

## **Amport Neighbourhood Development Plan Decision Statement: March 2026**

### **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 Amport 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 Amport Neighbourhood Plan relates to the area that was designated by Test Valley Borough Council as a neighbourhood area in February 2022. This area corresponds with the Amport Parish Council boundary that lies within the Test Valley Borough Council Area.

2.2 Following the submission of the Amport Neighbourhood Plan to the Borough Council, the plan was publicised and representations were invited. The publicity period ran from 5 September to 20 October 2025.

2.3 Andrew Ashcroft was appointed by Test Valley Borough Council with the consent of Amport 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 in consultation with Amport 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**

Where modifications are recommended to **policies they are highlighted in bold** print. Any associated or *free-standing changes to the text of the Plan are set out in italic* print

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
7.20	Policy AM1: Landscape Character and Settlement Identity	<p><b>Replace the opening element of the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>‘Development proposals should demonstrate how they preserve or, where practicable, enhance the distinct rural character of the landscape including those features and elements highlighted in the Landscape Character Assessment as shown in Figure 13. Development proposals should also respond positively to the recommendations of the Amport Character Appraisal (Appendix C) and Design Code (Appendix E).</b></p> <p><b>Replace the opening element of the second part of the policy with: ‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals should seek to:’</b></p> <p><b>Delete the fourth bullet point in the second part of the policy</b></p> <p><b>In the penultimate bullet point replace ‘landscaped’ with ‘landscape’</b></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.24	Policy AM2: Green and Blue Infrastructure, Landscape and Planting	<p><b>Replace the first element of the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>‘Development proposals for the expansion of the network of the green and blue infrastructure will be supported.’</b></p> <p><b>Replace the third element of the policy with:’ Development proposals that would result in the loss or damage to existing watercourses, water bodies, trees, and woodland will not be supported, unless appropriate justification and mitigation is provided. Appropriate river and watercourse restoration should be addressed and delivered wherever practicable.’</b></p> <p><b>Replace the fourth element of the policy with: ‘Development proposals that would affect protected trees or their setting should be accompanied by a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment to address how the development will affect tree root protection zones, crown spread, the setting of the affected trees and any appropriate mitigation measures.’</b></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
		<p>Replace the fifth element of the policy with: ‘Development proposals that would result in the removal of unprotected trees should provide appropriate landscaping enhancements and replacement trees.’</p> <p>Replace the final element of the policy with: ‘Wherever practicable, development proposals should incorporate native planting and/or planting which is beneficial to wildlife.’</p>	
7.32	Policy AM2.1: Protection of Pillhill Brook	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>‘Development proposals should respond positively to the importance of Pillhill Brook and ensure that its rural landscape character, identified views and biodiversity are maintained, and where practicable, enhanced.</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals that have an adverse impact on Pillhill Brook (including its main water course, associated ponds and pools and feeder streams) should demonstrate that there would be no increased risk of flooding, water pollution, or adverse nutrient loading.</b></p> <p><b>As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should incorporate an undeveloped buffer between it and the banks of the Pillhill Brook to mitigate the risk of flooding and water pollution and enhance biodiversity.’</b></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.32	Paragraph 6.2.18	<p><i>Replace paragraph 6.2.18 with:</i></p> <p><i>‘The whole of the neighbourhood 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 several 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. In these circumstances relevant development proposals in the neighbourhood area should demonstrate they are nitrogen neutral in accordance with Natural England guidance. Test Valley Borough Council will carry out the necessary assessment of developments under the Habitats Regulations, 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</i></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
		<i>mitigation schemes may become available which enable developers to purchase nitrogen credits to the value of the increased nitrogen levels their developments are calculated to generate.'</i>	
7.3.2	Paragraph 6.2.19	<p><i>At the end of 6.2.19 add:</i></p> <p><i>'The policy sets out a proportionate approach to the creation of a buffer. Where appropriate it should be up to 20 metres in size.'</i></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.37	Policy AM3: Flooding and Drainage	<p><b>Delete the first and second parts of the policy.</b></p> <p><b>Replace the opening element of the third part of the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>The Plan identifies the following areas as particularly vulnerable to flooding: [include the list]</b></p> <p><b>Replace the fifth part of the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>'Development proposals should incorporate SuDS designed as an integral part of the green infrastructure and street network and ensure that they mitigate any adverse effects from surface water run-off and flooding on people, property, and the ecological value of the local environment. In addition, they should provide flood storage capacity and contribute to the improvement of habitats and species migration.'</b></p> <p><b>Delete the sixth and seventh parts of the policy.</b></p> <p><b>Replace the eighth part of the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>'As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals that would involve the loss of permeable surfaces, trees, soft landscaping, or any other feature that helps reduce flood risk should incorporate appropriate mitigation measures to prevent an increase in flood risk either on-site or elsewhere.'</b></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.37	New paragraphs (6.3.8 and 6.3.9)	<p><i>Add new paragraphs of supporting text (6.3.8 and 6.3.9) to read:</i></p> <p><i>'The policy has been designed to provide a local dimension to Section 14 of the NPPF. As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should incorporate a</i></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
		<p><i>sustainable and integrated approach to the management of flood risk, surface water (including runoff) and foul drainage. These proposals should be robust to the expected impacts of climate change. Development will be in areas of lowest flood risk and development shall not increase flood risk elsewhere. Planning applications shall be accompanied by site-specific flood risk assessments as required.</i></p> <p><i>A surface water sewer should be seen as a last resort and no surface water will be permitted to enter the public foul sewage network. Development proposals should demonstrate that surface water drainage will not add to the existing site runoff or cause any adverse impact to neighbouring properties and surrounding environment, particularly in those areas highlighted by Figures 24 and 25 and the list of locations identified in the policy.'</i></p>	
7.46	Policy AM4: Local Green Spaces	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>'The following sites (as shown on Figures 26-29) are designated as Local Green Spaces [list the proposed LGSs except for LGS15]</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals within a Local Green Space will only be supported in very special circumstances.'</b></p> <p><i>Delete LGS15 from Figures 26 and 27</i></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.56	Policy AM5: Important Views and Vistas	<p><b>Replace the final parts of the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>'As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals should preserve or where practicable enhance the local character of the landscape and, through their design, height and massing, should recognise and respond positively to the various Important Views.</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals which would have a significant adverse impact on an identified Important View will not be supported.'</b></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
7.62	Policy AM6: Biodiversity and Habitats	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>‘Development proposals should protect and, where practicable, enhance local biodiversity (as shown on Figure 19), including the maintenance and creation of wildlife corridors (as shown on Figure 36). Wherever practicable, new development should take opportunities to connect fragmented habitats and provide nature highways such as through garden fences.</b></p> <p><b>New development should avoid the loss of significant trees and vegetation, and, where relevant, provide owl, bird and bat boxes and insect hotels in parks.’</b></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.62	Paragraph 6.6.9	<p><i>Replace paragraph 6.6.9 with:</i></p> <p><i>‘As a result, this Plan seeks to complement national policy which stipulates that development proposals deliver a biodiversity net gain of at least 10%.;</i></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.66	Policy AM6.1: Protection of Amport Fen	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>‘Development proposals should respond positively to the importance of the Amport Fen. Development proposals that would affect the significance of the Fen should include evidence of the extent to which its biodiversity will be protected and, where practicable, enhanced.’</b></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.66	Paragraph 6.6.12	<p><i>At the end of paragraph 6.6.12 add:</i></p> <p><i>‘Policy AM6.1 seeks to protect the Reserve from the adverse effects of development. In this context proposals which affect Amport Fen should address its character and the potential for the development to detract from its appearance and function. Potential areas to be addressed in the development of planning applications include the prevention of pollution and contamination of the reserve, protecting the setting and landscape character of the reserve, supporting the maintenance and creation of wildlife corridors to and from the reserve, and providing a suitable landscaped buffer.’</i></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.71	Policy AM6.2: Hawk	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
	Conservancy Trust	<p><b>‘Development proposals within the flight zone radius of Hawk Conservancy Trust (see Figure 38) should respond positively to the ecological and conservation significance of the Trust.</b></p> <p><b>Wherever practicable development proposals should pursue opportunities for creating buffer zones or wildlife corridors that enhance the habitat around the Trust.</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals that would unacceptably interfere with the natural flight paths or behaviours of the birds based at the Trust, will not be supported.’</b></p>	
7.71	New paragraphs (6.6.24/25)	<p><i>Add new paragraphs of supporting text (6.6.24/25) to read:</i></p> <p><i>‘Policy AM6.2 sets out a land use approach towards the Trust’s site. Within this context development proposals within the identified flight zone should submit a detailed impact assessment, demonstrating how proposals will have no adverse impact or how they will mitigate any potential risks to The Trust’s birds and their flight zones.</i></p> <p><i>As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals within the flight zone radius should include measures set out within a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (or similar document appropriate to the type of development proposed) to minimise risks to The Hawk Conservancy Trust’s birds, and to address the following measures:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• prohibiting or controlling the use of toxic rodenticides and other harmful chemicals;</i></li> <li><i>• implementing measures to prevent domestic pets from posing a threat to the Trust’s birds; and</i></li> <li><i>• incorporating noise control measures to prevent disturbances to the Trust’s birds, particularly during critical breeding periods.’</i></li> </ul>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.75	Policy AM7: Dark Night Skies	<p><b>Delete the second part of the policy.</b></p> <p><b>Replace the third part of the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>‘Development proposals which include lighting should ensure that:</b></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adverse effects from the installed lighting are avoided wherever practicable, and any residual impacts are appropriately mitigated by measures such as activated by sensors and turned off by timers;</li> <li>• building designs avoid uplighting and/or large areas of glazing; and</li> <li>• any lighting in car parking areas should be sensitively designed with low-level, covered or downward facing lighting.'</li> </ul>	
7.75	New paragraphs (6.7.8 and 6.7.9)	<p><i>Add new paragraphs of supporting text (6.7.8 and 6.7.9) to read:</i></p> <p><i>'Policy AM7 sets out a series of general and specific guidance for external lighting. Their purpose is to ensure that the measured and observed sky quality in the surrounding area is not reduced, lighting is not unnecessarily visible in nearby designated areas and key habitats and the visibility of lighting from the surrounding landscape is avoided.</i></p> <p><i>Wherever practicable, development proposals should demonstrate that they meet or exceed the Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance and other relevant standards or guidance (CIE 150:2017 Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations), or any equivalent replacement / updated guidance for lighting within environmental zones.'</i></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.83	Policy AM8: Historic Environment	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>'The Plan identifies the following non-designated heritage assets (Reproduce the schedule from the submitted Plan).</b></p> <p><b>The effect of an application on the significance of the identified non-designated heritage assets on Figures 42-46 should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'</b></p> <p><i>Improve the clarity of Figures 42-46</i></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
7.88	Policy AM9: Design Principles	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>‘Development proposals should respond positively to the Building for a Healthy Life Toolkit and demonstrate how they would preserve and, where practicable, enhance defining character features as set out in the Parish Character Appraisal and Design Guidance and Codes Code documents (as set out in Appendices C &amp; F).</b></p> <p><b>As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals should demonstrate how they have addressed the following matters:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>the way in which the design of the development has been informed by the immediate locality, as highlighted in the Design Code (Appendix E);</b></li> <li>• <b>the way in which the scale, height, massing, layout, landscaping, and appearance of the development reflects the prevailing character and attributes that are specific to the relevant Character Area as set out in the Character Appraisal;</b></li> <li>• <b>their use of traditional materials and local building styles;</b></li> <li>• <b>their provision of adequate amenity space and plot sizes;</b></li> <li>• <b>their provision of native landscaping, as identified in the Character Appraisal and Design Code;</b></li> <li>• <b>wherever practicable, the integration, retention, and enhancement of existing natural landscape features (including trees and hedgerows) into the layout and design of the development.’</b></li> </ul>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.93	Policy AM10: Housing, Infill and Redevelopment	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>‘Development proposals for the replacement of dwellings will be supported where they comply with relevant policies in the development plan and their designs maintain and, where practicable, enhance the character and appearance of the area as highlighted in the Character Appraisal and Design Code (Appendices C &amp; F).</b></p> <p><b>Proposals for extensions to existing dwellings should respond positively to local distinctiveness and accord with the Character Appraisal and Design Code (Appendices C &amp; F).’</b></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
7.92	Paragraph 7.3.12	<p><i>At end of paragraph 7.3.12 add: 'Policy AM10 has been formulated to add value to policies in the adopted Local Plan (mainly Policies E1, E9 and COM2). These policies comment about replacement buildings and extensions. In addition, developers should carefully consider the positioning of a replacement dwelling within the overall plot. National and local policies (including Policy AM8 of this Plan which addresses heritage assets). However, in this context, developers are reminded that care should be taken to ensure that extensions respond positively to the special historical or architectural qualities of any designated or non-designated heritage assets.'</i></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.100	Policy AM10.1: Development of Housing to Meet Local Need	<p><b>Replace the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals for a site of up to twenty market and affordable homes of smaller 1-, 2- and 3-bedrooms dwellings within Weyhill to meet local needs will be supported where they:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide public open space and equipped play facilities;</li> <li>• respect the settlement pattern and nature and character of the surrounding area (Appendix C);</li> <li>• preserve the parish's relationship with the surrounding open countryside;</li> <li>• protect the physical and visual integrity of a gap between settlements;</li> <li>• respond positively to the wider landscape and, where appropriate, incorporate native planting to maintain the rural character of the settlement's edge; and</li> <li>• provide access to the relevant settlement with connections to existing streets and paths for non-vehicle users.</li> </ul>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.105	Policy AM11A: Community	<p><b>Replace the first part of the policy with:</b></p> <p><b>'Proposals that support and safeguard the future of the important community facilities identified below and shown on the Policies Map will be supported:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amport C of E Primary School</li> <li>• Cholderton Farm Shop and Café</li> <li>• Amport Cricket Ground</li> <li>• The White Horse Inn</li> <li>• The Hawk Inn</li> <li>• Breach Farm Brewery,</li> <li>• Sea Scouts HQ</li> </ul>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St Mary's Church</li> <li>• Allotments'</li> </ul> <p>In the second part of the policy replace 'Proposals for the change of use of the List of Key Facilities will be resisted and only allowed in specific circumstances including where:' with 'Proposals for the change of use of an identified important community facility will only be supported where:'</p> <p>Replace the final part of the policy with:</p> <p>'The provision of a community/public open space and play area in Weyhill will be supported.'</p>	
7.109	Policy AM11B Local Economy	<p>Replace the first bullet point with:</p> <p>'can be satisfactorily accommodated within the local highway network.'</p> <p>Delete the second bullet point</p> <p>In the second and third parts of the policy replace 'must' with 'should'</p>	Accept Examiners Modification
7.114	Policy AM12: Accessibility, Road Safety and Sustainable Transport	<p>Replace 'All new development should' with: 'As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals should:'</p> <p>Delete the final two bullet points.</p>	Accept Examiners Modification
7.114	Paragraph 7.5.13	<p><i>At the end of paragraph 7.5.13 add:</i></p> <p><i>'Where relevant proposals should be accompanied by sufficient information to demonstrate how an increase in traffic (including HGV movements) which may be generated by a proposal has been taken into consideration. Any proposed traffic calming measures should be designed in a way that would not to increase noise or have an adverse impact on residents or users of the route concerned.'</i></p>	Accept Examiners Modification

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
7.116	Paragraph 1.5.2	<i>At the end of paragraph 1.5.2 add: 'The Parish Council acknowledges the potential significance of the adoption of the emerging Local Plan on the strategic planning context for the wider Borough. As such, the Parish Council will assess the need for a review of the Plan within six months of the adoption of the Local Plan.'</i>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.117	General	<i>Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies and to accommodate any administrative and technical changes.</i>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
<b>Other Matters</b>			
<p>7.119 I recommend that the Plan is modified to address the following points as raised by TVBC (and using the TVBC descriptions which refer either to its comments or to paragraph numbers in the Plan):</p> <p>Modifications shown in Track changes. Text in <b>Blue</b> as additions and <del>strikethrough</del> for deletions</p>			
7.119	Paragraph 2.1.2	Delete paragraph <del>2.1.2.</del> <del>Paragraph 239 of the NPPF states:</del> "For neighbourhood plans, the policies in this Framework will apply for the purpose of preparing neighbourhood plans from 12 March 2025 unless a neighbourhood plan proposal has been submitted to the local planning authority under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) on or before the 12 March 2025."	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Paragraph 2.2.2	Change paragraph as follows: The Local Plan includes several <b>strategic</b> Borough wide policies, which <del>comprise</del> <b>include</b> :	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Figure 3	The map is blurry and would benefit from being zoomed in showing a bit more detail.	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Paragraphs 3.1.1/3.1.2/3.1.4/3.1.5/3.1.7	3.1.1 Amport is a rural Parish situated in the <b>Borough of</b> Test Valley <del>district of</del> Hampshire, <del>England</del> and includes the settlements of Amport, Weyhill and East Cholderton. There are also many countryside areas which have small pockets of settlement, including parts of Quarley (Lains Farm) and Cholderton Park in the West.	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
		<p>3.1.2. Weyhill, East Cholderton, and Amport each uniquely contribute to the rural character of Amport Parish. Each settlement is enveloped in a picturesque, green landscape, providing a calm, peaceful and historic environment that this <a href="#">NP-Plan</a> aims to protect.</p> <p>3.1.4. Additionally, the strong community spirit is evident through an active, friendly populace, a respected school in Amport and the internationally renowned Hawk Conservancy Trust. Key communal spaces, such as the village green, pubs and the soon-to-be-completed village hall (shared with Monxton), further cement the Parish<u>es</u>'s appeal as a cohesive and vibrant community.</p> <p>3.1.5. However, despite its many strengths, the Parish faces several issues and offers areas for improvement. The community is not homogenous, being divided by geography and differing perspectives, which is further complicated by planning decisions that residents feel often favour certain settlement perspectives. <del>This imbalance is exacerbated by a perceived arms-length planning relationship with TVBC, leading to development feeling imposed rather than community-driven, specifically in relation to the potential risk of industrial creep in Weyhill, as evidenced from community consultation and stakeholder engagement.</del></p> <p>3.1.7. This <a href="#">NP-Plan</a> has been prepared to address these issues where possible, although some matters are community aspirations rather than ones which can be addressed <del>in</del><a href="#">through land use planning terms</a>. Equally, it is hoped that a better relationship with TVBC can be forged and the locally specific policies in this document used for better outcomes for the community.</p>	
7.119	Paragraphs 3.5.1/3.5.2/3.5.3/3.5.6	<p>3.5.1 Neighbourhood Plans can only contain land use planning matters, with policies to be used in determining the outcome of applications for development. This often means that other important issues of particular interest to the local community that do not relate directly to planning cannot be addressed directly by <del>Neighbourhood the</del> <a href="#">Plans</a>.</p> <p>3.5.2. Nevertheless, the Steering Group is aware of the importance residents attach to certain issues that fall outside of the scope of the <a href="#">NP-Plan</a> and has sought to address <del>these in this Plan</del> by including relevant 'Community Aspirations' with the aim of pursuing these by other means. These aspirations are clearly marked and are differentiated from policies, as they are not legally binding as material consideration for future planning applications. These non-land use issues include:</p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speeding, especially along narrow rural lanes.</li> <li>• Congestion around the school during pick up and drop off times.</li> <li>• Protecting the tranquillity of the area through limiting development.</li> <li>• Enhancing the existing services and facilities (not relating to a planning application).</li> </ul> <p>3.5.3. These non-land issues <del>were formulated using feedback from</del><u>have been evidenced</u> community consultations, most notably the community survey. Issues relating to road safety, specifically speeding and congestion, are further illustrated in Figures 10 and 11 below.</p> <p><u>3.5.6 Dissatisfaction with current community facilities were also expressed within the survey, with nearly half of respondents recognised enhancing local facilities to be a priority for the future of the Parish.</u></p>	
7.119	Delete Parish wide Objective 3	<del>3 Development which would change the character from rural villages towards a suburban area would not be supported.</del>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Parish wide Objectives 11 12, 13 and 15	<p><del>11 Further housing and business development within the Parish requires appropriate additional infrastructure to minimise wastewater impacts including flooding, sewage/drainage capacity, open space/community facilities, communications, public transport and access and highway safety improvements.</del></p> <p><del>12 On site provisions to be made for the management of surface water, to avoid run-off from new development into a foul or combined public sewer network.</del></p> <p><del>13 Improve the availability of fast fibre throughout the Parish.</del></p> <p><del>15 If there were to be a significant increase in the number of dwellings proposed, Southern Water should be asked to assess the capacity of the sewer network once a planning application has been submitted.</del></p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Paragraph 6.1.34 (SH14)	6.1.34. Areas of ancient woodland within Amport Parish include Sarson Wood, Hurst Copse, Little Vinels Copse, Great Vinels Copse, Gollard Copse and Upper and Lower Amport Wood.	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
		(SH14) It would be helpful if these were annotated on the map.	
7.119	SH15 (Figure 19)	This map difficult to read. A better map would add clarity.	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	SH21 (Figure 22)	This map difficult to read. Pillhill Brook should be annotated. A better map would add clarity.	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Paragraph 6.2.2 (SH20)	6.2.2. Amport Parish has a plethora of natural features and spaces within the settlements, as visible in Figure 22 below. Natural features include woodlands such as Cholderton Park, Victoria Copse, Cholderton Hill, Amport Wood, Furzedown, Sarson Wood, Gollard Copse, Little Vinels Copse, Great Vinels Copse and Hurst Copse.  (SH20) It would be helpful if these were annotated on the map.	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Paragraph 6.2.9 (SH24)	6.2.9. Within the Parish, the Brook runs from Mullen's Pond through East Cholderton  (SH24) It would be helpful if these were annotated on the map at Figure 22	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Figure 24 (SH29)	For both figures, better quality / larger maps are needed	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
7.119	Figure 25 (SH29)	For both figures, better quality / larger maps are needed	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Figures 26-29 (SH34-36)	These should be Policy Map 1, 2 etc rather than referred to as figures.	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Paragraph 6.5.3 Figure 30 (SH37)	6.5.3. To respect the importance of these views <u>to residents</u> , Policy AM5 identifies views recognised as being of particular significance to local people (see Figure 30 and Figures 31, 32, 33 34 and 35 below).  (SH37) Figure 30 should be a policy map and not a figure	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Paragraphs 6.5.4/6.5.5	6.5.4. <u>As a result of this selection, Therefore,</u> development proposals within the <u>NP-Plan</u> Area must include careful consideration of the potential impact on the identified views. This policy does not seek to prevent any development within the view but to ensure that the scale, massing and height of proposals do not result in the integrity of the view being undermined.  6.5.5. Moreover, due to their cherished nature and significant importance to the community, this Plan aspires to preserve the important views by maintaining native hedgerows, recognising the challenge posed by non-native high hedgerows that may obscure sightlines, and acknowledging that some <u>cherished-important</u> views may be seasonal in nature.	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Figure 30 (SH38)	This should be a policy map and not a figure. A larger map with the view numbers added would be helpful.	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
7.119	Figure 36 (SH39)	The map is difficult to read and a better / larger map is required.	Accept Examiners Modification
7.119	Paragraph 7.1 (Policy title)	<del>HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</del> <u>Non designated Heritage assets.</u>	Accept Examiners Modification
7.119	Figures 41-46	A better map is needed as this is difficult to read. An up to date map showing the latest OS base layer should be provided. A better map is needed as this is difficult to identify the assets.	Accept Examiners Modification
7.119	Paragraph 7.1.11	7.1.11. Policy AM8 therefore aims to safeguard the <u>non designated heritage assets significance of locally important assets and their settings in the plan area</u> . Significance, as defined by the NPPF, refers to "the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest". This interest can be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historical. It may also encompass the asset's setting, particularly if it was historically significant and remains so today.	Accept Examiners Modification
7.119	Paragraphs 7.3.2 to 7.3.4	7.3.2. <del>TVC's The</del> Report showed that several residents highlighted a need to move, and <del>from the 165 replies received,</del> over half of respondents <del>(51.55%)</del> felt there was inadequate housing available for people to relocate to. <del>The majority of 28 respondents who indicated a need to move in Part 2 of the survey are aged between 65-74, followed by those aged 35-44.</del> The primary reasons cited for moving include living with family/friends and want own home, downsizing due to current home being too large and providing support to family members in the Parish.  7.3.3. The need for housing for first time buyers and those looking to downsize is also supported in the community survey. <del>(see Figure 8), having received the most votes from respondents.</del>	Accept Examiners Modification

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
		<p>7.3.4. The overall housing need, using the survey results alone, suggests that there is a minimum need over the next five years for the <del>following 8</del> affordable <del>housing provision</del><u>homes</u> in the Parish <u>made up as follows</u>:</p>	
7.119	Paragraphs 7.3.9 to 7.3.12	<p><del>7.3.9 The need for a small scale development in the Parish contrasts with the large scale development currently being suggested by landowners and developments through the Borough Council's Call for sites.</del></p> <p><del>7.3.10. Residents in Weyhill have expressed feeling vulnerable to large scale inappropriate development due to the village's proximity to major roads and their proximity to the edge of Andover town.</del></p> <p>7.3.11. This <u>NPlan</u> is not proposing large scale development but is support<u>sive of a modest</u> development which would meet local identified needs and potentially deliver some form of community benefits.</p> <p>7.3.12. <del>It is a</del><u>The</u> priority for this <u>NPlan is</u> to ensure that future development should be in keeping with the rural character of the area and not adversely impact the existing views and quality of the landscape within and around the Parish, in addition to retaining the identity and character of each settlement.</p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
7.119	Paragraphs 7.3.1 to 7.3.5 (and should be renumbered as there are already such paragraph numbers in the Plan)	<p>7.3.1. This <u>NPlan</u> aims to ensure that any future development within the Parish is sensitive to the needs of the local community, environmentally sustainable, and complementary to the existing character of the area. We recognise the importance of small-scale, carefully considered development proposals that not only meet housing needs but also local infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>7.3.2. Regarding any future sustainable, residential development, <del>it should be noted that</del> only Weyhill and Ampport have a settlement boundary, with East Cholderton being <u>in the</u> open countryside. <del>Any</del><u>Therefore</u> new housing should be directed to <u>Weyhill and Ampport</u><del>these settlements</del>.</p> <p>7.3.3. Weyhill community had previously expressed feelings of isolation from the rest of the</p>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>

Ref	Policy / Paragraph	Examiners recommendation	Proposed Modification
		<p>Parish because of being cut off by the A303. <del>This is exacerbated by the area of the Parochial Church Council not tying in with that of the Civil Parish Council, meaning that residents of Weyhill have no legal rights to use the Ampert Church for funerals, weddings or the calling of marriage banns. Not only this, but Weyhill is not within the catchment area for Ampert School.</del></p> <p>7.3.4. This <del>NlanP and the series of consultation exercises have sought</del> <u>seeks</u> to bring together the entire community and to work to deliver policies that represent each part of the Parish. Any new residential development must therefore contribute to the social infrastructure that makes the Parish a desirable and sustainable place to live.</p> <p>7.3.5. Weyhill currently lacks sufficient public open space and equipped play facilities, which are essential components to support increased housing development. Given this context, development proposals in Weyhill that include provisions for the creation of public spaces and local play areas of a sufficient scale to meet community needs will be strongly supported.</p>	
7.119	Figure 54 (SH87)	A better / larger map is needed, so that the facilities are easily located and identified.	<b>Accept Examiners Modification</b>
	General	<i>Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies and to accommodate any administrative and technical changes.</i>	<b>Accept Examiners Modification to modify text where necessary to achieve consistency with the modified policies and to</b>

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Policy / Paragraph</b>	<b>Examiners recommendation</b>	<b>Proposed Modification</b>
			<b>accommodate any administrative and technical changes.</b>