interest, have local significance activities and support the community"</p> <p>- Our land(next to Hill Crest, Maury's lane) has No Historical interest nor can be used for recreational activities as it is a privately owned enclosed field, even though some residents choose to dump their garden waste on it and rip out our hedges to gain better views from their garden. With these facts you should take into account that according to published Government inspectors "nobody is entitled to a view and this shouldn't be used as a reason for adopting land as Green space"</p> <p>When we applied in 2015 for planning to build on our land we had all surveys completed to ensure that no wildlife would be affected, Newts, Bats, Mice ,Birds etc. In the reports no evidence was found and the only recommendation from the reports were that hedges should be maintained in the field for birds and other wildlife. Local residents who have illegally removed some of our hedges should be investigated for the damage they have done. It is stated in the plan that views would be affected if the land didn't remain as green space.</p> <p>- As pointed out above Government inspectors have stated that this isn't a reason for adopting land as green space. Even if it were the case (which it isn't) WHY was planning granted for two Large detached houses to be built in the rear garden of Hill Crest and at the bottom of our land 6 properties replaced 1 static Railway carriage. This doesn't show consistency from a planning point of view. I now find out that land attached to ours and owned by " Bay House" formally Murrays Mount has permission to fill the field with Solar panels. This again is not consistent with comments re views.</p> <p>It is quite clear to me that residents next to our land have requested that our land is entered on the plan as green space for no other reason than being NIMBY's.</p> <p>OUR LAND SHOULD THEREFORE BE REMOVED FROM THE GREEN SPACE PLAN</p>	58	<p>The policy and accompanying maps identify a total of 14 areas of undeveloped land within the Parish for protection, with the assessment of their value in the terms of NPPF paragraph 105 being found in the evidence base (Appendix G to the Plan). One of the open spaces, LGS4, has been the subject of strong objection by local residents, Mrs Francis and Mr Elkins, who I understand from their representations to be the joint owners of the land. Mrs Francis, in particular, raises a wide range of issues which are either not relevant to my examination or do not directly address the findings of the assessment exercises (including several suggestions of a lack of propriety or openness during the process). In addition to having similar criticisms, Mr Elkins questions the fact that I was appointed by the Parish Council and TVBC (this being a matter which is set out in the relevant Regulations). Neither objector has provided compelling arguments for removing the land from protection as local green spaces.</p>	No Change required

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Mrs M Francis	Comment	General	<p>I am appalled at the manner in which my land has been put on the schedule for consideration as a Green Space.</p> <p>This is a privately owned plot of land in a most inappropriate location for the development of a Green Space location. It is also an integral part of my Commoning life and Income for the last 40 years. Your proposal will affect the Use and Value of my Land .</p> <p>This would significantly impact my way of life and the inheritance of my family. I have not been invited to join or had any involvement in your 'Comprehensive Local Green Space Assessment' . It would appear I am not the only one.</p> <p>I would like to see this assessment and who was a party to it .</p> <p>It clearly was not comprehensive or even a proper assessment.</p> <p>I have been given no tangible reasons why this land is at all suitable as a Green Space. It meets none of the advised criteria.</p> <p>I have been told by your representatives that it will make no difference to me , this is not true.</p> <p>Mr G Milton of TVBC offered no tangible reasons why this change should take place except to Mumble something about Views which does not apply .</p> <p>It forms an integral part of my living and income.</p> <p>It is not easily accessible by the majority of the people of Wellow.</p> <p>There is no adjacent pedestrian walk or cycle way.</p> <p>The Access can is Hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists alike should you then go for change of use.</p> <p>There is no parking in the vicinity .</p> <p>It provides NO VIEWS across the Forest or any other aspect of the local area.</p> <p>It is less than 1/2 mile from several hundred acres of National Park.</p> <p>Forgive me for being a cynic but what is clear is that this is nothing but a Land Grab for some purpose that is not being divulged f to me !</p> <p>Either the people involved have some vested interests and it seems certainly very likely some immediate neighbours have a vested interest in this change .</p> <p>Have the council allowed more building than they are entitled to without creating enough green space and are using my Land as a cheap get out ?</p> <p>There is something very wrong here !</p> <p>I feel it was deliberate act to limit my time to review this.</p> <p>This Land has been in my family for generations , and I want some serious explanations from the Parish and Borough Councils as to how you have arrived at the conclusion this would be a suitable Green space .</p> <p>Why I have been given very limited notice to respond to your proposal !</p> <p>In addition I know many people in the Village none of whom appear to be aware of your letter or proposal !</p> <p>Please don't send me platitudes about NPPF and how robust the process is, it clearly is not !</p> <p>It is also clear that your 'Comprehensive local Green Space Assessment' ! Is a total fabrication, I know of no one resident who is aware of this Assessment !</p> <p>I understand there are various types of Green Space, no one has identified what Category of Green Space this is. It is clear there are specific conditions and applications that apply to each type of green Space so why have you not identified which one this is? What is clear that declaring a Green space paves the way for easy change of use in the future !</p> <p>I want to see the 'Comprehensive Assessment' you made on my Land , who was consulted and involved in it !</p>	58	<p>The policy and accompanying maps identify a total of 14 areas of undeveloped land within the Parish for protection, with the assessment of their value in the terms of NPPF paragraph 105 being found in the evidence base (Appendix G to the Plan). One of the open spaces, LGS4, has been the subject of strong objection by local residents, Mrs Francis and Mr Elkins, who I understand from their representations to be the joint owners of the land. Mrs Francis, in particular, raises a wide range of issues which are either not relevant to my examination or do not directly address the findings of the assessment exercises (including several suggestions of a lack of propriety or openness during the process). In addition to having similar criticisms, Mr Elkins questions the fact that I was appointed by the Parish Council and TVBC (this being a matter which is set out in the relevant Regulations). Neither objector has provided compelling arguments for removing the land from protection as local green spaces.</p>	No Change required

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Gladman Developments Ltd	Comment	WP-L3	<p>Policy WP-L3 seeks to designate 17 areas as Local Green Spaces (LGS) therefore protecting them from development due to their local significance or community value.</p> <p>In order to designate land as LGS the Parish Council must be able to demonstrate robust evidence to meet national policy requirements as set out in the Framework. The Framework makes clear at §101 that the role of local communities seeking to designate land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development:</p> <p>“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.”</p> <p>Further guidance is provided at §102 of the Framework which sets out three tests that must be met for the designation LGS, stating:</p> <p>The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:</p> <p>a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</p> <p>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</p> <p>c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Gladman contend that the table of proposed Local Green Space does not provide proportionate or robust evidence as required by the PPG to designate such land. Failure to demonstrate how each designation meets the tests set out in §102 is contrary to the requirements of national policy and guidance and is therefore inconsistent with basic condition (a). The Examiner of Backwell Neighbourhood Plan found two proposed LGSs at Farleigh Fields and Moor Lane Field to constitute extensive tracts of land given their respective sizes of 19 and 32 hectares. Accordingly, the Examiner concluded that their proposed LGS designations had failed to show regard to national planning policy and required their removal. Indeed, the following Examiner’s Reports make similar points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Oakley and Deane NP (Examiner’s Report dated December 2015) – the Examiner concluded that a proposed LGS designation on a site of just over 5 hectares to be contrary to national planning policy. • The Wivelsfield NP (Examiner’s Report dated August 2016) – the Examiner concluded that proposed LGS allocations on sites of 3.6 hectares and 8.6 hectares. The Inspector pointed to PPG paragraph 13 which listed “sports pavilions, boating lakes or structures such as war memorials are located, allotments, or urban spaces that provide a tranquil oasis” as potential LGS allocations. The Inspector stated the areas suggested are notably smaller than the fields promoted in the NP. • The Faringdon NP (Examiner Report dated August 2016) – the Examiner concluded that Humpty Hill at 5.6 hectares on the edge of the town was an extensive tract of land and it was subsequently deleted as a LGS allocation. <p>Whilst Gladman support the deletion of some of the previously designated LGSs, the Council should be mindful that LG4 and LG5, though drawn as separate parcels do become one large tract of land. Gladman do not consider this suitable and recommend that these parcels are also deleted.</p>	61	61. Having no reasons of my own to question the inclusion of any of the open spaces on the list, I make no recommendations for altering the scope of Policy WP-L3.	No Change required
New Forest National Park Authority	Comment	Paragraph 5.4.8	<p>Mitigating recreational impact on the New Forest’s designated sites</p> <p>It is suggested that this paragraph is amended to state: “It is also worthy of note that several local planning authorities in and around the New Forest National Park – including the National Park Authority and Test Valley Borough Council – jointly commissioned research into the recreational pressures on the New Forest’s internationally designated sites (Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar) arising from planned development. The research has highlighted significant recreational pressures from local residents living within close proximity to the designated sites; and the need for appropriate mitigation to protect site integrity. The package of recommended mitigation measures includes alternative greenspace provision and the enhancement of recreational walking routes outside the New Forest’s designated sites.” The NFNPA Authority commissioned, along with neighbouring Councils, a supplementary guidance which considers mitigation for recreational impacts of development on the New Forest Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area for Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar sites. The results show that the periphery of the New Forest is being eroded and habitats destroyed by the number of local people regularly visiting the area. To mitigate this, the research recommends alternative recreational greenspaces and routes outside the New Forest SAC/SPA/Ramsar.”</p> <p>This reflects the recommendations of the Footprint Ecology research reports - see Research into recreational use of the New Forest’s protected habitats - New Forest National Park Authority (newforestnpa.gov.uk).</p>	62	I recommend that paragraph 5.4.8 be deleted.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Gladman Developments Ltd	Comment	WP-L4	<p>This policy identifies 13 important views which the plan considers are important for the setting of Wellow and seeks for development to preserve these important views. To pass such a high bar any views should be clearly identified, including on an updated policy map, with the key characteristics and attributes detailed. This is essential to conform with national policy, guidance and case law regarding key views and valued landscapes.</p> <p>For a view to be identified for protection there should be demonstrable physical attributes that elevate its importance out of the ordinary. Any protection afforded by such a policy should not be seeking to protect views of the open countryside due to their pleasant sense of place.</p> <p>Furthermore, this policy must be suitably worded to allow a decision maker to come to a view as to whether particular locations contain physical attributes that would 'take it out of the ordinary' rather than selecting views which may not have any landscape significance and are based solely on community support.</p> <p>In this regard, Gladman object to the identification of view point 8 listed as 'From School Road looking north-west across to Buttons Lane'. The evidence to support the policy does little to indicate why a view should be protected from School Road, other than providing a nice view of the surrounding fields. Gladman submit that development could come forward east of Buttons Lane without causing significant adverse impact on the setting of West Wellow and there is insufficient evidence to support the protection of the view within this plan. Gladman therefore suggest this element of the policy is deleted.</p>	65	I make no recommendation to remove viewpoint 8 from the scope of Policy WP-L4. I have no reason to question the value of any of the other locations in the list.	No Change required
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-L7	<p>This in line with government policy and does not need repeating in the plan. The rest of the policy is not needed and could be added to the supporting text to signpost to the requirements. criteria a) to b)These would need to be undertaken for qualifying development and does not need repeating in the plan. criteria c) to g) This is addressed in Local Plan Policy E5 and does not need repeating in the plan. This could be signposted in the supporting text.</p>	69	<p>I agree with their comments and recommend that Policy WP-L7 be amended to read: "In line with statutory requirements, new development will be required where appropriate to provide a biodiversity net gain of at least 10%. In addition, all development proposals will be assessed against the requirements of Test Valley Local Plan Policy E5".</p> <p>70. By way of explanation for the reader, I further recommend that the following be added to the introductory text to the policy: "The Environment Act 2021 requires certain planning permissions to be subject to a condition requiring details of how a net gain of 10% in biodiversity can be achieved (on the site or elsewhere). More generally, when assessing planning applications which might impact on biodiversity and other natural assets, the local planning authority will have regard to TVLP Policy E5, which seeks to conserve, and where possible restore and/or enhance these features, while setting out the circumstances where loss or harm to them would not be permitted". I also recommend that attention be drawn to any relevant policies in the New Forest National Park Local Plan.</p>	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-L7	This in line with government policy and does not need repeating in the plan. The rest of the policy is not needed and could be added to the supporting text to signpost to the requirements. criteria a) to b) These would need to be undertaken for qualifying development and does not need repeating in the plan. criteria c) to g) This is addressed in Local Plan Policy E5 and does not need repeating in the plan. This could be signposted in the supporting text.	70	By way of explanation for the reader, I further recommend that the following be added to the introductory text to the policy: “The Environment Act 2021 requires certain planning permissions to be subject to a condition requiring details of how a net gain of 10% in biodiversity can be achieved (on the site or elsewhere). More generally, when assessing planning applications which might impact on biodiversity and other natural assets, the local planning authority will have regard to TVLP Policy E5, which seeks to conserve, and where possible restore and/or enhance these features, while setting out the circumstances where loss or harm to them would not be permitted”. I also recommend that attention be drawn to any relevant policies in the New Forest National Park Local Plan.	Accept Examiners Modification
Examiner	Modification	Figure 5.5		71	The Wildlife Corridors map on page 56 is incorrectly labelled as Figure 5-5. I recommend that this be amended to “Figure 5-18”, as shown in the table of figures.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-L8	<p>This should be a stand alone policy for the Mottisfont Bats Special Area of Conservation. The wording included has been agreed with Natural England through the examination process and is consistent with the wording in other NP's. Development proposals on greenfield sites and sites that support or are in close proximity to suitable commuting and foraging habitat (including mature vegetative linear features such as woodlands, hedgerows riverine and wetland habitats) should have due regard to the possibility that barbastelle bats will be utilising the site. Such proposals will be required to incorporate necessary surveys and ensure that key features (foraging habitat and commuting routes) are retained, in addition to a suitable buffer to safeguard against disturbance.</p> <p><u>Where direct or indirect impacts on suitable roosting, foraging and commuting habitats for Barbastelle bats are considered likely to occur, such impacts must be fully assessed, avoided and, where required, appropriately mitigated to prevent any adverse impacts on this internationally protected site at the planning application stage. This should be in full accordance with relevant best practice guidelines and must fully adhere to any updates to the guidance issued following the approval of this Plan.</u></p> <p>Planning applications for development shall be supported by an appropriate level of ecological survey undertaken in accordance with best practise survey guidelines. This will establish the ecological baseline in respect of bats and thereby determine the need for, and inform the formulation of any avoidance, mitigation and where required as a last resort, compensation measures necessary as part of the project design, to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of the Mottisfont Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC) over the lifetime of the proposed development and to promote the conservation of bats generally.</p> <p>Exterior lighting affecting roosting, foraging and/or commuting habitat for bats will need to conform with the latest best practice guidelines outlined by the Bat Conservation Trust and the Institute of Lighting Professionals (current guidelines being Guidance note 08/18 Bats and artificial lighting in the UK) due to the proximity to the Mottisfont Bats SAC.</p> <p>The above information will be required to enable the planning authority to assess planning applications under the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (or any subsequent amendments) and confirm there is no reasonable scientific doubt of any adverse effects to the SAC.</p>	73	I recommend that the policy be retitled “Mottisfont Bats Special Area of Conservation”, and that the first paragraph be amended to read: “Where direct or indirect impacts on suitable roosting, foraging and commuting habitats for Barbastelle bats are considered likely to occur, such impacts must be fully assessed, avoided and, where required, appropriately mitigated to prevent any adverse impacts on this internationally protected site at the planning application stage. This should be in full accordance with relevant best practice guidelines and must fully adhere to any updates to the guidance issued following the making [adoption] of this Plan.”	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
New Forest National Park Authority	Comment	WP-L9	<p>The policy approach to development that could impact on the New Forest Special Protection Area is well established in the Habitats Regulations, NPPF, adopted development plan policies for Test Valley Borough and the New Forest National Park Authority and the adopted mitigation strategies for both planning authorities. A case could therefore be made that policy WP-L9 is largely covering matters already set out elsewhere.</p> <p>However, if statutory consultee (e.g. Natural England) have advised that such a policy is necessary and the Parish Council wishes to include a specific policy in the Neighbourhood Plan (and we understand the reasons why they would), we suggest the following amendments:</p> <p>“New residential development and overnight accommodation (including seasonal workers accommodation and temporary campsites) within the identified New Forest SPA 13.8km ‘zone of influence’ – which covers the whole of the Wellow Neighbourhood Area - recreation buffer zone will need to mitigate against the recreation pressure on the New Forest Special Protection Area. This could be in the form of a financial contribution towards an agreed package of mitigation measures within and outside the designated sites, including the or provision of alternative natural green space for recreational use to the standard in force at the time of the application. Such mitigation measures must be secured for the duration of the development’s effects and must fully adhere to any updates to the guidance issued following the approval of this Plan.”</p>	75	I recommend that the policy be amended to read: “New residential development and overnight accommodation (including seasonal workers accommodation and temporary campsites) within the identified New Forest SPA 13.8km ‘zone of influence’ – which covers the whole of the Wellow Neighbourhood Area – will need to mitigate against the recreation pressure on the New Forest Special Protection Area. This could be in the form of a financial contribution towards an agreed package of mitigation measures within and outside the designated sites, including the provision of alternative natural green space for recreational use to the standard in force at the time of the application. Such mitigation measures must be secured for the duration of the development’s effects and must fully adhere to any updates to the guidance issued following the approval of this Plan.”	Accept Examiners Modification
New Forest National Park Authority	Comment	Figure 5-16 Figure 5-30	<p>400 metre zone from the New Forest Special Protection Area</p> <p>The key for Figure 5-16 includes an illustration for “The New Forest 400m Buffer Zone where no greenfield housing will be supported”.</p> <p>The position around greenfield housing close to the New Forest’s internationally designated sites is slightly more nuanced. Neither the adopted New Forest National Park Authority nor the separate New Forest District Council Local Plans include any greenfield housing site allocations within 400 metres of the New Forest’s designated sites due to concerns over ‘urban edge’ impacts. However, unlike the Dorset Heathlands and Thames Basin Heaths for example, small-scale development is permitted within the 400 metre zone, subject to undertaking a Habitats Regulations Assessment and appropriate assessment. This position was established through the respective local plan examinations and reflects Natural England’s stance that small-scale windfall development, spread across a wide geographic area, is unlikely to impact on site integrity of the New Forest’s designated sites (a position which will be kept under review and may change in the future). However, there was a clear distinction drawn between small-scale windfall sites and larger scale housing site allocations in local plans, which are not supported within the 400 metre zone.</p> <p>The same comment applies to figure 5-30 in the draft Wellow Neighbourhood Plan. Although greenfield housing site allocations were not supported by Natural England through the review of the local planning policies for the National Park, the Authority’s Local Plan (2019) includes a windfall allowance of 20 dwellings per annum. This windfall allowance has been met (and exceeded) over the first part of the Plan-period (2016 - 2023) and completions have included dwellings within 400 metres of the New Forest’s designated sites. These are small-scale in nature and geographically dispersed, but we would highlight that the 400 metre zone is not a ‘no development zone’ around the New Forest’s designated sites.</p>	76	The NFNPA also point out that the references in Figures 5-16 and 5-30 to a 400m buffer zone being an area “where no greenfield housing will be supported” are not strictly accurate. For this reason, I recommend that no attempt be made to explain the planning implications of this zone on the maps themselves, but that if the Parish Council considers it necessary to make reference to the matter this should be set out in appropriate detail in the supporting material.	Accept Examiners Modification
Gladman Developments Ltd	Comment	WP-L10	<p>This policy seeks to protect an extensive buffer around the river Blackwater including its tributaries. Gladman query why the extent of area to be protected is so large and includes the entirety of the site being promoted by Gladman.</p> <p>As part of development proposals and where the tributary runs beyond the site boundary, Gladman are exploring making this area publicly accessible for the benefit of future residents and existing community, however the policy is not currently supported by proportionate evidence and Gladman therefore suggest that the buffer around the watercourse is removed.</p> <p>Any major application around the watercourse will be subject to an LVIA as standard; this does not need to be mandated by a neighbourhood plan policy.</p>	78	I do, however, agree that the justification for the extent of the buffer zone needs to be set out, and I recommend that this be done. Appendix A to the Plan, part of the evidence base, includes the Wellow Parish Character Appraisal, with Area 7 being headed “Blackwater”: the relationship between this and Policy WP-L10 should be made clear.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-L10	What evidence is there to support this buffer? There could be a conflict between these two criteria	78	I do, however, agree that the justification for the extent of the buffer zone needs to be set out, and I recommend that this be done. Appendix A to the Plan, part of the evidence base, includes the Wellow Parish Character Appraisal, with Area 7 being headed “Blackwater”: the relationship between this and Policy WP-L10 should be made clear.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Figure 5-19	What evidence is there to support this buffer?	78	. I do, however, agree that the justification for the extent of the buffer zone needs to be set out, and I recommend that this be done. Appendix A to the Plan, part of the evidence base, includes the Wellow Parish Character Appraisal, with Area 7 being headed "Blackwater": the relationship between this and Policy WP-L10 should be made clear.	Accept Examiners Modification
Gladman Developments Ltd	Comment	WP-L11	This policy is considered to be strategic in nature and best dealt with through the Local Plan Review. While there is currently a policy void around this issue, any planning applications that are currently affected by the nitrates and phosphates issue across the County would need to accord with current regulations and Natural England advice to be capable of achieving planning consent. It is not suitable for this to be mandated through a neighbourhood plan policy.	80	I recommend that the first paragraph of Policy WP-L11 be replaced with the following: " Applications for development that will result in a net increase in nitrogen reaching the Solent International Sites through additional units of overnight accommodation will be required to confirm the nitrogen budget and set out specific and appropriately located mitigation measures that will be implemented to ensure development is nutrient neutral from the start of its operational phase. Such mitigation measures must be secured for the duration of the development's effects. The purchasing of off-site nutrient credits from an approved scheme may be an appropriate alternative to direct provision of mitigation. In this case it will be necessary to liaise with Test Valley Borough Council, the New Forest National Park Authority and Natural England as appropriate to confirm the suitable mitigation schemes from which credits can be purchased, and to ensure the credits purchased are sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts of the development on the Solent internationally designated sites. "	Accept Examiners Modification
New Forest National Park Authority	Comment	Para 5.9.8	Addressing water quality impacts of development on the Solent Based on our experiences of dealing with the requirement for nutrient neutrality in new development in the affected Solent catchment for several years, we suggested the following re-wording: "The whole of the Plan Area lies within the catchment of the River Test which flows into the Solent where wildlife of marine, tidal and intertidal areas is protected by a number of international designations. Natural England has advised these designations are being adversely affected by the nutrients associated with sewage and agricultural runoff and that the restoration of these sites partly depends on ensuring new development does not generate any additional nutrient inputs. Natural England is placing particular emphasis on nitrogen as this is considered to have an overriding impact in these saltwater habitats. Hence all development proposals in the Plan Area will need to demonstrate they are nitrogen neutral in accordance with Natural England guidance. Test Valley Borough Council and the New Forest National Park Authority will carry out the necessary assessment of the impacts of development on water quality developments under the Habitats Regulations for their respective areas of the Neighbourhood Area. may require developers to demonstrate that Natural England has assessed and agreed their calculations and mitigation proposals prior to an application being submitted and/or determined. In due course strategic mitigation schemes Mitigation schemes are may become available which enable developers to purchase nitrogen credits to the value of the increased nitrogen levels their developments are calculated to generate."	80	I recommend that the first paragraph of Policy WP-L11 be replaced with the following: " Applications for development that will result in a net increase in nitrogen reaching the Solent International Sites through additional units of overnight accommodation will be required to confirm the nitrogen budget and set out specific and appropriately located mitigation measures that will be implemented to ensure development is nutrient neutral from the start of its operational phase. Such mitigation measures must be secured for the duration of the development's effects. The purchasing of off-site nutrient credits from an approved scheme may be an appropriate alternative to direct provision of mitigation. In this case it will be necessary to liaise with Test Valley Borough Council, the New Forest National Park Authority and Natural England as appropriate to confirm the suitable mitigation schemes from which credits can be purchased, and to ensure the credits purchased are sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts of the development on the Solent internationally designated sites. "	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
New Forest National Park Authority	Comment	WP-L11	<p>Addressing water quality impacts of development on the Solent Based on our experiences of dealing with the requirement for nutrient neutrality in new development in the affected Solent catchment for several years, we suggested the following re-wording: “Applications for development that will result in a net increase in nitrogen reaching the Solent Region International Sites through e.g. additional units of overnight accommodation or increased intensity of farming will be required to confirm the nitrogen budget and set out specific and appropriately located mitigation measures that will be implemented in order to ensure development is nutrient neutral from the start of its operational phase. Such mitigation measures must be secured for the duration of the development's effects. The purchasing of off-site nutrient credits from an approved scheme A financial contribution to strategic mitigation measures may be an appropriate alternative to direct provision of mitigation. In this case it will be necessary to liaise with Test Valley Borough Council, the New Forest National Park Authority and Natural England as appropriate to confirm the suitable mitigation schemes from which credits can be purchased an appropriate mitigation scheme to which the contributions will be directed and to ensure the credits purchased any contributions are sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts of the development on the Solent internationally designated sites” The National Park Authority is not aware that farming practices are within the remit of the planning system or currently covered by Natural England’s Solent nutrient guidance, which instead focuses on new residential development and other forms of overnight accommodation.</p>	80	, I recommend that the first paragraph of Policy WP-L11 be replaced with the following: “Applications for development that will result in a net increase in nitrogen reaching the Solent International Sites through additional units of overnight accommodation will be required to confirm the nitrogen budget and set out specific and appropriately located mitigation measures that will be implemented to ensure development is nutrient neutral from the start of its operational phase. Such mitigation measures must be secured for the duration of the development's effects. The purchasing of off-site nutrient credits from an approved scheme may be an appropriate alternative to direct provision of mitigation. In this case it will be necessary to liaise with Test Valley Borough Council, the New Forest National Park Authority and Natural England as appropriate to confirm the suitable mitigation schemes from which credits can be purchased, and to ensure the credits purchased are sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts of the development on the Solent internationally designated sites.”	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-L11	<p>Applications for development that will result in a net increase in nitrogen reaching the Solent Region International Sites through e.g. additional units of overnight accommodation or increased intensity of farming will be required to confirm the nitrogen budget and set out specific and appropriately located mitigation measures that will be implemented in order to ensure development is nutrient neutral from the start of its operational phase. Such mitigation measures must be secured for the duration of the development's effects. A financial contribution to strategic mitigation measures may be an appropriate alternative to direct provision of mitigation. In this case it will be necessary to liaise with the relevant Council, the National Park Authority or Test Valley Borough Council and Natural England to confirm an appropriate mitigation scheme to which the contributions will be directed and to ensure any contributions are sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts of the development on the Solent internationally designated sites.</p> <p>Development proposals will only be supported if they can achieve nutrient neutrality regarding the Solent Maritime, Solent & Southampton Water and the Solent and Dorset Coast European sites. Assuming the developer’s nutrient neutrality calculation confirms that mitigation is required, it is likely that some or all of the following may need to be undertaken.</p>	80	, I recommend that the first paragraph of Policy WP-L11 be replaced with the following: “Applications for development that will result in a net increase in nitrogen reaching the Solent International Sites through additional units of overnight accommodation will be required to confirm the nitrogen budget and set out specific and appropriately located mitigation measures that will be implemented to ensure development is nutrient neutral from the start of its operational phase. Such mitigation measures must be secured for the duration of the development's effects. The purchasing of off-site nutrient credits from an approved scheme may be an appropriate alternative to direct provision of mitigation. In this case it will be necessary to liaise with Test Valley Borough Council, the New Forest National Park Authority and Natural England as appropriate to confirm the suitable mitigation schemes from which credits can be purchased, and to ensure the credits purchased are sufficient to fully mitigate the impacts of the development on the Solent internationally designated sites.”	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-F1	Policy E7 in the local plan addresses flooding and does not need repeating in this plan. This policy should therefore be deleted.	82	However, the inclusion of two maps showing the areas within the Parish at risk of flooding (figures 5-20 and 5-20A) adds necessary detail to the broader picture, and for that reason I have not thought it necessary to recommend deleting the policy.	No Change required

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-B1	Non-designated heritage assets should be a separate policy. This could be retitled 'Local Character Areas' as this is what the policy is referring to. This is excellent locally distinctive work, and each character area should be a policy to guide development in each area. This repeats form other policies in the plan. See comments below about separate policies for each character area. This should be a separate policy with the NDHA listed in the policy and cross referenced to the map.	84	<p>In addition to my earlier recommendation about removing detailed background material which is already to be found in the evidence base, I recommend that:</p> <p>a) Policy WP-B1 should be re-titled “Non-designated heritage assets” and limited to include the second paragraph only.</p> <p>b) Policies WP-B2, WP-B3 [and the first paragraph of Policy WP-B1] be replaced with a single Policy WP-B2 titled “Design and character”, with the text to read as follows: “In line with Test Valley Local Plan Policy E1, new development including redevelopment, conversions, and replacement of or extension to dwellings, should be to a high standard of design which respects the identified characteristics of the area in which it is located (see figure 5-26). In particular, proposals will be required to demonstrate how they have had regard to the Table of Characteristics of each of these areas, as set out in the Wellow Parish Character Appraisal, as well as to guidance contained in the Wellow Parish Design Code”;</p> <p>c) attention be drawn to any relevant policies in the New Forest National Park Local Plan;</p> <p>d) there should be a brief, consolidated explanation of the scope and status of all the documents other than the Local Plans and the Neighbourhood Plan to which regard should be had when development is being considered (as opposed to being background information or only of historical significance);</p> <p>e) the caption of the photograph on page 71 be amended to “Figure 5-25”.</p>	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-B3	This is a really good locally distinctive policy. The other character areas could have similar type of policy.	84	In addition to my earlier recommendation about removing detailed background material which is already to be found in the evidence base, I recommend that: a) Policy WP-B1 should be re-titled “Non-designated heritage assets” and limited to include the second paragraph only. b) Policies WP-B2, WP-B3 [and the first paragraph of Policy WP-B1] be replaced with a single Policy WP-B2 titled “Design and character”, with the text to read as follows: “In line with Test Valley Local Plan Policy E1, new development including redevelopment, conversions, and replacement of or extension to dwellings, should be to a high standard of design which respects the identified characteristics of the area in which it is located (see figure 5-26). In particular, proposals will be required to demonstrate how they have had regard to the Table of Characteristics of each of these areas, as set out in the Wellow Parish Character Appraisal, as well as to guidance contained in the Wellow Parish Design Code”; c) attention be drawn to any relevant policies in the New Forest National Park Local Plan; d) there should be a brief, consolidated explanation of the scope and status of all the documents other than the Local Plans and the Neighbourhood Plan to which regard should be had when development is being considered (as opposed to being background information or only of historical significance); e) the caption of the photograph on page 71 be amended to “Figure 5-25”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Examiner	Modification	WP-B2		86	I therefore recommend a further paragraph be added to the replacement policy, to read: “In addition to the general requirements of Policy WP-B2, development proposals must take particular care to respect the characteristics of the five special character areas described above and shown on figure 5-28”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Examiner	Modification	Figure 5-7		87	The map on page 82, showing the SCAs, is incorrectly labelled as Figure 5-7. I recommend that this be amended to “Figure 5-28” to avoid confusion.	Accept Examiners Modification
Wilson Designer Homes	Comment	WP-H2	<p>However, whilst Wilson Designer Homes welcomes and supports the allocation of the Site, it is considered that the wording of the policy remains too prescriptive regarding the mix of homes. It is acknowledged that the wording has evolved since earlier consultations to better link the policy to the associated evidence base this has introduced a degree of conflict within the policy. The policy as worded is now unclear whether the requirement to provide 2- and 3-bedroom homes or to accord with demonstrable local housing needs takes primacy. It is considered that the policy could be simplified as follows:</p> <p>“Site WP1 – Land at Rowden Close for approximately 9 new open market dwellings to include be a mix of 2-3 bedroom properties or in line with current local housing needs as identified”</p> <p>This would ensure that the policy responds positively to the evidence base including both the Wellow Housing Needs Assessment (February 2021) and the findings of the Test Valley Strategic Housing Market Assessment (January 2022), which together identifies greatest need for 2- and 3-bedroom homes. It is considered that the simplified policy wording above, which points to the local housing needs,</p>	91	Wilson Designer Homes strongly support Site WP1 but consider the wording of the policy to be too prescriptive regarding the mix. I accept their point and recommend that their preferred wording be adopted, namely: “Site WP1 – Land at Rowden Close for approximately 9 new open market dwellings to include a mix of properties in line with local housing needs as identified.”	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
			will ensure that the aspiration for 2- and 3-bedroom properties is achieved, without the policy becoming unnecessarily prescriptive, and this would also remove the internal conflict within the policy itself.			
Wilson Designer Homes	Comment	Site WP1	<p>Policy WP-H2 refers to the Design Code that will be appended to the Neighbourhood Plan. Wilson Design Homes has no issue in principle with reference to the Design Code within Policy WP-H2, but considers that the wording as drafted is too direct and has suggested that the wording be amended to better reflect the status of the Design Code.</p> <p>Whilst Wilson Designer Homes would generally support the aspiration of the Design Code in seeking to deliver a high-quality development, further discussions are necessary to ensure that the matters of detail do not undermine the deliverability of development as allocated in Policy WP-H2. This reflects the same concerns that Wilson Designer Homes expressed during the Regulation 14 consultation earlier this year. Paragraphs 129, 132 and 133 emphasise the need for policy makers to engage stakeholders effectively in developing design policies and codes for their areas. Paragraph 008 (ref ID: 26-008-20191001) of the Planning Practice Guidance highlights that design codes are best prepared in partnership to secure agreed design outcomes and maintain viability. Unfortunately, it is considered that the Wellow Design Code has not been subject to sufficient consultation, having only been published for the first time through this Regulation 16 consultation. As such Wilson Designer Homes has concerns that it is being given significant status as part of the Wellow Neighbourhood Plan despite not having been subject the same level of consultation, particularly as it includes detailed requirements that often expand on the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	92	I also agree with Wilson's view of the requirement (which relates to both sites) that development "must adhere" to the Design Code. I therefore recommend that this phrase should be replaced with "should have regard to ..." . I should make it clear that this recommendation is designed simply to draw attention to the advisory status of documents of this kind: it does not indicate any view of Wilson's concerns about the extent of consultation that was involved in its preparation, nor do I have any comments to make on any of their suggested amendments to the Design Code's content.	Accept Examiners Modification
Wilson Designer Homes	Comment	Site WP1 – Land Off Rowden Close, West Wellow (Pages 99 to 101)	<p>Constraints Plan (Page 100)</p> <p>This plan incorporates a mix of specific GIS based constraints (i.e. TPO areas and points), and more generalised constraints (i.e. wildlife corridors) that have yet to be defined by detailed site assessment work. It is therefore considered that the Plan should be retitled "Indicative Constraints Plan". This would convey a more initial high-level assessment of potential constraints, thereby allowing the identified constraints to be tested more fully at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Regarding the wildlife corridors, these appear to be derived from figure 5-18 of the Neighbourhood Plan document, which is a high-level parish-wide plan showing the broad alignment of the assumed corridors. The Design Code uses this as part of a more focused site constraints analysis and in doing so converts what is otherwise a high-level policy aspiration into a specific site constraint. The annotation wording seeks to address this by stating that the plan annotation "does not show an exact route", despite the lines on the plan appearing to do just that. Wilson Designer Homes considers that the routing of the wildlife corridors on this plan, intended only as a broader policy aspiration, lacks any evidential justification at this stage. Accordingly, it is considered that the key to the Constraints Plan should be updated to describe the wildlife corridors as "indicative only", allowing this to be tested more fully at the planning application stage.</p>	92	... nor do I have any comments to make on any of their suggested amendments to the Design Code's content.	No Change required
Wilson Designer Homes	Comment	Site WP1 – Land Off Rowden Close, West Wellow (Pages 99 to 101)	<p>Design Code (Page 101)</p> <p>The Design Code at page 101 comprises of a list of criteria against which development will be assessed and an accompanying high-level parameter plan. Set out below are Wilson Designer Homes comments against each of the criteria including reference to the Parameter Plan as appropriate.</p> <p>1. The western part of the site is allocated for residential development for up to 9 dwellings. Building heights should be limited to 2 storeys to limit urbanising impact. Dwellings should be no larger than 3 bed, with the potential for single storey dwellings in line with Parish housing needs. Bat and bird boxes should be integrated into buildings with hedgehog access provided under garden fences.</p> <p>Criterion 1 includes a direct conflict with the wording of Policy WP-H2 of the Neighbourhood Plan in so far as it states that the dwellings should be no larger than 3-bed. This goes beyond the Neighbourhood Plan, which identifies that the site should include a mix of homes in line with local housing needs. It is considered that the wording of this should be brought in line with the Neighbourhood Plan for consistency. See also representations on the wording of Policy WP-H2.</p>	92	... nor do I have any comments to make on any of their suggested amendments to the Design Code's content.	No Change required

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Wilson Designer Homes	Comment	WP-H2	<p>Additionally, Wilson Designer Homes has concerns with the tailpiece of policy WP-H2 which refers to the Design Code appended to the Neighbourhood Plan. Wilson Designer Homes has no issue in principle with reference to a Design Code within Policy WP-H2, but considers that the wording as drafted is too direct. It is considered that the wording should be amended as follows:</p> <p>“Development in on these sites must adhere have regard to the Design Code set out in Appendix A.”</p> <p>Paragraph 129 of the NPPF states that “all guides and codes should be based on effective community engagement”. Unfortunately, it is considered that this has not occurred in this instance. Wilson Designer Homes therefore has concerns that the Design Code document is being given significant status despite not having been subject to any meaningful consultation on the detail it contains until this late stage as part of the Regulation 16 consultation – this is the first time it has been published.</p>	92	I also agree with Wilson’s view of the requirement (which relates to both sites) that development “must adhere” to the Design Code. I therefore recommend that this phrase should be replaced with “should have regard to ... ”. I should make it clear that this recommendation is designed simply to draw attention to the advisory status of documents of this kind: it does not indicate any view of Wilson’s concerns about the extent of consultation that was involved in its preparation, nor do I have any comments to make on any of their suggested amendments to the Design Code’s content.	Accept Examiners Modification
Wilson Designer Homes	Comment	WP-H2	<p>Whilst Wilson Designer Homes would generally support the aspiration of a design code in seeking to deliver a high-quality development, further discussions are necessary to ensure that the matters of detail do not undermine the deliverability of development as allocated in Policy WP-H2. This reflects the same concerns that Wilson Designer Homes expressed during the Regulation 14 consultation earlier this. Please also see separate representations regarding the Wellow Design Code.</p>	92	... nor do I have any comments to make on any of their suggested amendments to the Design Code’s content.	No Change required
Gladman Developments Ltd	Comment	General	<p>Land South of Romsey Road, West Wellow</p> <p>Gladman are promoting land for residential development within the Parish. The 14.3 acre site is located to the south of Romsey Road and could deliver up to 115 homes in a mix of sizes, 40% of which will be affordable. This will provide a range of homes to meet the needs within the area and enable local people who are seeking an affordable house the ability to stay within their community. We have also reviewed our previous proposals and consider that there is significant potential for a smaller development that includes land for potential community use.</p> <p>A significant amount of public open space is proposed on site. In addition to the open space provided within the red edge an additional 1.11ha of open space is proposed to be provided on the land adjacent to the site. The green infrastructure will help retain and enhance existing landscape features, provide habitat connectivity and enhance biodiversity. New landscaping features will be incorporated into the development and will filter views of the new homes.</p> <p>The public open space across the sites provides a by a series of footpaths which link to the wider network. The footpath networks provide an opportunity for dog walking and recreation.</p> <p>West Wellow is identified as a Rural Village in the Test Valley Settlement Hierarchy with essential services and facilities which whilst not suitable for strategic scale allocations some additional development may be appropriate. The Village has a number of key services and facilities within walking distance of the site including a shop, pharmacy, village hall, Primary school and pub.</p> <p>West Wellow benefits from public transport links to wider destinations. Main bus routes offering services to Romsey and Nomansland. Romsey can be accessed within 10 minutes and larger settlements such as Southampton and Salisbury can be reached within 20 minutes.</p> <p>In addition, the site is located a 5-10 minute drive from Romsey which provides access to wider services, facilities, and employment alongside rail access to the wider region, while Southampton is located just a 15 minute drive from the centre of site.</p> <p>Site Assessment Report</p> <p>Gladman object to the assessment of the site through the Site Assessment report. The assessment is too narrow in its consideration and limits it on the whole to compliance with the adopted Local Plan ignoring the fact that the neighbourhood plan is the correct document to be making additional site allocations to the Local Plan.</p> <p>Through our previous applications on site, we have confirmed that the site is capable of supporting development, recognizing potential landscape and visual impacts and this should not be used in the assessment against the site. In addition, our amended concept plan clearly indicates that there is a natural boundary capable of containing a smaller development. At the very least the site should be scored amber and therefore considered through the SEA process.</p>	94	similarly, I have no reason to agree with the suggestion that the site assessment exercise was flawed in the way the land south of Romsey Road was discounted as an option for allocation;	No Change required

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Gladman Developments Ltd	Comment	WP-H2	<p>The policy allocates two sites for residential development: Site WP1 and Site WP2 for 9 and 10 homes, respectively. These allocations fall short of the already menial housing requirement of 22 homes, and significantly short of what the housing requirement should be.</p> <p>In commissioning work through AECOM, the neighbourhood plan notes that 'The brief to AECOM was that the following community consultation, the Parishioners were looking for small scale sites in line with both the findings of the Parish surveys and the housing figures presented in the Housing Needs Survey and Assessment.' Yet, the housing need is not met, regardless of the housing need being incorrect and significantly lower than it needs to be. This means that the AECOM assessment has been undertaken based on preferences of the local population, rather than robust evidence of housing needs. Where sites have been disregarded because of their size, this is not based on the actual suitability of a site to deliver housing, but simply because the population that responded to the survey would prefer smaller sites.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the fact that the question regarding the size of sites offered very small denominations and considered 'over 30 dwellings' to be large scale, it seems both the evidence base and resultant reports have been manipulated to stop large scale development coming forward in the village without due consideration of housing and sustainability needs of the village. This is explored fully in Appendix A which clearly notes that using difference scenarios gives a significantly higher housing need than is currently planned for.</p> <p>The decision to not provide for additional development is a significant missed opportunity, especially in light of our earlier comments around housing need and that this is likely to be in excess of what is currently planned for.</p> <p>Furthermore, as per our previous submission to the regulation 14 consultation, Gladman object to the assessment of land south of Romsey Road as currently contained within the Site Options and Assessment Final Report and the reasons for discounting the site for potential allocation. This will be addressed through Section 6 of this representation. Gladman suggest that an updated site assessment should be undertaken with the site considered as a reasonable alternative through the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) supporting the consultation to ensure that the basic conditions can be met.</p>	94	<p>while I note the criticisms of the HNA, Gladman themselves seem to accept that a range of approaches to an exercise of this kind is possible. It is also the case that PPG paragraph 041 states that "there is no 'tick box' list of evidence required for neighbourhood planning. Proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. The evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies in the draft neighbourhood plan....", and "where they do contain policies relevant to housing supply, these policies should take account of latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need". In my view, these requirements are broadly satisfied, especially given the fact that neighbourhood plan examinations (unlike those for local plans) are expected to adopt a proportionate, "light touch" approach. It does not seem to me, in the light of the above, that Gladman have made a strong case for concluding that the Plan fails to satisfy basic conditions a) and e);</p>	No Change required
Gladman Developments Ltd	Comment	WP-H1	<p>Gladman consider that it is vital to meet the housing needs of the community in full. The proposed housing requirement for 22 homes up to 2029 in the above policy and the associated Housing Needs Assessment evidence is fundamentally flawed and is not reflective of the parish needs.</p> <p>Gladman have undertaken a Housing Need and Sustainability Assessment and concluded that Wellow should have an identified a housing requirement of between 87 and 296 new homes over the period 2020-2040, based on three different assessment scenarios utilising a top-down apportionment. It is vital that proportionate housing is directed to Wellow to sustain the vitality of the parish and address emerging socio-economic issues that are arising such as significant housing unaffordability, waning school pupil numbers and an ageing population.</p> <p>The proposed housing requirement outlined by this policy is a mere 22 dwellings up to 2029, before the housing need for the rest of the plan period is to be based on a review of the data following the adoption of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2040.</p> <p>Gladman do not consider this to be an appropriate strategy. The neighbourhood plan should seek to determine the housing need for the entirety of the plan period and make suitable allocations to meet that need. Simply deferring the determination of the housing requirement for the majority of the plan period is not positive planning and serves to hinder the delivery of much needed market and affordable homes in the Parish.</p> <p>The Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) produced by the Parish Council is inadequate, inconsistent and does not align with national planning policy. Section 1 of the HNA Summary document outlines that this should be read in conjunction with the Technical Report, however this document has not been published as part of the evidence base of this neighbourhood plan, this needs to be made available for consultation.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the HNA Summary document outlines that a top-down approach using the borough-wide housing requirement (excluding the area within New Forest National Park) was used to determine the housing requirement for the Parish. Firstly, it is not appropriate to simply exclude the National Park area from assessments of housing need. As identified within the New Forest National Park Local Plan, there is a significant housing need within the national park and national policy guidance is clear that 'housing need' is an unconstrained assessment of the number of homes needed in an area². Assessing housing need is the first step in the process of deciding how many homes need to be planned for. It should be undertaken separately from assessing land availability, establishing a housing requirement figure, and preparing policies to address this such as site allocations. Indeed, this was the approach taken initially by the national park authority as they developed their adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>The NPPF expects strategic policy-making authorities to set a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas as part of their strategic policies and within administrative areas of National Parks, a housing requirement figure should be set for the proportion of the designated neighbourhood area which is covered by their administration³. In any case, a neighbourhood plan steering group can request</p>	95	<p>For the above reasons, I do not agree with Gladman's conclusion that the WNP fails to satisfy basic conditions a) and e).</p>	No Change required

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
			<p>an indicative housing requirement figure for their area from the local planning authority.</p> <p>In this regard, conducting a housing need assessment for Wellow parish while excluding the parish area within the national park does not accord with the NPPF and PPG. The subsequent housing requirement therefore cannot be considered to meet basic conditions a) and e).</p> <p>Secondly, it is unclear how the HNA conducts the top-down apportionment of the borough wide requirement and comes to the conclusion that 58 dwellings are required within Wellow between 2011-2029. The summary table within the executive summary outlines that 58 dwellings are needed between 2016 and 2029 (equating to 4.46 dwellings per annum), yet in section 6.1 of the HNA Summary document notes that market signals support the delivery of 58 dwellings between 2020-2029 (6.4 dwellings per annum), before removing completions from 2011 to set a requirement of 22 dwellings for the Neighbourhood Plan up to 2029.</p> <p>There are further inconsistencies when investigating the supporting text of Policy WP-H1 in the Neighbourhood Plan, where table 4 suggests a housing need of 80 dwellings between 2011-2036 (3.2 dwellings per annum) before looking at housing completions from 2011 and then suggesting an outstanding requirement of 44 dwellings between 2011-2036, before deducting proposed Neighbourhood Plan allocations (22 dwellings). It is therefore clear that the HNA Summary, Housing Survey and Neighbourhood Plan have substantial inconsistencies which make it impossible to understand how the proposed housing need or requirement figures have been arrived at.</p> <p>Without full sight of the technical HNA Gladman consider that the approach and conclusion on the housing need and requirements for Wellow is fundamentally flawed and cannot be considered to meet the basic conditions or deliver the needs of the local community.</p> <p>An alternative, proportionate assessment and understanding of a top-down apportionment approach to housing needs, including consideration of historic housing completions. In any case, the HNA is clearly led and supported by the preceding Housing Needs Survey. Gladman make clear that planning policy regarding housing need should not be determined by a survey that does not have robust demographic modelling and assumptions underpinning the methodology and instead is based on local preference. The Housing Needs Survey used to justify the HNA, and the subsequent housing requirement are fundamentally flawed. The Housing Needs Survey is an opinion survey conducted by a non-for-profit organisation.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the neighbourhood plan seems to ignore one of the key conclusions of the survey which was the provision of homes suitable for local residents to upsize. Rather the neighbourhood plan seeks to focus on delivering small family homes and bungalows with no acknowledgement of the local people who responded to this survey noting that they wish to move to a larger home but there are none suitable in the area.</p>			
Gladman Developments Ltd	Comment	Vision and Objectives	Gladman note objective 3a is to support a series of smaller developments rather than a single larger development, however it is essential that the associated benefits that can be provided from a single larger scale development should be considered. By not exploring the potential opportunities of larger scale development, the neighbourhood plan is limited from the outset in what it can achieve in terms of supporting sustainable development, delivering community benefits, and providing affordable housing.	96	Gladman also question Plan objective 3a, which states an intention to accommodate further housing through “a few smaller developments rather than one or more” larger ones. They say that this would limit the potential social yield which larger scale schemes can deliver. While I appreciate the general point here, the strategic context for Wellow is clearly not conducive to large-scale projects; what will matter more in any one case is the detailed assessment of any scheme against the Plan’s development management policies as a whole.	No Change required
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-H3	Infill and residential redevelopment including self-build within the Local Plan designated settlement areas boundary (as shown in figure 5-35). This is addressed in Local Plan policies COM2, COM8 and COM9, and doesn’t need repeating in the Neighbourhood Plan. This is addressed in policy WP-H1 – Housing Need, and does not need repeating here. criterion a)How will this be assessed? What is the evidence for this, other than its adjacent to the National Park. criterion b)This is covered in other national and Local Plan guidance and does not need repeating.	98	To reflect comments made about the wording of the policy by TVBC, I recommend that it be amended to read: “As provided for in the Test Valley Local Plan, infill development, including self-build residential, will be supported in principle on sites within the settlement boundaries shown in figure 5-35. Community-led housing projects and co-operative and affordable housing proposals will also be supported on sites adjacent to the settlement boundaries. All proposals must comply with other policies of this neighbourhood plan, including Policy WP-H1 and the need to have regard to the Parish Design Code”.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
New Forest National Park Authority	Comment	Para 5.17.12	<p>Replacement dwellings</p> <p>The adopted development plan for the New Forest National Park includes detailed development control policies for replacement dwellings and extensions. The policies have been carefully examined and are key policies for the National Park area (including at appeal). The summary of the National Park Authority policy on extensions in paragraph 5.17.12 does not fully reflect the planning policy approach in the National Park, which is complex and depends on the individual planning history of the dwelling that is proposed to be replaced. Where dwellings have been extended since the 1982 base date to 30%, the National Park Authority will not permit replacement dwellings to be any larger. This policy approach is designed to prevent properties being extended, then replaced, then extended to cumulatively increase the size of the dwelling floorspace.</p> <p>With such detailed, long-standing policies already part of the development plan for the National Park area of the Wellow Neighbourhood Area, the Neighbourhood Plan does not need to provide policy coverage on replacement dwellings in the National Park. Including an additional policy for the Wellow part of the National Park would add complexity and potential results in two policies on the same matter that point in slightly different directions (with different base dates for the definition of the 'original dwelling' for example). We are therefore of the view that Policy WP-H5 should not apply within the New Forest National Park area of the Wellow Neighbourhood Area. As worded, it could be interpreted as being more permissive than policy DP35 in the adopted New Forest National Park Local Plan (2019) and actually result in larger replacement dwellings in the National Park area of the parish than would be permitted through the existing adopted development plan for the area.</p>	110	<p>I recommend that Policies WP-H4 and WP-H5 be replaced with the following:</p> <p>“Policy WP-H4: Dwelling extensions Proposals requiring planning permission for extensions to existing dwellings must have regard to the guidance contained within the Design Code in Appendix A. Particular care should be taken to ensure that extensions do not diminish the special historical or architectural qualities of any designated or non-designated heritage assets (as shown on figure 5-22 to 5-24).”</p> <p>“Policy WP-H5: Replacement dwellings Planning applications for the replacement of existing dwellings will be determined in accordance with Test Valley Local Plan Policy COM12 and New Forest National Park Local Plan Policy DP35 (as appropriate) and other relevant policies of this Neighbourhood Plan, including the need for regard to be had to guidance contained in the Design Code”. In addition, appropriate modifications should be made to supporting paragraphs 5.17.11 and 5.17.12 to reflect these changes.</p>	Accept Examiners Modification
New Forest National Park Authority	Comment	Para 5.17.2	<p>Extensions to residential dwellings</p> <p>The adopted development plan for the New Forest National Park includes detailed development control policies for replacement dwellings and extensions. The policies have been carefully examined and are key policies for the National Park area (including at appeal). The summary of the National Park Authority's policy on extensions in paragraph 5.17.2 conflates two elements of our adopted policy – (i) the restriction on extensions being no more than 30% of the floorspace of the existing dwelling (as defined in the Local Plan from a base date of 1982); and (ii) the approach to extensions to 'small dwellings' – separately defined in the Local Plan as being dwellings with a floor area of less than 80m². With such detailed, long-standing policies already part of the development plan for the National Park area of the Wellow Neighbourhood Area, the Neighbourhood Plan does not need to provide policy coverage on this issue in the National Park. Including an additional policy for this part of the National Park does add complexity for applicants and decision makers and our preference would be for the policy to be deleted. If the policy is to remain, we would suggest the following revisions for accuracy:</p> <p>“Within the New Forest National Park, extensions which are appropriate to the existing dwelling and its curtilage are permitted under policy DP36. There is an important policy requirement exception however which specifies that extensions must not increase the floorspace of the existing dwelling (as defined in the Local Plan) by more than 30%. The National Park Local Plan also sets out the planning policy approach for extensions to 'small dwellings' (defined in the Local Plan), which may be extended up to a maximum internal habitable floorspace of 120m² where exceptional circumstances are demonstrated. There are exemptions for genuine family needs relating to those working in the immediate locality. In these circumstances the total internal habitable floorspace must not exceed 120sq m.</p>	110	<p>I recommend that Policies WP-H4 and WP-H5 be replaced with the following:</p> <p>“Policy WP-H4: Dwelling extensions Proposals requiring planning permission for extensions to existing dwellings must have regard to the guidance contained within the Design Code in Appendix A. Particular care should be taken to ensure that extensions do not diminish the special historical or architectural qualities of any designated or non-designated heritage assets (as shown on figure 5-22 to 5-24).”</p> <p>“Policy WP-H5: Replacement dwellings Planning applications for the replacement of existing dwellings will be determined in accordance with Test Valley Local Plan Policy COM12 and New Forest National Park Local Plan Policy DP35 (as appropriate) and other relevant policies of this Neighbourhood Plan, including the need for regard to be had to guidance contained in the Design Code”. In addition, appropriate modifications should be made to supporting paragraphs 5.17.11 and 5.17.12 to reflect these changes.</p>	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-H5	<p>Criteria 2a) this is covered in other guidance and does not need repeating here. Criteria 3. What is the evidence for this, other than its adjacent to the National Park?</p> <p>Criteria 4. this would be dealt with by a planning condition. 3 months doesn't appear to be a reasonable timeframe, and this would be dealt with by planning condition.</p>	110	<p>I recommend that Policies WP-H4 and WP-H5 be replaced with the following: “Policy WP-H4: Dwelling extensions Proposals requiring planning permission for extensions to existing dwellings must have regard to the guidance contained within the Design Code in Appendix A. Particular care should be taken to ensure that extensions do not diminish the special historical or architectural qualities of any designated or non-designated heritage assets (as shown on figure 5-22 to 5-24).” “Policy WP-H5: Replacement dwellings Planning applications for the replacement of existing dwellings will be determined in accordance with Test Valley Local Plan Policy COM12 and New Forest National Park Local Plan Policy DP35 (as appropriate) and other relevant policies of this Neighbourhood Plan, including the need for regard to be had to guidance contained in the Design Code”. In addition, appropriate modifications should be made to supporting paragraphs 5.17.11 and 5.17.12 to reflect these changes.</p>	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.16.9	How will this be assessed?	110	<p>I recommend that Policies WP-H4 and WP-H5 be replaced with the following: “Policy WP-H4: Dwelling extensions Proposals requiring planning permission for extensions to existing dwellings must have regard to the guidance contained within the Design Code in Appendix A. Particular care should be taken to ensure that extensions do not diminish the special historical or architectural qualities of any designated or non-designated heritage assets (as shown on figure 5-22 to 5-24).”</p>	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.17.12	What is the evidence for this over and above the pressures in other parishes?	110	<p>I recommend that Policies WP-H4 and WP-H5 be replaced with the following:</p> <p>“Policy WP-H4: Dwelling extensions Proposals requiring planning permission for extensions to existing dwellings must have regard to the guidance contained within the Design Code in Appendix A. Particular care should be taken to ensure that extensions do not diminish the special historical or architectural qualities of any designated or non-designated heritage assets (as shown on figure 5-22 to 5-24).”</p> <p>“Policy WP-H5: Replacement dwellings Planning applications for the replacement of existing dwellings will be determined in accordance with Test Valley Local Plan Policy COM12 and New Forest National Park Local Plan Policy DP35 (as appropriate) and other relevant policies of this Neighbourhood Plan, including the need for regard to be had to guidance contained in the Design Code”.</p> <p>In addition, appropriate modifications should be made to supporting paragraphs 5.17.11 and 5.17.12 to reflect these changes.</p>	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Para 5.17.12	What is the evidence for this, other than its adjacent to the National Park? How many homes under 100 sqm are there in he parish that this could apply to? Policy H1 should address the size issue with the 1-3 bedroom criteria.	110	<p>I recommend that Policies WP-H4 and WP-H5 be replaced with the following:</p> <p>“Policy WP-H4: Dwelling extensions Proposals requiring planning permission for extensions to existing dwellings must have regard to the guidance contained within the Design Code in Appendix A. Particular care should be taken to ensure that extensions do not diminish the special historical or architectural qualities of any designated or non-designated heritage assets (as shown on figure 5-22 to 5-24).”</p> <p>“Policy WP-H5: Replacement dwellings Planning applications for the replacement of existing dwellings will be determined in accordance with Test Valley Local Plan Policy COM12 and New Forest National Park Local Plan Policy DP35 (as appropriate) and other relevant policies of this Neighbourhood Plan, including the need for regard to be had to guidance contained in the Design Code”.</p> <p>In addition, appropriate modifications should be made to supporting paragraphs 5.17.11 and 5.17.12 to reflect these changes.</p>	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-H6	<p>The policy only refers to seasonal workers, so this part of the title (and Other Temporary Accommodation) could be removed. Policy H6 would not apply to most seasonal workers accommodation, as it is mostly provided under permitted development.</p> <p>Criteria c) this would not apply to seasonal accommodation, which by its very nature is temporary. This may be confused with housing for rural workers and there is no mechanism for housing with an agricultural occupancy restriction to be offered for rent or as affordable housing.</p> <p>Criteria d) this will not apply if the accommodation is permitted development.</p>	113	I recommend that (a) the title of the policy be amended to read: “Seasonal workers’ accommodation”; (b) the supporting text be edited to confine itself to the topic of the policy, including reference to the relevance of permitted development rights; and (c) that the policy itself be amended to read: “Where planning permission is required for the provision of accommodation for seasonal workers, in addition to complying with other relevant policies of this Plan a) the need for it must be demonstrated as being essential to the current or future operation of the business to which it relates; and b) the accommodation must be secured via a legal obligation to the business concerned for the purposes of staff accommodation.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-T1	Planning applications would have to demonstrate this in a Transport Assessment, and this does not need repeating in this plan.	115	I recommend that Policy WP-T1 be amended to read: “As appropriate to their scale and location, development proposals will be required to consider their impact on road safety and accessibility (including parking requirements) for all users, as provided for in relevant national and local planning policy”. In addition, I recommend that the supporting material to the policy include a summary of what those policies deal with and how they can be accessed.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-T2	This could be done without the need for planning permission. How will this be measured? How would the conflict be assessed. Most new development will increase vehicle movements to some degree. These are addressed in other policies and do not need repeating here	116	I recommend that the policy be amended to read: “The character of the narrow rural lanes identified in figure 5-36 is considered especially vulnerable to any significant increase in vehicular traffic. Where planning permission is required for any development, the Local Planning Authority will take whatever steps are available to ensure that the impact of the use of these lanes by motor vehicles is kept to a minimum”.	Accept Examiners Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	WP-C2	This is a given and does not need to be repeated in the plan. The policy wording could be moved into supporting text.	118	I recommend that the policy be deleted.	Accept Examiners Modification

Consultee	Support / object / comment	Section / Policy / Paragraph.	Comments	Ref	Examiners Recommendation	Proposed Modification
Test Valley Borough Council	Comment	Section 7.2 Ongoing Policy Management / Review & Monitoring	It would be helpful to set out the frequency of the review. Suggest adding wording such as: The Parish Council proposes to complete a formal review of the Plan at least once every five years or earlier if necessary, to reflect changes in the Local Plan or the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) and other local factors relevant to the Plan.	121	It is the practice in many neighbourhood plans for clear guidance to be given on the circumstances where (or when) a review might be undertaken. However, this is not a statutory requirement, nor is it the subject of Government policy beyond guidance that communities are encouraged to keep plans up to date. This being the case, I am content to leave the Parish Council to consider the advice on the matter from TVBC, and to act as they think fit.	Update for Clarity