

Neighbourhood Plan Revision & Refinement

Next Steps Checklist

Nether Wallop Neighbourhood Plan
Feedback on Posters & Draft Policy Content

Following feedback from TVBC officers on the community engagement posters and the draft policy content, the following checklist of actions has been prepared.

SG = Nether Wallop NDP Steering Group and/or Parish Council

RE = Richard Eastham, and team @ FERIA Urbanism

ES = Edward Souter

GF = Gail Foster

KA = Karen Addison

VISION

SG to revisit the draft vision statement to see if this can be made more forward-thinking. Comments from TVBC are that the vision needs to be forward looking and about where the parish sees itself over the next 10-15 years. TVBC suggests more can be made of the second part about managing change, retaining character, and conserving environment.

RE suggests that each SG member has a go at rewriting on their own version of the vision before swapping emails; then arrange a collaborative Zoom call (perhaps with RE on the line too?) to agree a preferred set of vision words.

ES Comment Agreed – GF Comment **agreed.**

OBJECTIVES

Although this appears to cover all the issues that members of the public have raised, policies must be drafted to support each one. Policies should underpin the statements.

RE to create a table that matches the policies against the objectives to ensure this is covered off in the way TVBC expect it to be.

ES Comment Agreed – GF Comment – **I actually thought we should be doing this as well, and had started a crib sheet. We will need our own version because when we go to reg 14 and the public are asked to comment, we will need to track those comments against each part of the NDP. Hard to explain, but if RE does, it, we should also do this in any case.**

POLICY VE1 – Design

TVBC do not consider these to be locally specific enough and as written, could be for any nearby area. 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. To strengthen the NDP, we need to elevate the CAA and VDS requirements into policies. 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.

SG to review both the VDS and CAA and highlight the sections they believe to be most relevant and most appropriate for “elevation” to policy.

ES Comment Agreed -This needs work and probably a team to do it

Neighbourhood Plan Revision & Refinement

Next Steps Checklist

GF Comment – I have the VDS in a word format and can bring this process. Agree a team should follow up and expand it.

KA Comment - Gail has done a lot of this with her document

RE to take these highlighted sections and rewrite them in a policy text form for inclusion in the next version of the plan.

TVBC say that the “only thing that is missing” from the draft plan content at this stage is the identification of locally important buildings and non-designated heritage assets. Recommend using the CAA to identify them, then their status is elevated in the NDP. It was noted that the SG already have that data. This data needs to be provided to RE in both text and map format. Then RE will transpose this schedule and drawing to computer generated maps for inclusion in the next version of the plan.

ES Comment-Agreed

GF Comment – This should not be difficult. I recommend getting the maps accurate in Parish Online system (rather than RE doing this) as this future proofs the PC for after the NDP is completed. (Should be easily possible.)

POLICY VE2 – Views etc

RE disagrees with the TVBC opinion that this needs to be flipped from a restrictive wording e.g. change from “unacceptable impact” to “positive visual impact” as this will only invite development in these important areas. So long as there is a healthy balance between restrictive and enabling policies, the Nether Wallop NDP will pass examination. Only if most or all policies are restrictive, does an examiner get concerned. This particular policy needs to be restrictive.

ES Comment- Agreed

GF Comment – half agree! Obviously the policy isn’t going to be just once sentence, so restrictive and permissive can be used at the same time. (to appease TVBC who will have a view on the plan!)

SG to schedule a list of the important views, with short justification, demonstrating why it is special enough to warrant protection. Link this schedule to a map, just hand-drawn, with view point (dot) and view direction (arrow) and note if this is a panorama (wide, fan-shaped arrow) or a linear view (straight line arrow). This drawing to be scanned and emailed to RE.

ES Comment -Agreed - again this needs a team to work on it. GF Comment – Agreed.

RE will transpose this schedule and map to computer generated maps for inclusion in the next version of the plan.

Disagree, think this should be done by us on Parish Online. We need to own the information, and have future access to amend it.

POLICY VE3 – Local Green Space Designations

SG and RE – No further work at this time. This element appears ready to be dropped into the Reg. 14 plan at the appropriate time. Unless there are further adjustments that the SG wishes to make, based on local knowledge and feedback? If so, please let RE know so we can update the relevant maps and text.

Neighbourhood Plan Revision & Refinement

Next Steps Checklist

TVBC concerned about the scoring system used, as this is not required by the NPPF. However, this was a useful way for the steering group to reduce the long list to the short list. So, for internal purposes, it has been beneficial.

However, the scores may be omitted from the Reg. 14 version of the plan. **Agreed? – Scores being omitted from the plan I am not sure about as we have to justify each space anyway. I am also unclear why the list needs to be reduced. To what? How many? What is the cut off? If all are relevant, why do we need to reduce? (i.e. where is the legislation that requires us to reduce?)**

POLICY WB1 – Brook, Environmental Protection

Appears to be a contradiction here from TVBC about not needing to repeat information. Elsewhere, as this repetition of information was a specific instruction, for example the CAA and VDS.

We suggest the protective policy information contained in other documents e.g. TVBC Local Plan Policy E5 on Biodiversity is “cut and paste” over in this instance to give the Nether Wallop NDP the depth of coverage it needs. Also, TVBC want the policy to be worded in a more specific way.

RE to research and reformulate Policy E5 and other relevant local plan policies for inclusion in the next version of the plan. Also, revisit the objectives section to ensure the Wallop Brook is mentioned.

SG to research what is so special about the Wallop Brook, what makes it deserving of a protective policy. This need only be bullet point list of issues. This list to include details of the farmers’ initiative – i.e. the HIWWT and Wallop farms trying to “join up the land” along the brook between Broughton Down and Danebury Hillfort, both of which are designated sites. **Agreed - again this needs a team including Simon Cooper to work on it. - Agreed**

POLICY WB1 – Brook, Cultural & Spiritual Protection

TVBC says these issues cannot be protected by policy but RE disagrees. The wording at present resists any development that would damage or restrict the enjoyment of the brook, while encouraging interventions that support it. This seems reasonable and open to implementation.

RE to raise this issue directly with TVBC. No action for SG at this time. **We can draw on help from The Wessex Chalk Streams & Rivers Trust of which I am a member and also Simon Cooper – agreed. (We still need to understand what spiritual protection is.)**

POLICY CS1 – Community Spirit

TVBC want to know what community spirit is. And how it is defined.

Q: How will a planning officer decide whether a planning application will affect community spirit?

Therefore,

SG to write a little more about the specific nature of community spirit in Nether Wallop. This text (no more than a side of A4) to be passed to RE to be developed into robust policy and/or supporting text wording for inclusion in the next version of the plan. **ES - Agreed GF – agreed. Team to do this?**

POLICY CS3 – Protection of Existing Employment Uses

TVBC consider this duplication of existing Local Plan policies – does the SG agree?

Decision needed on whether we continue to repeat and double-up in this area. RE recommends this doubling up does happen. **ES - Agreed GF – Agreed.**

Neighbourhood Plan Revision & Refinement

Next Steps Checklist

POLICY CS3 – Protection of Existing Community Infrastructure

TVBC consider this duplication of existing Local Plan policies – does the SG agree? Decision needed on whether we continue to repeat and double-up in this area.

RE recommends this doubling up does happen. ES - Agreed GF – Agreed as the local plan may be revised and remove sections we would rely on. I can highlight sections for checking.

POLICY HWB1 – Improve Walking Links

RE to provide the necessary caveats to ensure no inappropriate or unsuitable footpaths are provided across the parish, that might undermine the tranquillity and beauty of the area. This is a concern flagged by TVBC from the way the text is currently worded.

SG to advise if there are any specific places in the parish where increased access would be a problem.

ES-This issue needs careful consideration as, within the Parish Area of Nether Wallop a number of applications have been made by the Ramblers Association (Andover Branch) for new Rights of Way based on historic Ordnance Survey Maps. These applications mainly affect farm land owned by the Ponds and Jepson Turners but also some smaller land owners. NW has a large no. of RoW within the Parish Boundary already which are difficult to maintain and currently take a lot of volunteer effort to support Hampshire County Council who are ultimately responsible to Maintain RoW in Hampshire. GF – Agreed.

POLICY HWB2 – Countryside Access

“With regards to improved access to the countryside, these are discussions that you should be having with landowners” – TVBC say this this is because it is unlikely any large scale development will open-up this access. While RE agrees with this from a technical point of view, having this as a policy and/or aspiration in the plan will help enormously with such discussions. ES - Agreed see comment above GF – Agree with RE.

SG to consider if there are any specific points in the parish where increased access would be welcome and then identify the landowner. ES - see above GF – yes agree.

At the August event, there were comments from the public, along these lines, pointing out places where new walking links (inc. bridge links over the brook) would be welcomed. But how widespread is this feeling?

SG to investigate and advise.

RE to update (or remove?) the policy accordingly.

POLICY HWB3 – Maintaining Tranquillity

TVBC say that the light and noise issue is experienced this elsewhere – not sure what is meant here? Then go on to say that people can put up very bright lights, and having a policy is not necessarily going to stop some of those things happening. Yet the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) has exactly a policy that effectively stops these things happening.

SG to decide if it wants to retain this policy. ES - In my opinion Peace and Tranquillity are an essential part of the village. Does anyone disagree? GF – no, I agree. A policy will deter some people even if they have the right to certain installations, and not everyone will take up the right anyway. Keep the policy.

Neighbourhood Plan Revision & Refinement

Next Steps Checklist

If so, RE can advise on the most suitable wording – based on his experience of working with the SDNPA – to retain this policy.

POLICY HWB4 — Renewable Energy etc

TVBC say “... it is not clear that as written how this policy would be implemented, as it goes above and beyond current requirements”.

RE to check what is meant by this as the wording is based on existing policies found elsewhere that have passed examination. **ES - Okay GF – agreed.**

OTHER ISSUES — Local Plan Coordination

Despite previous requests, we still have no update from TVBC on the alignment of the draft NDP content with the adopted and/or emerging TVBC Local Plan policies.

RE to follow this up with TVBC as part of the other actions listed here. **ES - Okay but please copy us in as we can take this up with TVBC through NWPC if they do not respond in a timely manner. GF – Yes, please make sure I am on copy.**