

Transcription / Summary of comments made by Sarah Hughes at NDP Steering Group meeting of 2nd Nov 2020.

Sarah has taken her role in making these comments as playing Devil's Advocate, thinking what the examiner might raise. The aim is to be helpful and assist the Parish in producing the best plan it can deliver.

Neighbourhood Plan Vision Statement

"Nether Wallop has developed slowly over centuries, with gradual change blending its environment with the needs of the population. This plan aims to manage change within its environmental limits in order to retain and strengthen Nether Wallop's distinct history and character"

Quite good, but the beginning is quite negative and a bit backward looking. It appears to be scene setting which could be included in the supporting text. The vision needs to be forward looking at where the Parish sees itself over the next 10-15 years. More can be made of the second part about managing change. Retain character, mention homes and jobs, conserve environment etc.

Neighbourhood Plan Objectives

- 1 — Character & Identity Maintaining and enhancing the rural character of Nether Wallop, Jack's Bush and the wider parish area.
- 2 — Local Prioritisation Coordinating all new development so that it prioritises the creation of safe, sustainable, and mixed communities with good access to jobs and essential services for everybody who lives and works in the parish.
- 3 — Choice of Movement Maintaining a robust network of paths, streets, and roads appropriate for all modes of travel to support the needs of current and future residents, businesses, and visitors.
- 4 — Resource Efficiency Using land and resources efficiently so that existing and new developments have a reduced demand for energy.
- 5 — Environmental Protection Protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment, the quality and character of the built environment and the wider countryside.
- 6 — Design Quality Ensuring the quality of new development through the appropriate use of materials, details and inclusive design that responds to the Nether Wallop context.
- 7 — Managing Change Ensuring that any land put forward for development will be developed in such a way as to improve people's quality of life, for both existing and future residents.
- 8 — Future Infrastructure Delivering the community infrastructure necessary to support an evolving village in the 21st Century.

All seem to cover issues that members of the public have raised. If this is the full list of objectives, then policies must be drafted to support each one. Policies should underpin the statements.

Should check each policy and see which objectives it marries up with. It is helpful if the policy specifies which objective it meets. Some policies may meet only one, and some might meet all of them.

Make sure policies are delivering what you set out to achieve.

Not gone into detail of the wording, but in principle the list appears to cover majority of things the plan will cover. It is important that every objective has at least one policy against it.

DRAFT POLICY VE1 — Design Quality

- 1) The design, form and detail of new developments should be principally informed by the traditional form, layout, character and style of the parish's vernacular architecture. This will be applicable to both new build homes and other buildings and to alterations to existing properties.
- 2) Careful innovation in design or thoughtful modern or contemporary architecture is not precluded by this policy and such designs are encouraged.

Not really locally specific. As written this could be for any nearby area. The strengths of any plan is to having a local level of detail that is not included in the Borough's local plan, and that is particularly specific to the village. There is currently a Village Design Statement (VDS) for the Parish and a Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA). Both documents have a lot of detail in relation to the character areas. The VDS and CAA are currently material planning considerations in the planning process. The strength of the NDP would be to elevate the requirements into policies. The planning white paper mentioned the importance of having Design Codes which can now be very locationally specific in regards to character and materials. Not to re-invent the wheel, but bringing this work (which has already been done) into the Plan will elevate the effectiveness of ensuring what is built, is what people want rather than general "Barrat Boxes". The plan should drill down into this level. It doesn't matter that the VDS and CAA are older documents as the information contained is still relevant. It was recommended that chunks of the documents were incorporated in the plan. Otherwise by linking the documents, they are not given the weight that the plan has and are still seen as supplementary documents. For this reason the details should be included in the plan. Additionally then all the requirement for the planning officers to consider are in one document rather than references to others. Suggest there is a hefty Design Chapter in the plan which should be the really meaty one to describe how the building should take place. Refer to VDS and CAA, don't necessary lift and shift the information, but review, update and improve where necessary. VDS has guidelines, but a policy is more rigid so may need tweaking.

DRAFT POLICY VE2 — Views Between Village & Countryside

Developments should demonstrate that their proposals will not have an unacceptable adverse visual impact on the landscape setting of the village or views of key landmarks.

Can see what is trying to be done here, but it is quite a negatively worded policy. It needs to be flipped round a bit, “development needs to enhance.” change from “unacceptable impact” to “positive visual impact”. Just tweak a bit. In terms of views, it would be helpful to include a list of the important views, with a little back up rather than just a nice view that could be seen in any other part of the countryside. You have to demonstrate why it is special or so important that it warrants protection and raising over and above others. Other views can also be protected with the Landscape Character Assessments which describe the settings which will need to be taken into consideration in the event of a planning application. It would be important for Reg. 14 to have this list of views and justification included so that people can comment on it. Can use views from CAA for the more built up area and then add in the more long distance views.

DRAFT POLICY VE3 — Local Green Space Designations

- 1) The areas shown on the maps [see LGS summary booklet] are designated as Local Green Space.
- 2) Proposals for development of these areas will only be permitted where it has been demonstrated that there are very special circumstances (such as essential utility infrastructure) that justify the need for the development and there are no suitable alternative sites.
- 3) Proposals for the development of new green infrastructure to assist with flood protection and/or to contribute towards public enjoyment and health, and/or to create corridors for wildlife will be supported.

Another very important policy in the NDP, all needed in the actual policy is the maps of the areas. Don't need to repeat NPFF, evidence to support them in is an annex at the back of the paper. For Reg. 14 purposes if you want to have an explanation of the constraints in supporting text that would be appropriate, but for the plan you just need to say “We have identified the following greens spaces as Local Green Space designation.”

DRAFT POLICY WB1 — Environmental Protection & Enhancement of the Wallop Brook

- 1) Development proposals must conserve or enhance wildlife habitats and biodiversity of the Wallop Brook and its associated riparian environment, including creating links between habitats to improve connectivity.
- 2) Development proposals that would result in an adverse effect on the Wallop Brook, which cannot either be avoided or adequately mitigated will be refused.
- 3) Where development may impact important habitats associated with the Wallop Brook, it should be demonstrated that the development would have a positive impact on those habitats. A suitable long term management plan will be required.

Understand that the Brook is very important locally, but need to go back to the fundamentals of Land use planning and what NDPs are about. Don't need to repeat information which is contained elsewhere. Apart from the wording of “Wallop Brook” it could be for anywhere. It doesn't appear to be locationally specific other than mentioning the brook itself. It repeats a lot of the Borough Local Plan policy. (E5 on Biodiversity.) If you want to proceed with a policy on this you will need to be a lot more specific about what is so special about the Wallop Brook. Is it a SSSI? Or a local nature site? Any form of designation on it? The HIWWT and Wallop farmers are trying to join up the land along the brook with Broughton Down and Danebury Hillfort which are designated sites. See if policy can be worded in a more specific way, (not as per LP E5 or national guidance). Supporting text may include information why it is important locally, but whether a policy is required is another thing. Whilst community may want the NDP to cover everything that is important to them, it the NDP is a land use planning document. May include text to show important and that HIWWT are working to upgrade the site to SSSI. Upper Clatford have had a site designated as an SSSI, so this document might be able to signpost that this may be raised.

RE asked if it mattered if policy E5 was effectively repeated in the NDP given the uncertainty of the Planning White Paper. SH replied that this should be a conversation to be covered offline. ES stated that the Brook was very important to the Parish and a policy should be written to protect it. SH replied that if it was that important then the vision and objectives should be revisited because it doesn't not appear to be covered in the vision and objectives that are currently proposed.

DRAFT POLICY WB2 — Cultural & Spiritual Protection & Enhancement of the Wallop Brook

Development proposals that support and enhance the cultural and spiritual role of the Wallop Brook in parish life will be supported. Examples include proposals to increase safe public access to the Wallop Brook, to allow for community gatherings and celebrations, while ensuring biodiversity protection is not compromised.

Similar comment to above. Non-land use planning matters can be included as community aspirations, and have their own section rather than being incorporated in a policy. Cant be addressed in a NDP, but can be slotted into aspirations. SH and RE would have a conversation off line regarding the duplication.

DRAFT POLICY CS1 — Support for Proposals that Promote Community Spirit in Nether Wallop

- 1) Proposals for new developments and activity that support community spirit will be supported.
- 2) New community services and infrastructure will be supported within the parish where a need has been identified.

What is community spirit? How is that defined? How will a planning officer decide whether a planning application will affect community spirit? Could be moved to community aspirations. Perhaps the second sentence could become the policy and the rest made up of supporting text as to what might be acceptable.

DRAFT POLICY CS2 — Protection of Existing Employment Uses

1) Existing employment uses and premises across the plan area will be protected and enhanced. 2) Any loss of employment uses, or premises will not be supported unless it is accompanied by clear evidence demonstrating that the site or premises is not currently viable and that an appropriate alternative site or premises can be identified within the parish boundary.

Again this needs to be taken offline as this repeats LP policy LE10 and recommendation not to repeat.

DRAFT POLICY CS3 — Protection of Existing Community Infrastructure

1) Existing community infrastructure, and ancillary facilities across the plan area, will be protected and enhanced. Change of use applications to remove community uses will not be supported. 2) Proposals that would result in the loss of a community facility should be accompanied by evidence demonstrating that the site is not viable and that an appropriate alternate site will be provided elsewhere.

Against to discuss offline as this repeats LP policy COMM 11.

DRAFT POLICY HWB1 — Improve Walking Links

1) Improvements to the network of footpaths and footways throughout the village to ensure they are safe, convenient and comfortable will be supported.
2) Footpath widening and resurfacing where necessary will be encouraged.

Tricky one to comment on, clearly footpaths are land use planning because new ones can be created through development, existing footpaths need the wording thinking about a bit more carefully. There is a land use element in there, but for example "Footpath widening and resurfacing where necessary will be encouraged" needs to be considered, anywhere and everywhere regardless of it is in a lovely tranquil spot? Be a bit careful with this one. What are you trying to achieve and deliver because you may end up having inappropriate use of the footpaths. Or Unintended consequences.

DRAFT POLICY HWB2 — Countryside Access

1) Improved access to the countryside immediately surrounding the built parts of the parish will be supported.
2) Initiatives such as better signage, mapping resources and better maintained surfaces and gates on footpaths will be encouraged.

Has bits about improved access to the countryside which is surrounding the built part of the parish, sentence two is very good, but needs to be in the community aspirations part of the plan. There is not much in planning which is necessarily going to deliver that. If you are not looking at having much development in the parish it is difficult to see how this will be delivered. With regards to improved access to the countryside, these are discussions that you should be having with landowners, and won't necessarily be driven by a planning application. Perhaps this can be thought about in a bit more depth.

DRAFT POLICY HWB3 — Maintaining Tranquillity

1) Proposals must demonstrate that all feasible mitigation solutions have been implemented to reduce light and noise pollution to the minimum.
2) External street and common area lighting should be low energy, modest in scale, limited to what is necessary for safety, installed at low levels, and be sympathetic to the surrounding area and not interfere with the dark night skies.
3) The impact of noise and light pollution on the amenity of nearby premises, the character of listed buildings, the countryside and on identified nocturnal wildlife is reduced to the minimum.

Light and noise issue, experienced this elsewhere, some things don't require planning permission. People can put up very bright lights, having a policy isn't necessarily going to stop some of those things happening. Renewable energy, am unclear how this can be implemented. Only thing that is missing, is that the NDP is an opportunity to identify locally important buildings and non-designated heritage assets. Use those buildings in the CAA to identify that. Then their status is elevated in the NDP. IR noted we have that. SH confirmed that they should be listed in the plan.

DRAFT POLICY HWB4 — Renewable Energy & the Resource and Energy Efficiency of New Buildings

1) The development of new and existing buildings will be supported where they incorporate practical features that reduce energy consumption.
2) Support will be given to development proposals that incorporate appropriate low or zero carbon on-site power generation subject to the resulting proposal demonstrating good standards of urban design and compliance with other development plan policies.
3) Proposals which incorporate the reuse of materials and the use of local and sustainably sourced construction materials will be supported.

No comment was made on this policy.