

Amport Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

Examiner's Clarification Note

Purpose

This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification.

For the avoidance of any doubt, matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

Initial Comments

The presentation of the Plan is very good. The initial chapters set the scene for the remainder of the Plan and its policies.

The package of submission documents is proportionate to the neighbourhood area. The details in the Character Appraisal and the Design Guidance and Code are both helpful and comprehensive.

The Vision and Objectives of the Plan are both clear and locally-distinctive.

Points for Clarification

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made on the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now able to raise issues for clarification with the Parish Council and the Borough Council.

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of my report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.

Matters for the Parish Council

The relationship between the emerging Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan

I note that Section 2.4 addresses this matter in a general way.

The matter is also addressed in the comments made by Land & Partners/Obsidian Strategic. To what extent has the Parish Council sought to ensure that the relationship between an emerging Local Plan and an emerging Neighbourhood Plan as set out in Planning practice guidance (ID: 41-009-20190509) has been applied locally?

Policy AM1

This is a comprehensive policy that is carefully underpinned by Character Appraisal (2025) and the Design Guidance and Codes (2024).

The supporting text and the carefully-selected photographs consolidate the policy.

Policy AM2.1

I saw the importance of Pillhill Brook during the visit. The submitted policy is both interesting and distinctive.

Nevertheless, what is the justification for the 20-metre buffer in the second part of the policy?

Policy AM4

In general terms this is a good policy which is underpinned by the Local Green Spaces Assessment (2025).

What is the size of proposed Local Green Space 15 (land adjacent to Ordnance Lane)?

Policy AM5

In general terms this is a good policy which is underpinned by the Character Appraisal.

Land & Partners/Obsidian Strategic comment about the conflict between some of the identified views and the development of a new Weyhill Community as set out in the Regulation 18 version of the emerging Local Plan. To what extent has the Parish Council considered this matter?

Policy AM6

I note the commentary in the supporting text. However, what is the evidence for the requirement for the delivery of a 20% biodiversity net gain rather than the national requirement for 10%. In any event, how would 'where appropriate' be applied by the Borough Council through the development management process?

Policy AM6.2

Are the criteria included in the final part of the policy land use related?

Policy AM8

As the Borough Council advises the first part of the policy restates national policy. As such, I am minded to recommend that the policy is recast so that it only addresses non-designated heritage assets.

Does the Parish Council have any observations on this proposition?

Policy AM9

This is a good policy which is underpinned by the Design Guidance and Codes.

In the round, it is a very good local response to Section 12 of the NPPF.

Policy AM10.1

The supporting text does not naturally provide a context for the policy. To what extent would the development of new housing in Weyhill address the issues raised in paragraphs 7.3.1 to 7.3.5 of the Plan?

Are the new houses proposed to deliver the public spaces/play spaces proposed in paragraph 7.3.5?

Policy AM11A

I saw the importance of the community facilities during the visit.

I would value the Parish Council's comments on the Borough Council's proposed recasting of the policy.

I note the relationship between the final part of the policy and paragraph 7.4.5 of the Plan. In this context are they are costed and funded proposals for additional community facilities in Weyhill?

Policy AM12

I am minded to recommend that the policy should be worded to allow the Borough Council to apply a proportionate approach to the requirement for accessibility and sustainable transport.

Does the Parish Council have any observations on this proposition?

Matters for the Borough Council

Is the Borough Council continuing to work to the timetable for the emerging Test Valley Local Plan 2042 based on the details in the Local Development Scheme (February 2025)?

What is the Borough Council's thinking about the on-going inclusion of the allocation of land at Weyhill (Policy NA16) in the emerging Local Plan?

Representations

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?

I would find it helpful if the Parish Council commented on the representations submitted by:

- Land & Partners/Obsidian Strategic; and
- The Silverwood Partnership (obo The Dunning Family).

The Borough Council makes a series of comments on the Plan. I would find it helpful if the Parish Council responded to the various comments and the suggested revisions to the policies and the supporting text.

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for responses to the questions in this note by 12 December 2025. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

If certain responses are available before others, I would be happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled, please could it come to me directly from the Borough Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Amport Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

20 November 2025