Upper Clatford Neighbourhood Development Plan, Submission Draft

Response by Upper Clatford Parish Council to Neighbourhood Plan Examiner’s Questions

15 October 2020

This document sets out the response of Upper Clatford Parish Council (the Qualifying Body, QB) to matters raised by the Independent Examiner following initial assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan and representations.

1. Paragraph 1.9 (page 2) refers to the Environment Bill\(^1\) and paragraph 1.10 (page 3) refers to the Agriculture Bill\(^2\) but there is no indication of their current status or of the timetable for them becoming law. In the interests of clarity, could the PC consider the inclusion of some appropriate wording?

QB response: Whilst the QB has no information on the timetable for these Bills becoming law, the following wording is suggested in respect of their current status:

Paragraph 1.9, after first sentence insert: “The Bill was at Committee stage in the House of Commons in September 2020.”.

Paragraph 1.10, add at the end: “The Bill completed its third reading in the House of Lords in October 2020.”.

2. Policy UC1 (page 11) relates to sustainable development but I could find no explicit reference to achieving ‘sustainable development’ or ‘sustainability’ in the chapter on Vision and Objectives (page 9). Is there a reason for this?

QB response: the Vision and objectives of the NDP all contribute to sustainable development at a local level, the overall focus for this then being provided by policy UC1. There is no reason why ‘sustainable development’ or ‘sustainability’ is not referred to in chapter 3, apart from that it is addressed instead in chapter 4.

3. In Policy UC2 point 1 (page 12) there is a reference to a facility being ‘surplus to requirements’. How would such a position be assessed by a decision-maker?

QB response: the policy places the onus on the applicant to demonstrate a facility is surplus to requirements. Evidence in support of any such planning application would need to be provided in the form of an assessment clearly showing the facility in question was surplus to requirements. The robustness of this assessment would be considered by the decision-maker, consulting Sport England as required and appropriate.

---

\(^1\) The Environment Bill is currently at Committee stage in the Commons, due to report by 29 September 2020. See: [https://services.parliament.uk/Bills/2019-21/environment.html](https://services.parliament.uk/Bills/2019-21/environment.html)

\(^2\) The Agriculture Bill appears further progressed, scheduled for Third reading in the Lords on 1 October 2020. See: [https://services.parliament.uk/Bills/2019-21/agriculture.html](https://services.parliament.uk/Bills/2019-21/agriculture.html)
4. Policy UC3 (page 15) and paragraph 5.10 refer to the removal of permitted development rights to extend dwellings. What is the justification for this measure? Is there any evidence that the implementation of such a measure would contribute significantly to achieving a satisfactory ‘housing mix’?

QB response: this provision was included in response to a comment on policy UC3 made at the regulation 14 stage. The comment reported the experience of another Hampshire Parish whereby developers had been granted planning permission to build 2- and 3-bedroom houses then using permitted development rights to increase the number of bedrooms (particularly in the form of loft conversions) before the dwellings came to market. The QB felt it appropriate to respond positively to this comment.

The evidence from the Test Valley Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the NDP Questionnaire Survey, summarised in the NDP, emphasises the need for new housing proposals to address the community’s requirement for smaller accommodation. Schemes meeting the housing mix requirements of policy UC3 and granted planning permission on this basis can be expected to include a proportion of smaller dwellings. However, this desirable policy outcome may be frustrated if such dwellings are then extended either during construction or subsequently. The removal of permitted development rights will serve to bring such extensions within planning control and so enable the local planning authority to assess their implications for achieving and retaining a satisfactory housing mix.

There is no specific evidence that implementation of this measure will contribute significantly to achieving a satisfactory housing mix. During the plan period only a limited number of new dwellings are expected to arise in the Neighbourhood Area. In these circumstances, the QB considers that it is a reasonable step to ensure that such smaller dwellings as do come forward are able to be retained as such in the interests of meeting the demonstrable community requirements, and that this is clearly signposted in the NDP.

5. Paragraph 6.4 (page 19) refers to small businesses being those with under 10 employees. What is the justification for this figure, and does it accord with the advice in paragraph 83 of the NPPF with regard to supporting a prosperous rural economy?

QB response: the reference to under 10 employees in paragraph 6.4 is only intended as a description of the size of most existing businesses in the parish, and is not intended as a policy threshold (it does not appear in policy UC4). National policy supporting the growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas is referred to in paragraph 6.1.

6. In Policy UC5 (4) on page 20, what is meant by ‘environmentally acceptable’ in relation to a proposed access?

QB response: this criterion is further explained at bullet point 4 in paragraph 6.9. The intent of the provision is to ensure that new or improved access points do not unacceptably alter the prevailing character of the highway involved and are not to the detriment of biodiversity. Rural lanes in particular may be significantly affected by a general ‘opening up’ which may be brought about by changes in land levels and removal of vegetation required to meet junction design and visibility requirements. Loss of hedgerow can adversely impact on wildlife through loss of habitat and connectivity.
7. In Policy UC6 (page 24) how will requirement 5, regarding maintaining and increasing the number of trees, be achieved?

QB response: the retention of trees will be achieved through the submission and approval of landscaping schemes identifying suitable trees for retention on development sites. The local planning authority may consider the use of Tree Preservation Orders where justified. To increase the tree stock, applicants are encouraged to include additional indigenous tree planting in their proposals, again as part of submitted landscaping schemes. In the Local Plan, policy E2 and the associated paragraphs 7.23 to 7.25 also refer.

8. Bearing in mind that it is anticipated that the Neighbourhood Plan will become part of the Development Plan, did the PC consider including more detail in the UCNP itself about the character of the various settlement areas as listed in paragraph 7.3 on page 25 (perhaps as an Appendix)? Does the PC agree that such detail would be of assistance to the ‘decision-maker’ and if so, could some appropriate wording be devised?

QB response: the QB concurs with this suggestion and has prepared an Appendix to the NDP for the Examiner’s consideration (attached at the end of this document), based on the previously-prepared Evidence Document to this policy.

9. Policy UC7 (page 27) seeks, in sub-section 2, to prevent the sub-division of plots and sub-section 5 seeks to prevent the addition of rooms above the ground floor of outbuildings. What is the justification for these two requirements and why would such development be harmful?

QB response: the justification for these requirements is to be found in the Conservation Area Character Appraisal. In respect of criterion 2, plot sub-division, the Character Appraisal explains at pages 10-11 and 45 that the historic plot boundaries have generally been retained and that this is an important feature of the Conservation Area. However, modern development is beginning to erode this historic plan form through infill and the backland development of larger plots. The Appraisal recommends that further modern development which could lead to the historic boundaries becoming unrecognisable should be avoided. The Appraisal indicates that the historic plot boundaries are an acknowledged important feature of the Conservation Area which make a positive contribution to its significance. Their loss or further erosion would be harmful to character or appearance and their contribution is recognised in this criterion.

Criterion 5: the Character Appraisal further identifies that new domestic outbuildings can have a significant cumulative impact on a historic area. Care needs to be taken to ensure that outbuildings are subservient to and in proportion to the main dwelling; the insertion of rooms above will generally be discouraged (Character Appraisal page 44). This criterion seeks to give policy recognition to this in the interests of preserving the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

10. At the end of the first bullet point of paragraph 8.7 (page 36), there is reference to resisting plot subdivision. What is the justification for this?

QB response: this part of the NDP is based on the Test Valley Landscape Character Assessment. A review of the relevant guidelines in the Assessment for the River Valley Floors of the Pillhill Brook
and Lower River Anton has revealed no reference to plot subdivision. This therefore appears to have been included in error and should be removed.

11. In the last bullet point on page 36 there is a reference to ‘deciduous and other woodland priority habitats’. For what reason are they priority habitats?

QB response: they are included in the Priority Habitat Inventory and the National Forest Inventory.

12. Paragraph 8.13 (page 40) refers to the views identified on Plan 7 as ‘typical examples’. That implies to me that there may be other views that have not been identified on the Plan. Could the PC confirm the status of the views identified on Plans 7 and 8? What criteria have been used to assess the value of the views? What is the justification for Settlement View 12 and is it a public view?

QB response: the views identified on Plans 7 and 8 are the only views to which policy UC9 applies. They have been chosen by the Steering Group as valued views on the basis of the following criteria:

1. History/heritage
2. Contribution towards rural identity: Rural Countryside (RC), Rural Settlement (RS)
3. Landscape Character Type (LCT): Open Chalklands (OC), Enclosed Chalk Woodlands (EC), River Valley Floor (RV).

The following amended tables 4 and 5 from the submission draft NDP show how these criteria apply to each view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. on Plan 7</th>
<th>Description of view</th>
<th>Supporting criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dipden Bottom, viewed from south</td>
<td>2(RC), 3(EC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dipden Bottom, viewed from north</td>
<td>2(RC), 3(EC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open view SE from the bridleway SW of Fairleigh School</td>
<td>2(RC), 3(EC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>View NE from Red Rice towards Bury Hill Ring</td>
<td>1, 2(RC), 3(OC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Predominantly open views SE from Red Rice Road</td>
<td>2(RC), 3(OC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Predominantly open view WSW from Bury Hill Ring</td>
<td>1, 2(RC), 3(OC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Predominantly open views SW from Red Rice Road</td>
<td>2(RC), 3(OC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Open view SW from road opposite The Willows</td>
<td>2(RS), 3(OC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Woodland view along Norman Court Lane</td>
<td>2(RS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 from submission draft NDP with view criteria added
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. on Plan 8</th>
<th>Description of view</th>
<th>Supporting criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>View SW at Red Rice crossroads</td>
<td>2 (RC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>View NE towards Valley Mead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>View E Foundry Road approaching Waterloo Terrace</td>
<td>1, 2 (RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>View S Bury Hill Close in Anna Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>View N across Foundry Road from Waterloo Terrace</td>
<td>2 (RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>View N from Greenfields to the Gap</td>
<td>1, 2 (RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>View SE across Gap on Balksbury Hill</td>
<td>2 (RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>View W across the gap at Balksbury Hill</td>
<td>2 (RS), 3 (RV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>View E across the gap at Balksbury Hill</td>
<td>2 (RS), 3 (RV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>View S on cycle track from Andover</td>
<td>1, 3 (RV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>View S on Watery Lane entrance to village</td>
<td>2 (RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>View S River Anton from Watery Lane</td>
<td>3 (RV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>View SE from Red Rice Road into Above Town</td>
<td>2 (RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>View NW into Clatford Manor</td>
<td>2 (RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>View NE from the top of Red Rice Road</td>
<td>1, 2 (RC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>View E from The Street down Watery Lane</td>
<td>2 (RS), 3 (RV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>View NE from Church Lane bridge over water meadows</td>
<td>2 (RS), 3 (RV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 from submission draft NDP with view criteria added

In respect of Settlement View 12, the QB notes that a regulation 16 response has been made which refers to “view 12 (NE of Cobbetts Corner)”. This is a re-submission of that made by this respondent at the earlier, regulation 14 consultation on the draft plan. In response to this comment, this view was removed from the NDP. The QB therefore considers this objection has been met.

The Settlement View 12 that is now included in the submission draft NDP shows a different view, of the River Anton looking south from the Watery Lane bridge crossing. It is a public view which shows a characteristic river and meadow landscape.

13. It is clear from the Evidence Document on Policy UC10 – The Local Gap, that there is strong community support for the local gap. Could the PC summarise why, in its view, Policy UC10 – Local Gap (page 46) adds to Policy E3 (Local Gaps) of the Test Valley Borough Review Local Plan (TVBRLP)?

QB response: policy UC10 supplements Local Plan policy E3 by adding local detail. Policy E3 protects areas of countryside between Andover and surrounding small rural communities because of their contribution to local character. Policy UC10 provides further information to aid the implementation of the strategic policy by identifying separate land parcels and providing information on their contribution to the physical and/or visual separation they afford. This will assist applicants and decision makers in applying the strategic policy.

Policy UC10 also provides more detail, as explained in paragraph 8.23, on particular types of development which have been identified by the QB as having the potential to harm the separation
and integrity of the Local Gap. This will ensure that applicants and decision makers will be aware of the significance of such development proposals in terms of the importance the local community attaches to maintaining the separation and integrity of the Local Gap. The QB acknowledges that policy UC10 would only apply to development requiring planning permission.

14. Can the PC confirm that, on page 56, the text under ‘Demonstrably special and of local significance’ is the same for both LGS2 and LGS3?

QB response: LGS2 and LGS3 are two areas of meadow either side of Balksbury Hill. There are similarities between them, and also some differences. In the interests of brevity and to avoid duplication, the identified text deals with LGS2 and 3 together whilst clearly identifying where such differences exist. The QB would have no objection to providing separate text for LGS2 and LGS3.

15. The Evidence Document relating to Policy UC11 – Local Green Spaces (on page 6) refers to ‘8ha of considerable ecological importance’ (in relation to site LGS4). The assessment of the site on page 57 of the UCNP, refers to the site being 12ha in area. Could the PC confirm the total area of site LGS4 and summarise which parts of the site (if not all of it) are demonstrably special to the local community, including which parts (if not all of it) hold local significance because of beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity and richness of wildlife.

QB response: LGS4 is 12 ha. in area (the 8 ha. figure given in the Evidence Document refers to an earlier iteration of LGS4, now superseded). All of the site is considered to be demonstrably special to the local community. The parts which hold a particular local significance are as follows:

- **Beauty:** applies to all the site.
- **Historic significance:** applies to the embanked corridor of the former Andover/Redbridge railway line, formerly the route of the Andover and Redbridge Canal. A wharf (serving the canal) and subsequently a siding (serving the railway) were located to the west of Watery Lane and were used by the Waterloo Ironworks in Anna Valley. There is also evidence of a water meadow system to the east of Watery Lane in historic maps.
- **Recreational value:** the site offers informal recreational benefit (walking and cycling) given access to countryside and affording rural views from a variety of locations. It is within easy walking distance of Upper Clatford and Andover, thereby connecting town and country. This aspect of local significance is associated with the public footpath and cycleway which runs through the site from Watery Lane to the underpass under the A303 towards Andover, along the line of former canal/railway (shown on the screen shot below); Watery Lane, which crosses it from east to south, and which is used by walkers and cyclists as well as vehicles despite the absence of footways; and the public highways which adjoin the site. The Borough Council’s draft Green Spaces Strategy recognises the value of such green corridors in providing opportunities for walking, cycling or horse riding, whether for leisure purposes or travel.³
- **Tranquillity:** applies to all the site. The QB acknowledges that traffic noise from the A303 affects the site in the north, but considers that this does not significantly detract from the tranquillity afforded by the site and the evident visual contrast it offers with the surrounding built-up environments of Upper Clatford and Andover.

• Richness of wildlife: applies to the majority of the site which comprises the following Priority Habitat Inventory habitats: coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, deciduous woodland, and lowland fen, as shown on the annotated screen shot below from https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx. In addition, the newly-designated Pillhill Brook SINC flows through the site, and the Church Meadow SINC abuts to the south. LGS4 is part of the network of designated SINCs and priority habitats in the Pillhill Brook and River Anton corridors. It thus supports the Borough Council’s draft Green Spaces Strategy, a priority of which is to connect green spaces to form part of an ecological network, thereby providing links between habitats as stepping stones or routes for movement. As such their presence helps to mitigate against habitat fragmentation. The draft Strategy refers to the River Anton Enhancement Scheme as an example of an initiative targeting such green assets.4


Annotated screen shot from Magic Map showing Priority Habitat Inventory habitats and the route of the public footpath

4 Ibid., pages 4 and 14.
16. Could the PC summarise why, in its view, Policy UC12 on Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) (page 59) adds to Policy E5 (Biodiversity) of the TVBRLP?

QB response: policy UC12 adds local detail to Local Plan policy E5 by:

- referencing the local context for SINCs in the Pillhill Brook and River Anton corridors as part of a network of designated sites and priority habitats as identified in the Priority Habitats Inventory, and
- applying the precautionary principle to sites which are proposed as SINCs or otherwise under consideration.

17. What is the current status of the proposed Church Meadow South SINC?

QB response: the Parish Council’s application for the designation of this site as a SINC was approved for submission to the Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre (HBIC) at the Parish Council meeting on 14 October 2020. The HBIC assessment and evaluation of the site may take up to two years, although the recent application for designation of the Pillhill Brook as a SINC was approved well within this timescale.

18. Can the PC confirm that the Pillhill Brook SINC (Plan 12, page 61) effectively ‘joins’ SINCs TV0275 and TV0299?

QB response: The now-designated Pillhill Brook SINC (TV0609) has contiguous boundaries with TV0275 in the west (Anna Valley Watercress Beds) and TV0331 in the east (the River Anton). TV0299 (Church Meadow) is an area of unimproved grassland on the west bank of the River Anton, south of the Pillhill Brook confluence, and is itself contiguous with TV0331. The four SINCs form an interconnected local network of sites of biodiversity importance due to their meadow and aquatic habitats.

For the Examiner’s information, the Pillhill Brook SINC also runs westwards from the western boundary of TV0275, extending outside the Neighbourhood Area. The SINC citation is: “The Pillhill Brook is a chalk river that flows into the River Anton, a tributary of the River Test, one of the most species-rich chalk rivers in the UK. There are confirmed records of the notable species, otter and water vole, along the length of the brook.”. An unbroken watercourse SINC designation now exists from the origin of the Pillhill Brook to the River Test Site of Special Scientific Interest.

19. Revised Use Classes came into effect from 1st September 2020. Are there any references in the UCNP which would require consequent up-dating?

QB response: the QB is not aware of any such references.
20. The monitoring and review of Plans is an important component in the plan-making process, in order to ascertain whether or not the policies are effective. I could find no reference in the UCNP to the monitoring of the policies or to the future role of the PC (working with TVBC) in this process. I would welcome the views of the PC as to why this issue has not been addressed in the UCNP.

QB response: the QB understands the importance of monitoring both the implementation of the made policies and their continued relevance over time. Planning Practice Guidance indicates there is no requirement to review or update a neighbourhood plan, but the QB appreciates that factors such as the current review of the Test Valley Local Plan and/or the emergence of new evidence may result in policies in the NDP becoming out of date. In this event, the QB would consider the most appropriate approach to updating the NDP, in consultation with Test Valley Borough Council. This could include a full or partial review. To reflect this intention, the QB suggests the following modification in the form of an additional paragraph to chapter 9 of the Plan:

“9.5 The Parish Council will monitor the implementation of policies in the NDP and keep under review the need for the NDP to be amended and updated. Policies in the NDP may be superseded by other development plan policies, such as those arising from the current review of the Test Valley Local Plan, or by the emergence of new evidence. Where policies in the NDP become out-of-date, the Parish Council in consultation with Test Valley Borough Council will decide how best to update the Plan.”

Upper Clatford Parish Council
15 October 2020
Proposed NDP Appendix B, prepared in response to Examiner’s question 8.
APPENDIX B: CHARACTER OF SETTLEMENT AREAS

Descriptions of the following areas of settlement in the Upper Clatford Neighbourhood Area are provided pursuant to NDP policy UC6 and to supplement the Upper Clatford and Anna Valley Village Design Statement.\(^5\)

The character of the settlements within the Parish were subdivided into six areas which shared similar characteristics:

- Area 1: The Village Street and Conservation Area
- Area 2: Anna Valley
- Area 3: Above Town and Red Rice Road
- Area 4: Era Park and Balksbury Hill
- Area 5: Orchard Hill Farm
- Area 6: Red Rice.

\(^5\) Further detail may be found in the Evidence Document to this policy at https://www.upperclatford.com/community/upper-clatford-15048/ndp---consultation-documents.
Area 1: The Village Street and Conservation Area

Area 1 is subdivided into four distinct areas. Where appropriate, specific characteristics of each are described below, but where the characteristics are broadly similar, they are combined. Reference to specific areas are linked as per the map below as follows:

1a - Norman Court Lane and Church Lane
1b - Village Street (South)
1c - Village Street (Central) and Watery Lane
1d - Sam White’s Hill / eastern end of Foundry Road

Layout

- **Areas 1a and 1b** have a few large and mainly listed houses or barns set in rural farmland to the north east and south west and extensive water meadows across the central area lined on the west with forest.
- **Area 1c** forms the main street through the village from Sackville Court to Anna Valley and includes most of the historical houses and listed buildings. Many of the oldest street front houses are gable end on to the street. There are some ‘tracks’ off the main street with developments along these.
- **Area 1d** development is mainly on raised land west of Sam White’s Hill avoiding impact on Pillhill Brook valley with a mix of older thatched, Victorian and newer properties and some modern bungalows. Valley Rise and Manor Rise are mainly newer 1950–60s residential developments.
Appearance

- **Areas 1a and 1b** farmland with large mature hedgerows to the north east along Norman Court Lane and south of the Old Rectory. Church Lane is open both sides to the ancient water meadows with the Grade II* listed Church set in the water meadows. The area north of the Old Rectory is rural country lane with steep sided hill to the west with an old chalk pit.

- **Area’s 1c** general appearance is of a very old streetscape with a variety of mainly individual properties mostly 18th and 19th centuries, many of which are thatched. Some are repurposed for residential use such as the Old School House, Post Office, Chapel, bakery and village shop. Mostly low rooflines and no houses of more than two storeys. Muted colours.

- **Area 1d** many of the houses are not visible from the lower street level.

Scale and density

- **Areas 1a and 1b** have low density development where individual larger properties are set in their own grounds and gardens.

- **Area 1c** has a ribbon type development, and many of the houses have well-spaced grounds and gardens. Properties are a mix of small and medium sized mainly 18th and 19th cottages. There are also a few newer residential properties from the 1950s, 1960s and up to present day. Some very small ‘terraces’ of two to four houses.

- **Area 1d** – mainly small to medium individual houses. Medium density.

Materials

- **Area 1a and 1b** old red brick, brick and flint, slate or thatch with some important cobb walls. All Saints Church has Norman elements and later extensions in Brick and Flint.

- **Area 1c** the majority are of brick and flint with slate or thatch roofs, some have cobb walls and some weatherboarding. Later houses are of red brick.

- **Area 1d** is mainly brick and flint, some thatch and some newer brick-built bungalows.

Important views in and out of features and landmark buildings: The important street views are the Village Street itself and from the Village Street across the water meadows to the south and north of Church lane. Watery Lane provides views of the water meadows to the south and Pillhill Brook to the north. Views either side of Balksbury Bridge of meadows to east and the playground to the west. The views of the gap between Upper Clatford and Goodworth Clatford south from the path between the Village Hall carpark and the Old Rectory of the Church in the water meadows. Between Red Rice and the main settlement is an important heritage feature, Bury Hill Ring which provides important views over the whole settlement and wider parish area.

The connections between private and public spaces: The public spaces include The Green, The Church and Graveyard, and Balksbury playing field. The Village Hall car park, while not a public space, is owned by the Village Hall. Many are linked by footpaths which also provide access to Bury Hill Ring.

The character and uses of surrounding areas: Actively managed arable farmland by Home Farm to west and Norman Court to the east. The Valley floor, which splits the area, is entirely ancient water meadows, occasionally grazed by cattle or sheep.
Area 2: Anna Valley

**Layout:** the hamlet of Anna Valley runs south of Pillhill Brook between Brook House and St Anne’s Well with a parallel through-route provided by Foundry Road. The north of the hamlet is mainly given over to woodlands and fields with four detached houses which can only be approached from the Salisbury Road. Foundry Road is characterised by ribbon development in the east whilst the west consists of post-war estates mainly built on a brownfield site formerly occupied by the Waterloo Foundry. There are three single-track lanes running off Foundry Road, one of which runs north under The Lodge to Sun Valley; the second runs south to the Old Chalk Pit which is leased to a scaffolding company whilst the third, which also runs south, services two infill properties and Ambleside which is within Area 3, Above Town and Red Rice Road.

**Appearance:** the eastern end of Anna Valley is suburban to the south of Foundry Road, with watercress beds, woodlands and fields between Foundry Road and the parish boundary to the north. The western end of the hamlet is suburban with extensive estate development on both sides of Foundry Road. The ground to the south of the hamlet rises to Bury Hill.

**Scale and density:** the density north of Foundry Road is mainly very low, due to the amount of land given over to agriculture. The estate to the north (Tasker’s Drive) is of medium density containing detached houses in single plots. The estates to the south (e.g. Brook Way, White Oak Way and Highbury Road) are also mainly of medium density although Bury Hill Close, which consists of semi-detached and terraced housing, is of higher density.

The vast majority of houses in Anna Valley have two storeys with some bungalows in Foundry and Highbury Roads. The only three-storey property is Bury Hill House, a Victorian residence, which has been converted into flats. As it has been rendered, it does not stand out amongst the surrounding buildings.

**Materials:** the bulk of housing is constructed of brick, with some rendered elevations, under tiled or slate roofs.

**Style:** with the exception of the Victorian and Edwardian properties associated with Taskers Foundry (Brook House, the Mission, The Lodge and Waterloo Terrace), houses are of inter-war and post-war designs. The style of the post-war estates varies, being contemporary to the decade in which the houses were built.

**Important views in and out of features and landmark buildings:** important views out of Anna Valley include those to the south with the backdrop of Bury Ring to the south and of the open unmanaged wooded area north of Waterloo Terrace. Landmark buildings include Brook House, formerly a
residence of the Tasker Family, Waterloo Workmen’s Hall, Lodge House, and the semi-detached cottages of Waterloo Terrace.

The connections between private and public spaces: public spaces include small areas in Taskers Drive (surrounding the Waterloo Ironworks plaque), Valley Mead, Brook Way, White Oak Way and Foundry Road. The Anna Valley playground and the open space up to the settlement boundary is also an important local open area. The Chalk Pit is owned by the Parish Council but tenanted out and therefore not accessible to the public. A public footpath connects the area and links it to Bury Ring and Areas 1 and 3.

The character and uses of surrounding areas: the surrounding area to the south includes the heritage site of Bury Hill Fort and farmland. To the north, the low-lying land is wooded with Pillhill Brook and associated watercress beds.

Area 3: Above Town and Red Rice Road

In UC6, the Area 3 was subdivided into three sub-areas:

A. Clatford Manor
B. Above Town
C. Red Rice Road.


Layout: The western part of Upper Clatford runs from the Village Green, along Red Rice Road, to the high ground bordering Bury Hill. The southern part of this area is mainly given over to agriculture with post-war housing development (Above Town) bordering the Upper Clatford Conservation Area. The northern part of the area (Clatford Manor and its associated post-war housing estate) and Red Rice Road is a ribbon development with a mix of residential and agricultural land.

Appearance: The area has two of the distinct private developments, Clatford Manor and Above Town. Above Town was developed in the 1950s as a Council Estate and many of these were sold off under the right to buy scheme in the 1980s. Clatford Manor was a private development in 1960. Red Rice Road is a ribbon development of individual houses and bungalows, with some of the latter being slowly replaced with larger houses. North of houses on Red Rice Road are four properties which stand on larger plots.
Scale and density: Properties at the eastern end of Red Rice Road are of medium density being detached houses within single plots, many of which have been enlarged in recent years. Both the Clatford Manor and Above Town estates are of higher density and consist of semi-detached and terraced housing.

Most houses in this area are double storey. Some of the bungalows in the Above Town estate were originally built for older people. The only three-storey property is the former Clatford Manor, a 19th Century residence, which has been converted into flats.

Materials: Most of the constructed is with brick elevations, those around Clatford Manor being rendered, under tiled or slate roofs.

Important views in and out of features and landmark buildings: Red Rice Hill and Bury Hill Ring afford excellent views to the east over the settlement area and the Anton valley, and south across farmland. The view at the lower, western end of Red Rice Hill is through the chestnut trees of the village green, a distinct and important open space. There is an important green space in the quadrangle of Clatford Manor.

The connections between private and public spaces: There are several public spaces within this area including the lawns and trees within Clatford Manor estate and more limited open areas in Above Town. These areas are all connected by footpaths or pavements.

The character and uses of surrounding areas: The land to the south of Red Rice Road is farmland. To the east and north it abuts other parts of the village. The area to the west is Bury Ring Farm with view of the beech trees on the ancient defences of Bury Hill Ring, an important heritage site.

Area 4: Era Park and Balksbury Hill

Era Park and Balksbury Hill lie south of the A303, outside the Settlement Boundary and within the Local Gap.

Layout: Individual properties on single / joint plots and an industrial estate (Balksbury Hill) with light industrial and sports complex to the east (Era Park).

Appearance: Residential houses are two storey 3-5-bedroom detached houses mainly on single plots with direct or single-track access to Balksbury Hill. Those on entrances to industrial areas have two-way access. All roads other than Balksbury Hill, are unadopted. Era Park and the sports complex are not visible from the public roads.

Scale and density: The housing is of low to medium density; the industrial buildings and the sports facilities have greater scale but low density. The houses in this area are two storeys; the industrial buildings are a mix of single- and two-storey design.
Materials: The housing is constructed with brick elevations under tiled or slate roofs. The buildings within the industrial estates have brick elevations; those in the Balksbury Hill Industrial Estate being in part rendered or painted.

Important views in and out of features and landmark buildings: The important views from this area are into the green spaces within the Local Gap which surrounds the complex. To the north is the remnant of an ancient Hill Fort. The most important view is to the south, across open countryside towards the Pillhill Brook, with the settlement edge of Upper Clatford and Anna Valley beyond.

The connections between private and public spaces: The area lies on the road to the west (Balksbury Hill) which is an important link between the settlements. The A303 runs along the north east boundary and the settlement.

The character and uses of surrounding areas: Except for the area adjacent to A303, this area is almost wholly surrounded by private open green space. To the south and west is the open space within the Gap. To the north west is the ancient Hill Fort, largely destroyed in construction of the A303 by-pass.

Area 5: Orchard Hill Farm

Layout: Orchard Hill Farm and Little Orchard, a residential property to its north are located on the eastern side of Norman Court Lane in the northeast of the parish within the Local Gap.

Appearance: the area is set in rising farmland with water meadows surrounding the River Anton.

Scale and density: there are two two-storey houses, one quite substantial (Orchard House) and a complex of farm buildings (barns and chicken houses). The density is very low.

Materials: both Little Orchard and Orchard Farm House have brick elevations under tiled roofs. Little Orchard has rendered walls. Agricultural barns are mainly brick with metal corrugated roof. Chicken houses are thought to be timber frame with corrugated asbestos type roof.

Style: Little Orchard is of post-war design, the style being that of a rural cottage.

Important views in and out of features and landmark buildings: there are important views to the west of the River Anton and associated water meadows.

The connections between private and public spaces: there are no public spaces.

The character and uses of surrounding areas: the area is surrounded by farmland to the north, east and south, and Norman Court Road to the west.
Area 6: Red Rice

**Layout:** Red Rice is a hamlet in the centre of the parish 1.5 miles southwest of Upper Clatford. It is located at the crossing of the Fullerton-Red Rice / Stockbridge Roads. Red Rice House is south of the Fullerton Road, has been used as a school since 1960s. Garden House is a large property to its south within Red Rice Park. To the north of the crossroads is Home Farm with its agricultural buildings and former tythe cottages for farm labour. Park House, a large newly built residence, lies north east of the crossroad.

**Appearance:** The area is rural with woodland to the south of the crossroads. Home Farm has the appearance of a working farm.

**Scale and density:** The density is low with Red Rice House and school buildings (classrooms, dormitories and staff accommodation) located in extensive parkland. Home Farm and Park House also sit within their own extensive grounds. All dwellings are of two-storey design with the exception of Park House which is 3 storeys.

**Materials:** All buildings are of brick elevation under slate or tiled roofs. Red Rice House is faced with Clipsham stone whilst Park House has lime rendering to its walls.

**Important views in and out of features and landmark buildings:** The important views are from the road to Red Rice east and west across the depression between Red Rice and Bury Hill Ring. This area is surrounded by open farmland, interspersed with woodland. The two listed buildings (North and South Lodge) are visible on the approach to Farleigh School from Stockbridge Road. An important landmark building is the main structure of Farleigh School.

**The connections between private and public spaces:** All open spaces are either within the school grounds, farmland (Home Farm and Abbotts Anne Estate) or privately-owned parkland and gardens (e.g. Park House and Garden House).

**The character and uses of surrounding areas:** The open spaces in this area are a mix of arable agricultural land, woodland, private gardens and extensive school grounds and playing fields.