

Upper Clatford Neighbourhood Development Plan

Response to Regulation 16 representations

Introduction

1. The Upper Clatford Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) was submitted by Upper Clatford Parish Council (the Qualifying Body, QB) to Test Valley Borough Council on 12 March 2020. A consultation in accordance with Regulation 16 was carried out by the Borough Council from 13 July to 8 September 2020.
2. The NDP progressed to examination on 21 September 2020. The QB has been given the opportunity to respond to representations made at the Regulation 16 stage. The QB wishes to respond to:
 - a representation by Test Valley Borough Council to the effect that some of the policies in the NDP unnecessarily repeat those in national planning policy or the Test Valley Local Plan, and
 - representations made by Atlas Planning on behalf of their client.
3. The QB's responses to these representations are set out in the schedule overleaf. The opportunity to respond is appreciated. The QB has no comment to make on the other representations.

Responses by the QB to selected representations to the Upper Clatford Neighbourhood Development Plan Regulation 16 consultation

Abbreviations used

NPPF: National Planning Policy Framework

NDP: Upper Clatford Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Draft

LGS: Local Green Space

SINC: Site of Importance for Nature Conservation

TVBC: Test Valley Borough Council

Summary of representation	QB response
<p>Representations by Test Valley Borough Council</p> <p>1. Policy UC1 <i>Sustainable development</i>: this is an overarching principle of planning which does not need to be repeated. The policy criteria could be incorporated into other policies of the NDP.</p>	<p>Policy UC1 follows logically on from the NDP's Vision and objectives. It explains how these social, economic and environmental objectives will be delivered and balanced against each other in the context of the Neighbourhood Area and provides a basis for the more detailed planning policies which follow. As such it helps to ensure that the NDP is coherent and locally relevant.</p>
<p>2. Policy UC11 <i>Local Green Spaces</i>: the final sentence of the policy is not required as the criteria for allowing development on Local Green Space is identified in the NPPF.</p>	<p>The QB does not agree that this final sentence is not required. The NPPF does not provide criteria for allowing development on LGS, other than to say at paragraph 101 that policies should be consistent with those for Green Belts. A policy statement in the NDP is clearly required to provide suitable guidance to applicants and decision makers. Indeed, TVBC themselves suggested such a final sentence in commenting on an earlier version of this policy at the regulation 14 consultation, in response to which the draft Plan was amended accordingly.</p>
<p>3. Elements of policies UC2 <i>Community services, facilities and recreation</i>, UC8</p>	<p>These policies in the NDP all contribute to delivering the Plan's Vision and objectives, from which they have been developed. They address the views and concerns of parishioners as expressed in the Questionnaire Survey and in responses to the regulation 14</p>

Summary of representation	QB response
<p><i>Landscape character and UC10 Andover – Anna Valley/Upper Clatford Local Gap and all of policy UC12 Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation unnecessarily repeat policies in the Test Valley Local Plan.</i></p>	<p>consultation on the draft Plan. They are coherent, comprehensive and locally relevant, reflecting and responding to the unique characteristics and planning context of the Upper Clatford Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>In respect of policies UC2, UC8 and UC10, removal of the elements disputed by TVBC would be to the detriment of the policies concerned by rendering them less coherent and comprehensive.</p> <p>In respect of policy UC12, this adds local detail to the Local Plan by setting out the context for SINCs in the Pillhill Brook and River Anton corridors as part of a network of designated sites and habitats identified in the Priority Habitats Inventory. It also applies the precautionary principle to sites which are proposed as SINCs or otherwise under consideration.</p>
<p>Representations by Atlas Planning on behalf their client.</p> <p>1. We object to the designation of LGS4 as contrary to the requirements of NPPF 100. The proposed area for designation (whilst valued to some degree) is not demonstrably special and does not hold a particular local significance. The land is also vast enough to be considered an ‘extensive tract’ and is not local in character. Accordingly, the NDP does not meet the first of the basic requirements. We therefore respectfully request that LGS4 is deleted from future versions of the Neighbourhood Plan. In addition, we contend</p>	<p>The QB notes that these regulation 16 representations are re-submissions of those by this respondent to the regulation 14 consultation on the draft plan.</p> <p>Table 7 to the NDP explains how LGS4 meets the tests in paragraph 100 of the NPPF and why it is of importance to the local community, demonstrably special and holds a particular local significance. Whilst this is disputed by the objection, the many expressions of support for the NDP’s Local Green Space proposals received through the regulation 14 consultation confirm otherwise and support the continued designation of LGS4 for the reasons stated. In respect of test c), the boundaries of LGS4 have been carefully chosen, mindful of national guidance that such spaces should not be extensive tracts of land. It represents a well-defined, contained parcel with specific attributes which may be readily appreciated from the public highways and footpath which border or cross it. LGS4 is local in character, reflecting the immediate landscape context and character created by such features as the distinctive boundaries of Priority Habitats, the A303 and the River Anton.</p> <p>In respect of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development, it is evident from the NDP’s Vision and objectives that social, economic and environmental aspects have been considered together in preparing the Plan. NDP policy UC1 confirms a balanced approach to the three overarching objectives of sustainable development. The ability of local communities to designate Local Green Space flows itself from national planning</p>

Summary of representation	QB response
<p>that the proposed NDP would also fail to accord with the second basic requirement, as the overly restrictive approach to development proposals within the proposed LGS would be contrary to the overarching objective of achieving sustainable development.</p>	<p>policy. In respect of NPPF paragraph 99, the Plan's proposals for LGS4 are consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services, as explained in the NDP at paragraph 8.31. LGS4, together with the other proposed Local Green Spaces, is also capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. In respect of the future expansion of Andover there are many other opportunities for peripheral development which do not entail encroaching on the proposed areas of LGS.</p>
<p>2. We also object to the inclusion of view 12 NE of Cobbett's Corner as an important public view under policy UC9 as the view achievable at position 12 is not a public view, nor is it reasonable to consider it 'important'.</p>	<p>The view from Cobbett's Corner was included in the draft Plan. Following the regulation 14 response made by this respondent, it was removed from the Plan. The QB considers this objection to have been met.</p>
<p>3. Finally, whilst no objection is raised to the inclusion of the proposed additional SINC sites, we do query the rationale behind the proposed designation of only a partial stretch of the Brook, when it would appear there is an opportunity to include the full extent.</p>	<p>This objection has now been met by the designation of SINC TV0609.</p>

Upper Clatford Parish Council
15 October 2020