

Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan

Examiner's Clarification Note with TPC Responses (26.5.21)

This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification. For the avoidance of any doubt matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

Initial Comments

The Plan provides a clear vision for the neighbourhood area. It develops a series of policies which get to the heart of its character and the appearance.

The presentation and layout of the Plan is particularly good. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is noticeably clear. The Plan makes good use of various high-quality maps.

The package of supporting documents is both comprehensive and helpful. The Sustainability Appraisal and the associated site selection process and documentation provide a helpful context to the housing sites included in the Plan.

Points for Clarification

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now able to raise issues for clarification with the Parish Council.

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of my report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions.

I set out specific clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan.

Examiners Query Policy SB2

The approach in this policy helpfully identifies the range of uses which may receive support outside the settlement boundary. However as currently drafted it does not make it clear that development outside the settlement boundary (in open countryside) will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and which may include a range of uses related to policies set out in the Local Plan and the submitted neighbourhood plan.

I am minded recommending a modification to achieve this effect. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

TPC response

SDNPA raised this in their Pre-submission response and TPC addressed it in its responses to SDNPA. It was further raised in the SDNPA's report on the Submission plan.

You will see TPC take the view that in listing the classes of development which may be permitted outside the SB, the TNP provides the "exceptional circumstances" which SDLP requires. There is no conflict here with the SDLP because "exceptional circumstances" are not defined in the SDLP or in other policy. TPC have been considering a minor modification to the TNP to make this clear to the users of the plan.

If this addresses the point the Examiner is raising, we will welcome his wording. Alternatively, TPC suggests the following change for the Examiner's consideration:-

Add at end of SB2: "These constitute exceptional circumstances for the purposes of SDLP Policy 25.2".

Examiners Query Policy HN1

The details in the second part of the policy are awfully specific.

Does the Parish Council have the evidence to support such an approach?

The reasons for setting housing size limits in HN1 and the evidence from the Housing Needs Survey to support this are set out in Explanatory Note EN/B House Sizes Policy. For Twyford to sustain a fair and balanced housing market it must provide affordable market housing available to the local community. Limiting the size of future market houses using nationally recognised minimum standards as a starting point and allowing only a modest increase to these in future housing construction seems a sensible way of achieving this.

Evidence on the current high cost of housing in Twyford and the imbalance towards larger and more expensive houses is illustrated in the 2013 Twyford Rural Community Profile

https://10beee29-400b-4cd1-b5d6a6c4243c7d06.filesusr.com/ugd/2c77d0_e89caa5225ba4bd3966d3c6d47232e7b.pdf

The housing data on page 31 shows how small a proportion of Twyford housing is in council tax bands A,B and C (the lowest tax bands). The proportion in 2011 was 26.6% compared to 46.2% for Hants and 66.2% for England and this has not improved since that date with 21

four-bed and 14 three-bed market dwellings built since 2011 compared with only 12 two-bed and 8 one-bed market dwellings. (SDNPA dwelling completions records for Twyford). The Rural Community charts also show the 2009 median house prices for Hampshire as being £370k detached, £255k semi-detached, and £201k terraced. This compares with the recent median prices for Twyford in April (HM Land Registry) of £833k detached, £418k semi-detached and £386 terraced which represents a 1.6 to 2.2 times increase over a 12 year period when median salaries have not increased by the same percentage. It is relevant also to note that overall, sold housing prices around Twyford over the last year were 24% up on the previous year and 18% up on the 2018 peak of £514,952.

As a result of the above, the housing affordability ratios for Twyford (median house prices as a ratio of median salaries), which were already high in 2011, are likely to have increased in 2021 making Twyford even less affordable to younger individuals and families. In the view of TPC, the House Sizes Policy is justified as a way of trying to rebalance this, and is a more equitable approach to these issues than focussing on “small and medium sized houses”.

Examples can also be provided of large extensions, both to large and medium sized houses, and to new build following demolition of smaller houses and of applications, both refused and pending, of very much larger replacement houses.

Note that EN/D addresses the setting of specific size figure in the plan and accepts that it is to some extent arbitrary. It follows figures already set by others in statutory plans. Whatever figure is set will immediately be taken as a minimum by applicants and test to its limits. So there is little point in adding the word “approximately” as this will also be challenged and the maximum “flexibility” will become the norm, using successful challenges as precedents. The SDNPA has produced a supplementary policy to help define the 30% limit which is qualified by “approximately”

Also Note that the New Forest National Park Local Plan is now adopted; the house size policy is SP 21.

Examiners Query Policies HN3, HN4 and HN5 (second part a/b)

Do these policies bring any added value beyond the relevant Local Plan policies?

TPC response to HN3 query: Yes, the eligibility criteria for Hewlett Close differ from those applied by SDNPA, namely that priority is given to those with the local connections specified regardless of whether they are currently living within the SDNPA, (as the SDNPA criteria state), and less priority is given to the qualification by employment in the Parish. This is because of the very large numbers coming into jobs in Twyford from surrounding settlements.

SDNPA appear anxious to impose their own criteria and have raised the matter in both consultations. As eligibility criteria will be imposed as a condition or by Sec 106 Agreement by SDNPA, TPC’s inclusion of specific criteria will set the policy framework for the Planning Authority’s decision.

This issue is addressed in Explanatory note EN/C.

TPC Response to HN4 query as for HN3

TPC response to HN5 (second part a/b) query as for HN3.

Both of these add to the SDLP.

HN5 is seen as an important policy as it is likely to be the one most used by the widest range of people, for multiple purposes. The SDLP policies are drafted to cover development both inside and outside the Settlement Boundary but with subtle differences. TNP HN5 is simpler because it applies only within the SB. The categories listed here do not appear in SDLP.

HN5.2a The 30% limit applies in TNP to all dwellings inside the SB, not only to “small and medium sized houses”, and to larger houses only if it is not overbearing and detrimental to the amenities of local residents as in SDLP SD 30 and 31.

See Explanatory Note EN/B.

HN5.2.b restates policy HN1 for clarity and completeness.

HN5.2c could be repositioned in LHE4. See response to the Examiner’s query LHE4 and suggested amendment.

Examiner’s Query Policy HN7

Has the policy’s content now been overtaken by the recent change in ownership of the site?

Could the approach in the second part of the policy be equally well applied to uses other than residential and which would be consistent with the building and its location?

TPC Response: Yes. The change in ownership has changed the circumstances. The policy needs to be updated. The policy for the elderly no longer appears relevant.

However, the principles worked out in anticipation of the sale of the property on the open market with the possibility of change of use and further development still apply. The Parish Council suggests the following wording:

Amended Policy HN7 follows with tracked changes:

Policy HN7 Orchard Close

Purpose of the Policy

Orchard Close has been a residential home, established by Catherine Cusack ~~it has~~ providing ~~ed~~ assisted living accommodation for older people for over 60 years. ~~Originally established by Catherine Cusack in her own home, it is owned by Abbeyfield Winchester Society Ltd, a non profit organisation and charity. It is and has been the only such facility in the village.~~ Orchard Close is shown on Map 5. The pre submission version of the Plan included an enabling policy to support the continued provision for the elderly.

~~The Abbeyfield Winchester Society Ltd. It has~~ however now closed and the site was placed on the open market for while the Submission version of the [plan was in final stages of preparation. The Policy was amended to apply the principles of the previous policy to cover a wider range of uses,

~~It has now been acquired by Twyford School for School purposes but no planning application has yet been submitted. Orchard Close. However the rise in the number of elderly is a factor both locally and nationally and is identified as an issue for local and neighbourhood plans. The South Downs Local Plan support for increased provision within the National Park is set out in SDLP paragraphs 7.45 and 7.46 and 7.4.~~

~~Twyford's older population is currently above the national and district average and predicted to remain so. Consequently there may be an alternative operator who is prepared to meet the demand for additional facilities for the elderly which Orchard Close has provided up to now.~~

Orchard Close is located outside the settlement boundary; ~~and it's~~ further expansion development requires "exceptional circumstances" to be shown, in accordance with SDLP Policy SD25.2. a specific policy. The site is relatively large and merits a special policy to guide changes which are imminent. ~~has capacity for further buildings. The usual planning criteria would apply, with additional consideration being given to the ability of Bourne Lane to provide satisfactory access in terms of its width, footways, street lighting, use and conservation value.~~

Alternative Use

~~If the site is acquired for alternative use, the policy is set out by SD 25.2 which is very general terms and applies to all development in the National Park, outside the settlement boundary.~~ Orchard Close ~~however~~ has a number of individual characteristics which should inform of the landscape-led design of proposals for new development ~~and which justify a more focused policy.~~ These are:

- The Edwardian gardens as described by Hampshire Gardens Trust.
- The trees, both surrounding, and within the site.
- Bourne Lane is a historic sunken lane.
- Bourne Lane has no footway or lighting and is substandard width.
- Bourne Lane is heavily used.
- ~~The existing community focussed use for the elderly~~ The purpose built care home
- ~~The continuing need for elderly provision including downsizing within Twyford.~~

The institutional use

Applying these to an alternative use for the site there should in the first place be no new vehicular access to Bourne Lane to accord with MA5 and SD 21.2. There should be no increase in traffic generation above that already associated with the care home; current standards show that this allows reasonable flexibility for alternative development while safeguarding the historic lane from increased traffic. ~~for a small amount of residential development.~~

There are several dwellings close to Orchard Close, so the impact on change to residential use is acceptable amenity is also to be considered. ~~However, because of its current use for the elderly and the need for new provision for the elderly shown for instance in the Twyford Housing Needs survey, the continued use of the site for provision for the elderly is to be preferred to general housing, subject to demand.~~

Residential use or other uses may take place by conversion of one or both of the existing buildings. If redevelopment is proposed, new building should be limited to the footprint of the existing buildings, or to the immediate surrounds. The aim of this is to minimise the impact on the historic garden which was designed around a building near the top of the garden. Proposals which both protect the integrity of the garden and its features and secure its continued management are to be addressed in all proposals ~~and to be preferred.~~

The requirements for affordable housing will be in accordance with HN4 and SD 28.

The improvements to pedestrian access would be an advantage ~~but is likely to require third party land.~~

The location outside the settlement boundary, associated with the constraints of access and the sensitivity of the historic garden and its trees, all indicate a small scale scheme ~~determined in part by viability to secure the design objectives and the reuse of the site.~~

Policy - HN7 Orchard Close

~~1. The expansion of Orchard Close to provide additional facilities for the elderly will be permitted provided:~~

~~a) It forms part of Orchard Close.~~

~~b) It is justified by local need.~~

~~c) Landscape, access and design constraints are properly addressed.~~

~~d) Provision is made for medical care.~~

2.1. The change of use or redevelopment of Orchard Close to residential or other uses will be permitted provided

a) A landscape led design brief is first prepared retaining the existing landscape garden with its trees.

b) Any new buildings to be within or close to the footprint of the existing buildings

c) There is no increase in traffic generation.

d) No new vehicular access point is formed.

~~e) The Edwardian house may be retained or replaced as a private house.~~

~~f) New dwellings to be for the elderly~~

~~g) Affordable housing to accord with HN4/SD 28.~~

Note: Hampshire Garden Trust research on this garden is at HGT/ Orchard Close.

Both Twyford School and SDNPA make comments on HN7; TPC's comments on these are set out at the end of this paper, and in the attached schedules.

Examiners Query. Policy BE1

1. *As Policies HN3/4. i.e., Do these policies bring any added value beyond the relevant Local Plan policies?*
 2. *In any event the policy and elements of the supporting text read as being more onerous than local and national planning policies. Please can the Parish Council clarify its approach to this policy?*
 3. *In addition, in the second part of the policy is the 'like for like' approach reasonable?*
-

TPC Response to 1. Yes, for the following reasons:

- a) SD 34 supports proposals which “foster the economic and social wellbeing of local communities “subject to further conditions. TNP sees this as an umbrella policy which enables TNP to define economic and social wellbeing in so far as it affects the Twyford Community. As SDLP does not give further guidance on how economic and social wellbeing are to be defined for the purpose of this policy, TNP has scope to do so itself, guided by Government Policy NPPF paras.83 and 84 and the general aims of SDLP.
- b) SD 34 also applies to all proposals both inside and outside the SB; TNP distinguishes its approach between the two. Inside the SB, SD 34 applies without qualification but TNP needs to state this for the purpose of clarity of all users.
- c) Outside the SB, the application of SD 34 is qualified by the overarching policy of SD25.2 i.e., “exceptional circumstances”, which as has been mentioned before, are not further defined by SDLP. TNP seeks to define those circumstances. It does so by accepting SD 34 a-d. and g. as categories of development which appear to benefit the economic and social well being of Twyford Community and so should be approved and should pass the “exceptional circumstances “test.
- d) The two categories not accepted as meeting the “exceptional circumstances” test are SD34 e and f.

TPC response to 2:

- a) Twyford has a large employment base and has significant provision for a wide variety of businesses and employers. Its information base specifically collected for the TNP is of better quality than either SDNPA or WCC and included a survey.

In summary the Business survey was conducted by TPC using a wide variety of sources to identify all the economic activity in the Parish. It was therefore to include all employers as well as companies. Just over 100 were identified, but this still did not pick up the service workers employed by individual families in the village i.e. cleaners, gardeners, carers, child minders. Many of the 100 were very

small enterprises based at home. At the other end of the scale were the schools, the shop, the surgery/pharmacy, and the firms based at Northfields /HEP. A questionnaire was sent to each by email. Meetings were also held with the surgery and Twyford St Mary's. The initial response in mid 2016 was 14 replies; these includes the major providers of local services to the community (shop, pub, schools, surgery) employing between them 235 people. The percentage return was less than we had hoped. At a meeting in January 2017 with Jonathan Humphreys, MD of Northfields/HEP we requested further returns from his own company and his tenants; this resulted in 9 further replies from him and 8 of his tenants totalling a further 220 employees. Jonathan Humphrey said that these 9 (out of 17) represented the major companies at Northfields/HEP.

The headline information from these two sets of responses is that:

- 23 firms/employers responded out of approx. 100
- Employing approx. 435 people
- Of whom 318 are full time
- 7 % of total employees live in the Parish
- 90% come by car
- The firms operating in Northfields/HEP are generally focussed on wider markets than the Parish.

Using these figures the following estimates of total employment in the village are:

Northfields/HEP	275-300
Service employers	180
Shops, pubs and other Twyford businesses	100
Working from home (2011 census)	100
Total	655 – 680

Plus employment from two consents at Northfields including Care Home:

275-300

- b) TNP BE1 is firmly based on the adopted SDLP policy SD 34 and differs from it only in respect of development outside the SB where two further tests are to be applied namely.
- Is it in the social and economic benefit of the local community?

- Does it constitute exceptional circumstances?

.....and only in respect of two of the seven permissible categories listed by SD 34 e and f.

- c) The exclusion of categories SD 34 e and f is based on sound evidence and local circumstances. Subcategory e. provides for planning consents for businesses for “resilience” and to “protect local jobs”. Resilience is discussed in SD 7.134, and includes expanding premises; no limit or further criteria are set down so the extent of expansion for this purpose is unclear. The expansion of a site appears also to be permissible in this. The protection of local jobs is not a high community aim because, as shown by the TNP survey of local businesses and employers, level of provision relative to the economically active in the Parish is already very high (approximately equal). Few local people work for local employers and few of the local businesses serve the local community and finally because there are up to 300 further jobs in approved planning consents at Northfields.
- d) Subcategory f provides for the intensification of an employment site and makes more efficient use of brownfield land. The terminology used is overly broad and permissive. Further advice on intensification in SDLP para 7.135 gives no additional criteria; there is no limit placed on the expansion or intensification for any purpose of any established business or any existing employment sites by SD 34 other than the catchall but very vague “providing it does not compromise the special qualities of the National Park”.
- e) While the intent of the policy SD 34 is to deliver benefits, it does not appear to be deliverable in Twyford’s case, the potential for harm is strong. The existing employment sites outside the settlement boundary fall into the following categories:
- Converted farm buildings.
 - Listed buildings.
 - Long established haulage yard now diversified.
 - Northfields/Hazeley Enterprise park (Redeveloped egg farm)
 - Water bottling plant permitted as an exception to policy but now occupied by general industry.
- All of these sites are special cases of one sort or another, in sensitive locations mostly with multiple drawbacks (access by rural lanes; RoW conflict; remote from settlements/ sustainability; noise/ residential neighbours.
- f) None of the firms established in these premises are significant to the economic and social wellbeing of the Twyford Community.
- g) The expansion of each one of these sites/firms/businesses would be permitted under SD34a-d and g.
- h) In any case it should be noted that BE1 is permissive; it does not preclude a case being made which meets the “exceptional circumstances” threshold of the SD25.2 and permission being granted on that basis.
- i) The two unimplemented planning consents granted within BE2 provide scope for the expansion and modernization of the businesses established there. The approvals provide for additional floor space which would be available for the expansion of these and other Twyford businesses regardless of whether they conform to the categories listed in SD 34 or BE1. Further details of these consents are noted below.

See also the TNP responses to Pro Vision (Humphreys Group) and Explanatory Note EN/F.

The TNP policy BE1 seeks to apply the National Planning Policy guidance on Rural Employment Para's 83 and 84 (considering SDLP SD 34 and the purposes of the National Park) to the local circumstances of Twyford.

TPC response to 3.

BE1.2 "Like for like": ... There is a confusion here in our policy as the word "redevelopment" is repeated with a different policy in the following sentence. So, we should omit one or the other.

Examiners Query Policy BE2.1

I saw the scale and significance of Northfields Farm and the Hazeley Enterprise Park when I visited the neighbourhood area.

- 1. As I read the policy it appears to conflate the preparation of planning policy, the need or otherwise for a master plan to guide development on the wider site and the ongoing implementation of extant planning consents. Please can the Parish Council advise on how it approached these matters?*
 - 2. In terms of details:*
 - a) are there specific reasons why the feed mill needs to be removed before any further commercial development takes place on the site?*
 - b) is it reasonable to require that any development should not proceed before a master plan is agreed?*
 - c) in any event how does the Parish Council anticipate that a master plan would be prepared?*
 - d) Is the approach in the final sentence reasonable in requiring that elements of landscaping be located outside the site (notwithstanding any joint ownership matters)?*
-

TPC Response to 1

1. As you will appreciate the Northfields Farm/HEP site has presented a challenge to TPC for many years. Piecemeal consents given by WCC over the years have led to the creation of a substantial commercial area, cheek by jowl with residential property with several harmful effects (landscape impact, noise, smell and traffic) partly mitigated by conditions. The incremental development had been led by the initiatives of the landowner, not by policy. The TNP had clearly to consider the site from the point of view of the community and of the Development Plan especially SD 34 & 35.

2. TPC has noted that over the last 15 years or so while BE2 has been actively changed from farming into a commercial site by the owners, the LPA had not developed any vision for the future of this site of its own, despite its substantial size and the significance and the sensitivity of the surrounding countryside and settlement. This was the case with WCC and remains the case with SDNPA.
3. As the TNP has progressed over the six years there have been a number of changes for the TNP to take into account, including:
 - a. SDLP replacing the previous Joint SDNPA/WCC plan
 - b. The granting of further consents within BE2.

In addition, the owners have submitted two separate Pre-App proposals to SDNPA over the space of two years. Both were for an OAP retirement complex comprising approx. 100 units, utilizing a large part of the Commercial area (including the Mill). The first of these, in 2017, was done with no notification to the TPC; this was at a time when the owners were cooperating with TPC's Business Survey of their tenants and proposing Site 1 as an alternative to Site 26 for the housing and engaging in the business policies of the TNP. The second Pre-App was a year later.

Neither of the retirement village proposals has been proposed as part of the TNP. TPC considered them as part of the Pre-App process and objected to SDNP in a long a reasoned submission. This helped clarify TNP's approach on two points:

- As the care home might not proceed, the policy context for further applications should be put in place.
- Commercial use was preferable to OAP.

It should be noted that the consent (as shown on *SK1*) for the 132-bed care home was justified in part by the demand for this type of facility in the surrounding areas outside the National Park, but before the NP was designated. Another reason was that it would provide employment for local people. This was claimed by WCC without survey information to support it. Neither of these reasons put forward in 2008 remains valid in 2021. The third reason was to provide the owners with the incentive to relocate the mill. However, circumstances have changed here too.

The draft TNP policy for Northfields/HEP as sent for SEA was intended to:-

- Define the extent of the site.
- Establish its status as development land but outside the SB.
- Provide a framework in which the site could be considered comprehensively as new applications were submitted
- Its environmental impacts could be assessed cumulatively.
- Address the outstanding issues of landscape framework, hours of working and traffic routing.

A further consent was granted for redevelopment and new development over more of the site as defined by BE2. By July 2019, the SDLP had also progressed to adoption so following the publication of the Pre-Submission TNP in January 2020, TPC was able to review its policy in the

light of both objections and comments of SDNPA and Pro Vision for the Owners of Northfields/HEP and of the now adopted SDLP policies SD 34 and 35. TPC has addressed these matters in its responses to the two principal objectors/ sets of comments at Pre-Submission and in Explanatory Note EN/F.

In its revisions of BE2 for the Submission version of TNP, TPC noted that the SDLP SD 34 and 35 had settled the policy on the use of the land, - namely that land in commercial use should remain so. Both Pro Vision and SDNPA have endorsed the identification of the site as a local employment site (SD 35.4.b).

TPC has also noted that SD 34 appears to support a wide range of further commercial development on BE2 site with few constraints. TPC were alarmed by this because it seemed in conflict with the principle aim of SD 34 namely that it should be for the economic and social wellbeing of the community (in this case Twyford); that BE2 was a special case, which had not been clearly envisaged or planned for by SDLP; that BE2 needed to be considered both cumulatively and comprehensively for its effects on the environment. How else could the multiplicity of extensions of buildings and sites, be said to be “landscape led”.

So, the separate policy for determining what would happen if the care home were not built, could be dispensed with as SD 35 ensures continuation of the commercial use in any redevelopment.

So, the revised policy BE2 anticipates these further scenarios:-

- the abandonment of the care home consent and its replacement with commercial development
- multiple smaller applications in accordance with SD34
- re-development of the unconsented parts of the site.

The TNP then looks at the way in which the key policies for this site (landscape led, SD 34 and 35; community benefit) can be delivered while ensuring that existing environmental problems are addressed and the cumulative impact, with either limits set or mitigated, as necessary. The master plan is seen as the best tool for this purpose.

Of the two outstanding consents both appear to have been started and so are capable of implementation. The TNP has no influence if this development is built as consented i.e., the mill would be removed, the care home built with the additional commercial development and redevelopment.

However, BE2 would apply to any further development; the Master Plan requirement would still apply to guide the two other categories of developments above (i.e. to accord with SD 34 and the unconsented parts of the site as identified above). The exercise would be very much simpler as so much development would then be in place subject to conditions including the landscaping, hours of working and transport requirements of the two approvals.

So Yes, BE2 does conflate the three elements identified by the Inspector, but in this order:

- A. It notes the current state of play, the two unimplemented consents and the uncertainties created by the owners' proposals for alternatives, the lack of a comprehensive landscape of traffic plan etc and the absence of a bespoke policy for an important site in the countryside
- B. It notes SDLP's policies SD 34 and 35 should be applied to the site
- C. And proposes a master plan as the best way forward, as being able to be adapted to once the owners decide on their development intentions.

In conclusion, it sees the master plan process as the only way in which the Planning Authority can establish firm ground for making informed decisions and exercising control in the changed situation created by the new SDLP policies. TPC's remarks below explain this further.

TPC Responses to 2 on the detail questions:

2 a: The removal of the mill was the main justification for the grant of consent for the care home and the additional commercial development; the site was outside the SB at that time and therefore the consent was contrary to policy; it was also a key justification when the application was referred to the SoS as a Departure. As the site is outside the SB "exceptional circumstances" are required to justify consent under SD 25.

The mill remains an issue in creating noise, vibration, smell and heavy traffic using SDNP roads at antisocial hours, and as an eyesore. The removal of this mill is secured by Sec 106 with a timetable and the owners have bought a Mill in Calne to which they intend to move their operations within the agreed timetable. This timetable has in the view of TPC been unreasonably extended to 2026 from a consent granted in 2008; further development should not be permitted in advance.

- The mill is still in operation.
- It has until 2026 to be demolished.
- Sec 106 can be modified by the LPA with an appeal process.
- The consent was granted 10 years ago which is beyond the normal duration of both Local Plans and planning consents.
- It was not then, and has not been since, a planning policy.
- The 2017 consent (see on Plan SK1) was granted by SDNPA (WCC) for major new development without this requirement.
- The community support the demolition.

2b: The implementation of the two unimplemented consents (Nos 2 & 3 below) can of course proceed without the master plan at any time (subject to compliance with the Sec 106 requiring the demolition of the mill in the case of No 2 below). These consents are helpfully shown on the Plan SK1 attached to Pro Vision’s response to the Submission Plan; together they provide for the following floor space:

1. 03/00302/FUL: 4460 sq. m in 9 buildings with 16 units; All commercial. All built and occupied since about 2006
2. SDNPA/14/05196/REM (this amends 09/02924/OUT): 2990 sq. m in 8 buildings with 13 units. All commercial plus 5304 sq m Care Home plus play school 251 sq. m: granted in 2009; not yet implemented.
3. SDNPA/17/02639/FUL: 4220 sq. m in all commercial 5 buildings with 8 units. Not yet implemented.

The total commercial floor space if built as consented, will be 11,670 sq. m in a mixture of B1 B2 B8 uses floor space in 29 buildings. In addition there are:

- some unconsented areas containing several other buildings totalling approx. 500 sq. m
- the consented 130 bed care home of 5340 sq. m
- the consented play school of 251 sq. m.

Floor space on the site was provided by the owners in a note on 4th May 2017 as follows:

- B1 a 1988 sq. m
- B1 b and c 4697 sq. m
- B 8 2888 sq. m

This note states that this does not include the mill site redevelopment consented but not yet constructed.

TPC estimate the buildings on the mill site total approx. 1980 sq. m giving an overall total of 11553 sq. m in 2017 in approx. 22 buildings. There were 17 tenants as notified to TPC and recorded in the SDNPA Economic survey. TPC understand that this is the current floor space.

These figures provided here are taken from various plans and reports submitted and approved; they are intended to give a general picture rather than complete accuracy.

All the buildings are within the BE2 area

If the need for the master plan is accepted, a clear event is needed to trigger the preparation for development control purposes. TPC see this as any new development proposal. In selecting this event, TPC is looking at the scale of the existing operation, the scale of the consents granted and awaiting implementation, all as set out above. In summary, TPC note:

- The two unimplemented consents are for a total of 6100 sq. m commercial floor space in approx. 13 new buildings,
- with the care home and the playschool in addition,
- will provide buildings for a range of permitted business use classes.
- The buildings to be demolished are all tenanted.
- The largest building, a warehouse is to be redeveloped for much smaller buildings.

This is major development in any context and especially so in a national park and even more so in a village the size of Twyford.

2c: How is the master plan to be prepared?

The master plan is to be prepared by the owner/manager of the Estate in discussion with the Planning Authority prior to the submission of any further planning application.

The master plan is to apply the policy established for the first time in SDLP and TNP; it is to be applied to the whole of BE2 and to land around the perimeter of the site in the same land ownership. This is to ensure that the key objectives of the planning authority can be delivered as proposals for further development are considered. These are:

- being landscape led
- relating well to surrounding residential development
- achieving sustainability with an integrated plan for movement and access
- providing a base line for assessing cumulative effects

There is no prescribed form for master plans so the components and procedure will be agreed between the Planning Authority and the owners/managers of the Estate. The owners are well advised and, using a full team of experts, have submitted a series of high-quality applications. This work provides much of the basis for the master plan.

Landscape Framework:

This will be based on an assessment of the landscape objectives for the site based on the studies prepared as part of TNP and SDLP and by the owners own landscape architects. The framework will be a plan identifying key area to be kept open/ or planted to achieve these objectives. In the development which has taken place on the site over the last 15 years i.e., since the chicken sheds on the eastern part of the site were rebuilt as commercial buildings, the landscape controls have been set in the individual planning applications with no overall context. Planting has been carried out by the owner on land both within the site and on land outside the defined commercial area which has an important landscape function for future development but is not under the control of the Planning Authority.

Possible developments can be used to test the effectiveness of the framework. The framework in its turn will set the limits on the location of further development and the height and size of buildings and the balance between buildings, parking, and open land within the developed area.

If the approved applications are built, the scope of this landscape framework will be simplified as so much has been set by these consents. Nevertheless SD 34 with BE1 and BE2 allow for numerous smaller developments so the effects can be planned for through the Landscape Framework.

If, however, the care home does not proceed, and alternative development is applied for, the Landscape Framework will need to address major changes to what has been planned so far and be adapted to new forms and layouts of building. It is possible that the approved layouts for commercial development will be affected.

Relating well to surrounding residential development

Apart from the landscaping objectives, the interface of the Commercial/Industrial area with the surrounding development and community needs to be considered, including visual, noise, smell, hours of work, traffic and social interaction. Much of this work has been done already in the three planning consents shown on SK1 but they are not brought together, and no standards or objectives have been set for further development. The removal of the mill and the building of the care home and other approved development would change the external effects, if implemented. Reassessment is therefore justified before any further consents are granted.

If the care home does not proceed, the assessment has different matters to consider, i.e., whatever is proposed as an alternative.

Sustainability: integrated plan for movement and access:

The highway and access aspects of new development have been assessed and approved on a piecemeal incremental basis. Controls are voluntary. The routing of heavy lorries has harmful effects as noted in Response on MA4. The implementation of the consents will result in the demolition of the main lorry generating uses (mill/ Post Office), but with a greater number of workers and more floor space (care home; new commercial) traffic patterns will change. They will change differently if the care home is not built. The increased emphasis on reducing travel by the private car must be taken on board, together with information on the current car dependence on out of village residence of the great majority of employees.

Again, the extensive work by traffic consultants for the planning consents on behalf of the owners/managers provide a basis for the master movement and access plan, but a radically new situation has been permitted, the combined effects of which have been predicted but cannot be accurately assessed until built and occupied. However, until the mill is demolished the 2014 Planning consent cannot be implemented; the possible non-viability of the care home and what the alternative might be, compound the uncertainties. This is an issue for the timing of the master plan...see below.

Cumulative effects

SD 34 with BE1 and BE2 allowing for further development within the local Industrial site is defined in BE2. Additionally, most of the site has extant consents and on the assumption that these are built as permitted, the further developments are likely to be individually relatively small, - extensions, intensification, changes of use, extra parking etc. etc. However, the cumulative effect may be significant, for instance, on traffic and internal space currently undeveloped and landscape.

As the LPA elected not to require the preparation of an EIA under Schedule 2 of the EIA Regs, there is no current basis for assessment of the cumulative effects; this will be the function of the master plan.

Timing of the Master Plan

The site has the benefit of several consents involving redevelopment on a major proportion of the site with provision of multiple new commercial units and a care home. The first uncertainty is the timing of implementation. No development can take place until the mill has been demolished by 2026 but it could be demolished before. The development, however, does not need not be started then. TPC is uncertain if the further consent is also dependent on the implementation of the care home consent. The care home is also uncertain. The intentions of the owner/developer are not clear. BE2 plus SD 35 would establish commercial use as the alternative but without the current uncertainties.

In short there are fundamental uncertainties over the timing and implementation of the existing consents which put at risk the ability to assess and plan for the effects of further development. Further development including the preparation of the master plan should await the owners' decisions.

The master planning process

The following link gives a summary of a typical master planning process but as it notes there is no classical or set model. The first step is normally to establish the base position (Step A-B) i.e. the current active use of the site in accordance with implemented consents. However, in this case, that is set to change because of the demolition of the mill (but possibly not until 2026) and it is not certain if and when the owner will implement his other consents. In 2019, the position further changed with the adoption of the SDLP, changing the policy. So, the base position will remain uncertain until the owner decides which of his consents or even which part of them he decides to implement. Once the base position is established, a brief for the master plan can be established, so that the further studies can be completed to provide the parameters for further/alternative development.

https://www.kent.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/23583/Masterplanning-for-SuDS-Part-5.pdf

2d: The inclusion of land outside the development site for landscaping follows the current and past practice of the owners. Significant planting has been carried out by the owners in multiple locations around the perimeter of the site, some of which is conditioned as part of the

outstanding consents. This is indicated diagrammatically in BE2 (Plan No xxx) The inclusion of land outside the defined BE2 site is necessary to provide effective screening as many of the buildings are on the edge of the site and cannot be screened otherwise as the site and the buildings, as you will have seen, occupy high ground, sloping away steeply to the north and more gently to the south and is visible over a wide area. Landscaping around the edge to some extent replace trees lost within the site.

To sum up, the landscaping of land around the perimeter of the site is necessary to avoid harm to the landscape of the SDNP and enhance it. All necessary land is within the same ownership. It would be shown as “blue” land in a planning application on the BE2 site and so could be conditioned for landscaping.

Examiners Query Policy BE3

Would it be reasonable for a master plan to be required to assist in the determination of smaller, day-to-day development proposals?

The third part of the policy reads as supporting text rather than policy. I am minded recommending that it is relocated to the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

TPC response

As the Examiner will see from our comments on the School’s response to the Submission plan, TPC had been repeatedly told that a master plan was in preparation. This goes back some years. So TPC had anticipated the School’s master plan would have been finalised and agreed and integrated into the TNP.

As the TNP progressed but the school master plan did not, the TNP proposed a policy framework in which the school’s future developments could be fitted while respecting the objectives of the SDLP and the emerging TNP. This included the preparation of the master plan which we had anticipated was an action agreed by the School.

Now we learn that the School does not want to prepare a master plan which is contrary to its position a year ago in its comments on the Pre-Sub plan. We understand the substantial changes that have taken place at the School in the last year namely:

- acquisition of Orchard Close
- change of both headmaster and bursar.
- acquisition of the playing field adjacent to Hazeley Road.

As yet no planning application has been submitted for Orchard Close to change it to School use; it is not part of the designated area for Twyford school, so that site will continue to be subject to a separate policy albeit recognizing the School acquisition.

As for the School's site as defined in BE3, TNP has been amended to include the newly acquired playing fields.

So, these changes make the master plan even more important as our comments on the School's submissions explain more fully,

So, the question is what development can take place on the defined school site without triggering the need for the master plan?

In defence of the BE3 policy as drafted, it should be noted that the bulk of the defined School site is now the open playing fields, and that (as noted in BE3.3) this land to the south of its buildings has always been kept open by the school; in the TNP's view this should continue to be the case. Any change to this policy could only be in the context of an agreed master plan.

Similarly changes to access, parking and circulation would also attract public interest and have repercussions outside the boundaries of the site, so should be part of the School's strategy for access and movement.

Land north of the main buildings up to Bourne Lane is likely to have nationally important Archaeology (early Saxon Cemetery; see TNP evidence in support of LHE3) so this too needs to be evaluated.

Applications within the complex of buildings of the main school will involve either Conservation Area or Listed Building consents so an overall heritage Statement and Design framework is likely to be required in any case.

In summary, TPC propose that the policy remains as drafted but that it is left to the discretion of the Development Control team to judge if an application raises no wider issues and so would not trigger the master plan requirement.

TPC response on BE3.3

The maintenance of the setting of the house in which the school first started is an important design issue supported by the conservation area designation and the listing of buildings. So, the long held approach of keeping the land forward of the building free of buildings has been central to the development of the school complex.

The significance of the open land has been increased as the area now includes the land the whole way to the Hazeley Road. This is sensitive countryside for multiple reasons, many of which have been raised in relation to the DB1 allocation by SDNPA, Terra Firma (for TPC) Historic England and local people in comments on the Pre-Sub plan.

So, the continued protection of the land forwards of the school buildings should be included as a design parameter within the policy.

TPC agree it is wrongly worded and suggest the following amendment to BE3.1.3 as follows:

On account of the openness of the lower land (now playing fields) new buildings are to be confined to the upper part of the site in close proximity to existing buildings.

Examiner Query: PoliciesCP1/CP2

Is the added value of these policies (beyond Local Plan policies) the identification of the sites/assets concerned?

TPC response: Yes

Examiners Query Policy LHE1

This policy includes an excellent assessment of parcels of land concerned. The crafting of policy wording is also well-considered.

Noted with pleasure: TPC have requested WCC to consider extending the designated gaps on their side of the District /SDNPA boundary in their review of their Local Plan which is now underway.

Examiners Query Policy LHE2

How does the Parish Council anticipate that this policy would be applied in combination with Policy SD4 of the Local Plan?

TPC Response: TPC has produced a body of work to particularise the landscape character of TNP area. (Terra Firma’s reports; Village Character Assessment; photographic report of village views; Hampshire Gardens Trust analyses; Historic landscape report). It is this which LHE2 seeks to distil to guide future development, particularly but not exclusively in Table 3. All of this is in addition to the evidence produced for the SDLP and so gives more detailed framework for applicants and the Planning authority than is currently available.

SD 4 lists the main topics to be assessed in development proposals and advises on the methods and standards required. TNP relies on SD4 in those respects. [Note: SDNPA criticizes LHE2 but these concerns may really be about SD 4; alternatively the dependence of TNP on SDLP in this respect is not fully appreciated.]

LHE2 omits reference to SD4.4 and SDNPA criticize TNP for the omission. In defence of TNP, neither SDLP nor the SDNPA subsequently have given any further guidance on the Green Corridors despite them being in SDLP’s words “an essential component of the National Park’s GI” (para 5.18). TNP’s identification of Green Infrastructure in LHE5 and of the River Itchen and its valley in LHE6, provides more satisfactory guidance for users and fully addresses the Green Corridor terminology. This too is criticized by SDNPA for noting that the Green Corridor/ Infrastructure extends beyond the TNP boundary and requires a joined-up policy approach. This would be with both SDNPA and WCC to North and WCC to South. WCC are currently revising and updating their Local plan and SDNPA are working on the Itchen SAC and its management. TPC’s expressed intentions are therefore timely. The TNP is, we hope with justification, focussed on delivering an integrated policy approach to match the integrated habitats associated with the SAC, which are not of course determined by Local Authority boundaries but by the species and their needs. The impact of a planning application on a habitat beyond the parish boundary are, of course, relevant matters for a planning application.

Examiners Query Policy LHE3

Is the added value of this policy (beyond the Local Plan policy) the identification of sites?

TPC Response: yes

Examiners Query Policy WE1

There appear to be some words missing. Please can the Parish Council advise?

TPC Response: There is an extra word out of place: see amendment below.

Twyford Parish Council, in partnership with Hampshire County Council as Highway & Land Drainage Authority will bring forward a flood mitigation scheme to the east of the B3335:

Examiners Query Policy WE2

This policy reads as a process requirement matter rather than a policy. I am minded recommending that they it is repositioned into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

TPC Response:

TPC rewrote this Policy following detailed comments of the Pre-Submission plan by Southern Water. SW have now noted the change and endorsed it. However, we note the Examiner’s recognition that this outlines process rather than addressing Twyford’s specific concerns which were clearly stated in the preamble. The Pre-sub policy was clearer in this respect.

TPC have been constantly reminded by SDNPA that a neighbourhood plan should not repeat higher level policies. However, in the case of foul sewerage the higher-level policies of the SDLP are not at all clear and do not appear to mention foul sewerage specifically. Nevertheless, the umbrella policy is SD 54.1 in its reference to “other pollutants”.

As sewage issues are a major concern within the parish in specific locations, as set out in the supporting text to WE2. We suggest that the following wording adapted from SD 54.1 is reinserted as Policy WE2.1; this would form the introduction to the current wording of Southern Water.

WE2. 1. Development proposals will be permitted provided that additional foul sewage does not have a significant negative affect on people and the natural environment now or in the foreseeable future, taking into account cumulative impacts and any mitigation, by virtue of surcharging of the existing system.

Examiners Query Policy MA2

As I read the wider Plan the third part of the policy addresses a matter which is part of the wider housing allocation off Hazeley Road rather than a free-standing proposal. Please can the Parish Council clarify its thinking on this matter?

TPC Response

The provision of the extra parking spaces is a free-standing policy and land allocation unrelated to the provision of further housing. The TPC analysis of the parking situation supported by a survey (and by the public, the Parish Hall, the shop and the GPs Surgery), give ample proof of

the need for more spaces for multiple village centre use. The policy would still be in the TNP even if there were no extra housing over the allocation was elsewhere. In allocating the proposed housing on Site 26 [Policy HN2], TPC was of course aware that the land for the car park extension was in the same ownership [Policy DB1] and that there would be opportunities for co-operation on acquisition and delivery. The mixed-use allocation is of course in line with NPPF. The mention of the extra parking is included in MA2 to provide a complete picture on parking and to record the separate justification.

Examiners Query Policy MA4

Is the policy necessary?

TPC Response

Yes: This is a development proposal.

The issue of HGV access to and from Hazeley Enterprise Park (HEP) is an ongoing issue. Whilst the management of HEP impose a routeing agreement on HGV users and have some monitoring of the direction of travel of these vehicles, it is not always adhered to. HGVs travelling on the recommended route to and from HEP involves some 6km on minor roads through the SDNP and even then, access to the M3 is indirect and via partial-movement junctions. The more convenient route is through the centre of Twyford ignoring the 7.5 tonne weight restriction on the western end of Hazeley Road and this occurs daily.

The purpose of this Policy is to concentrate all HGV movements onto a more suitable road (i.e., the 1km of B3335 north of the village) and onto an all-directions junction of the M3 (i.e., Hockley M3 Junction 11). This would remove HGV traffic from 6km of Historic Rural roads (Policy MA6) and relocate it onto 1km of non-historic road.

The Parish Council notes that the representation on behalf of The Humphrey Group accepts the benefits this link could provide and does not object to this Policy, although noting that enabling development might be required to assure delivery. SDNP are silent on this policy.

Examiners Query Policy MA6

Is the added value of this policy (beyond the Local Plan policy) the identification of the rural routes?

TPC Response Yes, giving the identification, recognition and hopefully preservation of our historic roads. The policy is set within the context that this document is a Neighbourhood Plan identifying all major features of the village that may be affected by development.

The Parish council also notes that Historic England strongly endorses the inclusion of this policy.

Examiners Query Policy SS1

This policy takes a more restrictive approach to that in Policy SD 51 of the Local Plan.

Is there a specific reason for the approach taken?

TPC Response.

The TNP is more restrictive only in respect of free-standing solar arrays and wind turbines which are by their nature obtrusive. The limitation on the free-standing proposals both of SD51.1 and 2, derives from the TNP analysis of the extra sensitivity of the Twyford landscape for the following reasons:

- the high level of visibility from a wide arc both inside and outside the NP because of the ground form (high land and river valley)
- the multiple viewpoints because of the number of rights of way
- the “salient” aspect of Twyford at the western extremity of the SDNP, with land outside the Park to its south and west and high levels of visibility into it.
- the multiple layers of sensitivity of the Twyford landscape (SDNPA/ Itchen Valley/Setting of Winchester/Green Corridors/Infrastructure)
- high numbers of people viewing large swathes of Twyford daily.
- the multiple other pressures for development and activity from within Twyford and from the population outside, e.g., M3 widening; Southampton Airport expansion; new housing.
- Multiple other means of renewable energy can be exploited where for instance solar arrays utilize roofs of buildings or by use of waterpower or heat pumps.

We note that SD 51 is framed in a highly permissive way. While it is of course subject to the overriding duty/objective/policy to be landscape led, the policy SD 51 is a blanket one across the whole of the SDNP. The TNP can be more nuanced and so can produce evidence of support for its more restrictive approach.

It seems unlikely that the objective of this policy will be materially harmed by the policy restriction because of the small extent of land inside SDNPA which is excluded by the TNP policy, leaving ample space outside which is available for such structures.

Examiners Query Policy DE1

Is the implication of the policy’s approach that developments which do not follow its advice will not be supported?

TPC Response: Yes

Examiners Query Policy DB1

- 1. This policy incorporates an excellent development brief for a neighbourhood plan.*
 - 2. Should it make specific reference to the conservation area?*
-

TPC Response

1. Noted with pleasure.
2. Yes. The lack of a reference to the Conservation area in DB1 (or HN2) is pointed out by Historic England. It would be informative to refer to it, although, also in strict policy terms, this policy as with every other in the TNP is to be read in conjunction with the South Downs Local Plan, in this case SD 12 and SD 15 which cover it. HE seems to imply that the omission of full references means that the Conservation Area importance has been ignored or inadequately evaluated. This is not the case.
A small part of the allocated site, (0.2ha) is included in the CA as defined in 1980. The south and east boundaries of this small parcel follow boundary lines shown on the OS 1937!2500 in which it is part of a 1.9-acre Parcel no 171, the curtilage of a private house which is now the pre prep school. The boundaries are long gone; it is not known if they were there in 1980 when the CA was defined or what these boundaries comprised. The small parcel is now part of a larger arable field. The land contains no other historic feature but does include part of the clump of 1. mature beech and 2. pine trees which both the Brief and TPC’s own analyses of the landscape have identified as important. The whole clump of 11 trees is shown as Open Space in the DB1 layout and is now subject to a TPO; the landowners have

agreed it will be passed to TPC as public open space when planning consent is granted. In short, the Conservation Area’s purpose of preserving and enhancing has been achieved and HE’s concerns anticipated, albeit without the specific mention of the CA in DB1 to date

As well as including a small part of the Twyford CA, the north-west corner of the DB1 site borders the CA. There the original private house (not listed) and garden have developed into the pre-school complex. Buildings and play structures have been added; the land is separated from the DB1 land by high close boarded fencing.

The preparation of the SEA was fully informed on heritage issues by the SDNPA’s Conservation Officer as set out in SEA para 6.27. His review of the Twyford CA was by that time underway. The Conservation Area issue here was, and is, a landscape one so the further discussions recorded with the landscape officer in SEA 6.28 and 6.29 focussed on steps taken to protect the more sensitive views and the role of the clump of trees. Thus, the heritage assets were a key element in the appraisal of the site by the SEA. The SEA assessor in addition to the benefit of the advice of both the landscape and heritage officers within SDNPA had the further advice of TPC’s consultant landscape advisor, Terra Firma.

We suggest the following paragraph is added to the supplementary text of DB1:

“Conservation Area:The NW corner of the site (0.2 ha) falls within the Twyford Conservation area of 1980. The sole feature of conservation importance is the clump of 11 mature beech and Scots pine which is on high land and widely visible. Only three are within the 0.2 ha area and are to be retained as part of the whole clump both as a feature of importance and to preserve views into the Conservation Area and across the new development. The tree clump is now subject to a TPO clump and its future management is to be secured by its designation as Public Open Space when planning permission is granted and dedication to the Parish Council. A Heritage Statement will be required in accordance with South Downs local plan policies SD 12 and SD 15”.

Examiners Query Policy DB2

Is the second part of the policy effectively the two criteria which follow on from the first part of the policy?

TPC Response: yes

Examiners Query Policies LHE4, LHE6, WE1, MA1, MA3 (the first two parts) and M5

These policies address a series of interesting matters. However, they are community actions (something which the Parish Council or the Parish Council with others intends to implement) rather than land use policies.

To retain their importance within the Plan I am minded recommending that they are repositioned into a separate part of the Plan as highlighted in national planning policy. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

TPC Response

LHE4 Conservation Areas. TPC was asked to include this policy as a free standing one by Twyford Conservation Area document. TPC had been led to expect that this document would have been finalised and would do the “heavy lifting” for the conservation area policies for the TNP. Although a draft was sent informally to the TNP technical team by SDNPA early in 2020, this was not followed up by any formal process of consultation. Comments were made by the TNP technical team but the document did not progress. As a result, the TNP LHE4 policy simply referred to the 1980 document with no further elaboration. The only policy which TNP currently includes for the Conservation Area is that in HN5 safeguarding walls and gardens. This policy should be retained. It is supported by existing evidence including the 1980 CA, the draft revision by the SDNPA, the Twyford Character Assessment etc. We suggest that the HN5 policy is moved to LHE4 which is retained and redrafted as follows:

Policy LHE4 Twyford Conservation Area

1. Twyford’s Conservation Area as designated by Winchester City Council in 1980 will be subject to SDLP SD 15.
2. Within the Conservation Area proposals which safeguard garden land and walls will be approved.

The supporting text of LHE4 should also include the following:

“The gardens of the conservation area are an especially important contribution to its character; both in the areas of smaller houses and cottages as well as of the larger and grand houses. Walls too are important, both those fronting paths and roads and boundary walls separating gardens and house plots. Both walls and gardens should be retained.”

LHE6 Biodiversity. The first part of this policy identifies the statutory and non statutory local areas of Nature Conservation value in Twyford. It is an especially important part of the neighbourhood plan and fundamental to the SEA and we think to the support for the plan by HE in their Submission response. It should be retained in the body of the plan.

As to LHE2 comments on Winchester City Council’s revisions to its Local Plan, SDNPA appear already to be working on a non-statutory cross border policy for the River valley into which this policy would fit. The cross-border policy is an important one as the dynamics of the River is a cross border feature; joint planning of the River and its valley is an important land use consideration, e.g., Nitrate pollution and its causes.

The Third Point is aspirational.

WE1 Flood Risk Management. Flood risk as will be noted from the Flood Mitigation reports and supplementary text to WE1 is an important issue for the village and one that is to be solved hand in hand with the housing development area and improvements to village parking. The flood mitigation scheme shows that land outside the highway is required and this is duly safeguarded and identified in the plan.

This policy has preceded beyond the aspirational and is now agreed by Hampshire County Council who will be responsible for its maintenance as Highway and Land Drainage Authority. HCC have agreed that TPC can take the lead in preparing the scheme and securing the finance, which TPC have now largely secured in cooperation with the land ownerships required. Because of the high profile of this issue, we request that it should remain in the body of the plan.

MA1.1 Agreed that MA1.1 is aspirational.

MA1.2 is a further example of TPC taking the initiative to deliver infrastructure improvement which is properly a responsibility of Hampshire County Council but with the support of County and District. The District Council has awarded this project £50,000 CIL. The route is also identified and may require third party land which is safeguarded by this policy. The cycle route policy is a cross border linking WCC to the north and south and extending further south into Eastleigh. Retain if possible in the body of the plan.

MA3 Minor Traffic Management improvements; we agree that these are aspirational as clearly stated in the supplementary text. We would prefer them to be retained within the main body of the text but highlighted as aspirational. Traffic is the most important matter identified by parishioners as impacting upon their daily lives within the village.

MA5 Transport within the village

TPC agree that these are aspirational. However, they are the schemes identified by parishioners as key matters during the consultation process and to be addressed within the life of the plan. Increasingly CIL monies are being allocated to parish councils by SDNPA to finance schemes that in the past the Highway Authority would have undertaken at their own expense. Parish councils are in this way becoming key agencies in the delivery of infrastructure, including this sort of minor traffic scheme. They do however benefit from identification as policy. Retain if possible, in the body of the text but highlight as aspirations.

Examiners Query Policies ST2, LHE7, SS2

These policies do not appear in the shaded policy boxes which are used elsewhere in the Plan.

Please can the Parish Council clarify which elements of the relevant sections are intended to be policies?

TPC Response

All of these were policies within the pre-submission plan of the TNP as they seemed to TPC to be important to the understanding to the National Park changes and its land use policies for achieving its objectives. SDNPA have despite the balancing arguments put forward by TPC, put pressure on TPC not to repeat any policy of the SDLP's.

In TPC's view, both TNP and the SDLP would gain by showing that the two plans are part and parcel of the Development plan and acknowledge full their relevant roles. In short, TPC would like to restore these as policies in the same format as in the remainder of the TNP.

ST2 Tourism: The policy text for ST2 as included in the Pre-sub plan dealt not with land use issues but Countryside Management ones. This was pointed out by SDNPA and we agreed. The policy was removed but the text retained.

However, support for improved information to make the special qualities of the national park more widely understood and appreciated, is an important SDNPA aim; in this case it was wrongly expressed. The Findon neighbourhood plan has approved policy which could be amended to express the intention of the TNP in this respect.

"ST2 Improving signage and information: Proposals for the improvement of information and signage for local people, visitors and tourists will be supported, provided that they are appropriate to their surroundings".

LHE 7: Dark Night Skies is a flagship policy of SDLP, but it is innovative so will not be widely known to Twyford residents or to other non-specialist users of the TNP. In TPC's views it would be especially useful to include LHE7 as a freestanding policy, supported by a map showing the two zones into which Twyford falls for the purposes of this policy, based on the SDLP map. This would be in line with the Pre-sub policy to which only SDNPA objected. The wording is as follows:

Policy LHE 7 (6) - Dark night skies. The Dark Night Sky status of Twyford Parish is set out in the SD interactive map. SDLP SD 8 will apply.

SS2: The encouragement of sustainable development is of course at the heart of both SDLP and TNP. The inclusion of SS2 (Sustainable Buildings) is one way in which that policy is delivered and is central to any suite of policies seeking to achieve sustainability in land use. It was supported by several people in Pre-sub comments with criticisms that TNP did not go far enough. SDLP however said it should be deleted as it

only repeated SDFLP policy. TPC acknowledge that the TNP Policy does not add to the SDLP policy and in response omitted the highlighted policy in the Submission Plan even though it was only a signpost. We have however retained the text as important and relevant information. TPC would prefer to restore the Pre-Sub text as Policy in its signpost form as follows:

Policy SS2 Sustainable and Adaptable Buildings All new development should incorporate sustainable design features to reduce the impact on the environment. This is to be achieved through SDLP Policy 48.

Representations

Examiners Query Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?

Does it wish to comment on the representations from:

- *Twyford School*
 - *Historic England.*
 - *The Humphrey Group*
 - *The South Downs National Park*
-

TPC Responses

TPC has responded to the four organisations listed above with the following attached schedules:

Organisation	Responders' Comments	TPC Responses
<p>Representations prepared by Southern Planning Practice on behalf of Twyford School</p>	<p>TS largely supportive of the TNP and believe it will positively help to guide new development in the village.</p> <p><u>TS Response to SB1</u></p> <p>1.1 As raised in previous representations submitted to the Pre-submission TNP, the school do not fully understand the rationale behind the proposed amended settlement boundary which seeks to exclude the entire Twyford school site. The Twyford Parish Landscape Assessment Part 3: Settlement Boundary Review undertaken by terra firma Consultancy Ltd in February 2016, guided by the SDNPA Settlement Boundary Review: Methodology Paper, made several suggestions to expand and contract the settlement boundary, however none of these suggestions related to the removal of the TwyfordSchool site from the existing settlement boundary.</p> <p>TS focus for representations is on 3 policies – SB1, HN7 and BE3.</p> <p>Response to SB1</p> <p>1.2 We note that the Twyford Parish Council response set out on pages 36 and 37 of the main consultation responses schedule (29 October 2020) states that Policy BE3 replaces the settlement boundary and “<i>gives the school extra scope not less</i>”. If this is the case we are supportive of this approach, however we believe that the removal of the section of the</p>	<p>Glad to have this recognized and supported</p> <p>1.1 and 1.2 See TPC’s response on this subject to the Pre sub comments of Twyford School as follows</p> <p>“ 7. Removing this change would impose a separate group of policies on one part of the school i.e. all those in SB1. The purpose of the special policy BE3 is to devise a framework for the school to plan its activities and future development on a comprehensive basis, and to do so for both the developed and undeveloped area. So BE3 replaces the SB policies and gives the school extra scope not less. The part of the school formerly within the SB, are the core buildings of original school and still in use for that purpose. Including them in SB would only make sense if the school were intending to put these buildings to alternative non-school use; however this would raise multiple other issues and is not, as TPC understand, what the school intends. In other words, the realigning of the settlement boundary provides development to take place in</p>

	<p>school site which is currently included within the settlement boundary, as defined by the SDNPA, is not evidence based and as such the amended settlement boundary in the TNP should be challenged by the Inspector.</p> <p><u>TS Response to HN7</u></p> <p>3.1 We would like to make both the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan Group and the SDNPA aware that Orchard Close was acquired by Twyford School in January 2021. As such the first paragraph in respect of policy HN7 on page 22 of the TNP under '<i>Purpose of the Policy</i>' should be amended to reflect the School's ownership. We would also like to highlight to the Inspector that this Policy has been largely created when Orchard Close was put on the market in Summer 2020, since the Pre-submission TNP, and therefore has not been through the full TNP consultation process.</p> <p>3.2 We acknowledge that Policy SD25 of the South Downs National Park Local Plan is quite general to cover all development in the National Park and we agree it is useful to have a Neighbourhood Plan Policy to guide development in local</p>	<p>the school property as a whole rather than having two sections where two separate policies prevail. The Special policy is designed to permit development on the school site for school purposes within the context of a master plan and so get rid of the "outside the settlement boundary" complications e.g. for staff flats."</p> <p>The School should be further reassured by the proposed modification to the text of SB1. This makes clear that the inclusion of a policy in TNP for development outside the SB, constitutes "exceptional circumstances" as required by SD policy 25.2</p> <p>3.1 Agreed; The draft policy was however supplied to the landowners and their agents and to SDNPA is known to have been referred to in the negotiations on sale.</p> <p>3.2 The policy and preamble sets out the key constraints. The efficient use of previously developed land (if it is) is subsidiary to the Statutory duty for national parks. Development</p>
--	---	--

	<p>circumstances in accordance with Paragraph 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). However, we encourage the TNP to ensure that Policy HN7 is not overly restrictive to prevent the efficient use of an area of previously developed land outside of, but very well rated to, a settlement boundary.</p> <p>3.3 With regards to the expansion of Orchard Close to provide additional facilities for the elderly, we do not believe such policy aspirations are evidence based. It is understood that the former care facility at Orchard Close ceased business due to lack of demand in this location. This lack of demand is evidenced by the Twyford Housing Need Survey Report which was undertaken in July 2015. This report confirmed at Paragraph 28 that only two households families needed support to live independently and three further households wanted to downsize and stay in the parish (Paragraph 25). Five households do not justify the provision of the care facility at Orchard Close. The TNP acknowledges that whilst the continued use of the site for provision for the elderly is preferred, this is subject to demand. We believe that the evidence presented in support of the TNP does not justify the need for the care home. It is also pertinent to note that there is an extant permission for a 131 bedroom care home at Humprey Farms in Twyford which is capable of being built out, however, it is understood that there may not even be the need for this facility and hence the TNP looks at options for the redevelopment of Northfields Farm and Hazeley Enterprise Park at Policy BE2.1 of the TNP.</p> <p>3.4 With regards to the above, and the fact that Orchard Close is now under Twyford School's ownership with aspirations for the potential change of use of the site to boarding facilities or other schooling facilities, we request that the Inspector seeks the following modification of criterion 2 of Policy HN7 "<i>The change of</i></p>	<p>of this site should be landscape led.</p> <p>3.3 Policy HN7 has been overtaken by the acquisition by Twyford School and both the policy and supporting text to be amended.</p>
--	---	---

<p><i>use or redevelopment of Orchard Close to residential or other suitable use will be permitted provided:</i>". Our addition is added in red for ease of reference.</p> <p>We would also request that the Inspector removes any reference to the requirement for the site to provide elderly care facilities as there is no demonstrated need for such a use.</p> <p>3.5 We are supportive that the site should be developed in a landscape-led manner however clarity is sought on Criterion a) which states "A landscape led design brief is first prepared retaining the existing landscape garden with its trees.". We believe that a landscape report should only be required if a planning application for new built form is submitted on the site. The site is not of a size or in a highly sensitive location that would require it to have a landscape-led design brief.</p> <p>3.6 In respect of Criterion b), Twyford School endeavour to make efficient use of the existing built form at on site at Orchard Close prior to considering the potential to seek permission for new buildings. The acquisition of the site and redevelopment by Twyford School should be looked on favourably by the TNP as it could reduce the need to provide additional buildings on the main school site considered under Policy BE3. This policy will be discussed in further detail later in these representations.</p> <p>3.7 We understand and support the TNP aspirations to reduce traffic generation in the village and encourage this to be where possible and practical to do so. We believe that the traffic generated by Orchard Close will be reduced now it is in ownership of Twyford School. Whilst there may be some trips to and from the site, it will be integrated with the main school site and the level of traffic generated from the site is considered to be less</p>	<p>3.5 Agree apart from the final sentence. The site has multiple qualities justifying a landscape led approach.</p> <p>3.6 The development potential of Orchard Close is limited by its location outside the SB and by its own landscape qualities and by the other considerations set out in HN7. The case for additional development has yet to be made. This would extend the scope of the master plan currently required for further development on the Schools land included in BE3</p>
--	---

	<p>than the previous care home use. The TNP should therefore support the redevelopment of the site for additional schooling facilities for Twyford School as it would fulfil criterion c).</p> <p>3.8 Criterion d) of Policy HN7 states that there should be no new vehicular access to Bourne Lane. We support this element of the policy as we believe the existing access provides a largely suitable access to the site. As the site is now in Twyford School’s ownership and is likely to be used for additional school facilities, we would like to highlight that the School would seek to improve the pedestrian access to the site to ensure it is safe and suitable which would be advantageous to the highway safety of Bourne Lane. If necessary, widening of the existing access may be sought, however an additional access is unlikely to be required.</p> <p>3.9 Criterion f) states “<i>New dwellings to be provided for the elderly</i>”. It is unclear whether this means that the redevelopment of the site should only provide dwellings for elderly persons, or if it means that a proportion of any new dwellings on the site should be for the elderly. Clarity should be sought from the Inspector regarding the TNP’s intended meaning of this criterion. In fact, as set out above, there is no demonstrable need for the provision of a care facility in Twyford, let alone on this site. Therefore we request that the policy is amended to reflect this and any need for a care facility is appropriately removed.</p> <p>3.10 In summary, we support the efficient use of land at Orchard Close for redevelopment, however we believe that Policy HN7 as currently written is over prescriptive and would appear to only</p>	<p>3.8 Bourne is a single track road with limited passing, with neither footways nor street lighting. It is an ancient lane so cannot be widened. It is also heavily used by school traffic twice daily as well as for access to Bourne Fields etc. and as a rat run.</p> <p>TPC have assessed the traffic generation of the care home and consider it to be less of a constraint than the landscape.</p> <p>Noted: the school should bear in mind policy MA7.</p>
--	---	--

<p>allow the site to be used for care facilities for the elderly or redeveloped for residential uses which would be new dwellings for the elderly as required by criterion f). We believe the Policy should be reworded, as set out at paragraph 2.7, to provide a more flexible, efficient use of a previously developed site in Twyford. Such an approach would be in accordance with section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>4.0 Response to BE3.</p> <p>4.1 and 4.7 TS state supportive of BE3.</p> <p>4.2 Policy BE3 sets out that further development of the school will be supported subject to the prior preparation of a master plan. Clarity is sought with regards to when and how this master plan would be approved by the TNP. Whilst it is understood why the TNP would like to see a master plan of the site, given the recent acquisition of Orchard Close and changes in teaching practices, it is believed that a detailed master plan would not be appropriate as it is quite likely to continue to evolve. Instead, we believe an indicative parameter master plan should be sought to be submitted with any future planning applications to show how the school intends to develop the site over the next 10 years. We would also like to highlight that whilst a master plan could detail the school's aspirations, each planning application should be considered on its own merits.</p> <p>4.3 Twyford School prepared a master plan in 2017 which detailed aspirations for the school over approximately a 10-year period. This document was an internal document which was mainly shared with governors and management; however, it was shown to the local community in 2018 for information</p>	<p>See above and TPC responses to Examiner.</p> <p>4.3 As far as TPC is concerned, the School's master plan never progressed beyond the draft stage. At no stage was it approved by the Planning Authority or even formally presented to them or to TPC as a consultee. Since then as noted in our response to the Examiner on BE3, the schools situation has been transformed by</p>
--	---

	<p>purposes. Since this time, and in light of the acquisition of Orchard Close, which may allow achievement of some of the school’s objectives, the way in which the school’s aspirations will be accommodated has changed. As such, the master plan is considered to be somewhat out of date.</p> <p>4.4 Criterion a) of Policy BE3 sets out that the master plan should incorporate “<i>Proposals for access and movement which reduces both the use of the car and the current impact of pupil related traffic on the village and local roads</i>”. Whilst Twyford School are supportive of the TNP trying to reduce traffic in the village, we believe it needs to be realistic and seek to minimise additional traffic and look at the potential to reduce existing traffic in Twyford. Twyford School have recently increased the morning bus service capacity to help reduce the reliance on the private car and therefore reducing traffic generated to and from the site in peak morning hours. At present, approximately 60 pupils use the morning bus service. The School are also currently looking at the possibility to provide an evening bus service for pupils which will help to further reduce the traffic generated by the school. In addition, if the site at Orchard Close were to provide additional boarding facilities, this could potentially further help to reduce the traffic generated on a daily basis to and from the school site.</p>	<p>the change of key staff, the acquisition both of Orchard Close and of the playing fields down to Hazeley Road. The previous focus on confining development to a tight cluster of buildings at the north of the site will no doubt be reviewed. This of course increases the relevance nature of the master plan, which will not include, more land and new considerations. This thinking needs to be shared with the planning authority as it evolves in order to inform individual applications. A full appreciation of the multiple constraints to which the School is subject is of course central to this exercise.</p> <p>TPC had always understood the preparation of a master plan was an initiative of the School and was reassured by that. It was one reason why the TNP was altered at the request of the School to incorporate the large additional areas to the south within the boundary of the special policy are in BE3. TNP would review this decision if the master plan commitment is removed, and would leave it in the countryside outside BE3.</p> <p>4.4 TPC appreciates the School’s efforts to reduce and limit the effects of traffic on the local roads, and on residents and to increase the School’s sustainability and carbon footprint.</p> <p>Reduction is in traffic to the school and reduction in its impact is has always been a key aim.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>4.5 Criterion b) and c) require the school’s master plan to incorporate a landscape and design strategy and a strategy for the historic fabric and archaeology. Twyford School endeavour to ensure any future development proposals both enhance and respect the landscape and the history fabric and archaeology on the school site. Twyford School are extremely proud of their history and are always looking to retain and enhance this where possible, especially the main school which is a Grade II Listed Building and has been since 1955. Testaments to Twyford School’s commitment to preserve the school’s history include the chapel within the main preparatory school has been preserved for generations. Other traditions such as court cricket has thrived over the years and will always be part of Twyford School’s history. As such, Twyford School do not believe there is a need for a masterplan to reiterate the school’s existing ambitions.</p> <p>4.6 With regards to Criterion 3), we believe this to be overly restrictive as currently worded. Instead, we believe that the location of any new buildings on the school site outside of the main built up area should be informed by a Landscape and Visual Appraisal to ensure they are located in a landscape led manner.</p> <p>5.0 <u>Conclusion</u> 5.1 Supportive statement</p> <p>5.2 However, as set out above, Policy HN7 has been introduced since the Pre-submission TNP Consultation and as such as currently drafted, we believe that it does not contribute to achievement of sustainable development as set out in Section 2 of the NPPF and it is not in general conformity with the strategic policies of the South Downs National Park Local Plan. Therefore, at present the TNP fails to meet basic conditions d. and e. of the</p>	<p>4.5 See above. This setting out of the significance of the School’s historic fabric, landscape and archaeology simply serve to underline the importance of full understanding prior to the agreement of further development. In the case of Twyford School all fall squarely within the policies set by NPPF, by SDLP. They are not matters either body leaves to the discretion of individual institutions however responsible. SDNPA has supported BE3 including the need for a master plan.</p> <p>TPC have taken great care to provide a framework in which the School can continue to evolve and develop which will recognize the impact it has on the local community and the nationally important multiple constraints. We have been pleased with the support we have had from SDNPA and the absence ...at submission stage of adverse comment from Historic England or the Twyford Community. None of these should be taken for granted.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>basic conditions that a draft neighbourhood plan or Order must meet if it is to proceed to referendum (Planning Practice Guidance - Paragraph: 065 Reference ID: 41-065-20140306). Notwithstanding this, we believe that this could easily be remedied by reviewing the policy in accordance with our comments set out at paragraph 2.7 to ensure Policy HN7 is not onerous or overly restrictive.</p> <p>5.3 In conclusion, we request that the inspector takes on board all of the comments set out above in these representations and in particular looks at the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenges the amended settlement boundary in the TNP in terms of the non-evidence based approach; • Seeks to amend criterion 2 of Policy HN7 to read <i>“The change of use or redevelopment of Orchard Close to residential or other suitable use will be permitted provided:”</i> and all references to the need for an elderly care facility are removed; and • Seeks clarity on the requirement of the Twyford School Master Plan and looks to reword some of the criterion as necessary. 	<p>It should be noted that the term master plan is not defined in either the TNP or the SDLP; In the context of BE3, TPC see such a plan as containing an understanding of the key assets of the site, the constraints imposed National and local policies, the current use of the site and the problems caused, if any. The aspirations of the School for further development then need to be tested against the base information and the preferred solution justified. The school should be prepared to share this vision with the local community so that they can comment before it is approved.</p>
<p>Bozhana Pawlus, Business Officer for Historic England</p>	<p>HE consider the Vision and Objectives conform to para 29 of the NPPF; also welcome the revision of Objective 5 in response to their previous comments and the addition of a specific objective for conservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of Twyford Conservation Area and the significance of the heritage assets in the parish.</p> <p>Policy HN2 and Policy DB1 are unified as a single policy for ease of reading and application of development plan policy, believing the current two policies serve no purpose and are confusing.</p>	<p>Disagree. Each Policy has a separate purpose; the first is the outcome of the site selection stage and indicates compliance with SDLP SD 25; the</p>

	<p>HE consider site 26 has potential negative impact on heritage and the mitigation and enhancement measures identified in the Sustainability Appraisal, and do not translate fully into the Purposes and Policies of the plan that address site selection. Policy HN2 does not contain sufficient detail on how the conservation area will be affected nor does it include requirements to avoid or minimize harm or direction to how this should be achieved.</p> <p>We note the statement in the Strategic Environmental Assessment that potential negative impacts to the conservation area resulting from development of the site could be mitigated through careful design appears to be based on an assessment that harmful impacts would not result in 'substantial harm' (See paragraph 6.27). However, the NPPF requires that great weight is given to the conservation of designated heritage assets <i>"irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance."</i> (NPPF, para. 193). As such we feel the comment in the SEA at this point is unsubstantiated. Without clearly setting out how proposals should avoid or minimise the potential for harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area, either directly or through change within its setting, we feel that at present the policy does not promote sustainable development.</p> <p>We note that a paragraph on landscape mitigation has been added to Policy DB1's supporting text. It proposes the retention of the tree clump on high ground in the centre of the site but it is not clear why this feature is significant and how it will be maintained. To ensure the Policy at DB1.d to retain this clump is enforceable we recommend that it is clearly identified on the proposals map. Policy DB1 makes no reference to views to and from the conservation area and how these will be protected through</p>	<p>second DB1 is the Design brief, also a substantial body of work.</p> <p>The HE comments appear to be desk based and not as the result of site visits. TPC hope that HE's concerns are fully addressed in our response to the Examiner's questions, and, if the Examiner thinks fit, by the addition of the additional paragraph to the Explanatory text of DB1 plus our reliance on SDLP SD 12 and 15.</p> <p>As background, TPC were very surprised by the potential negative impact on heritage when the SA assessor flagged this; TPC challenged it. The SEA assessor then took further advice from SDNPA's Heritage specialist. As well as the Landscape Officers. The notional harm of development within the Conservation area defined in 1980 is not borne out by the facts on the ground i.e. that there is no longer identifiable heritage value other than the trees.</p> <p>Part of the clump (3 out of 11 trees) is within the Conservation Area. This is proof of its value.</p> <p>The site has been fully analyzed by a series of assessments and the trees identified as of value. The landscape studies required by DB1 will</p>
--	--	--

	<p>appropriate design, layout and materials. Paragraph 125 of the NPPF states that: <i>“Plans should, at the most appropriate level, set out a clear design vision and expectations, so that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable.”</i></p> <p>The SA/SEA includes a recommendation that mitigation of potential effects on the conservation area should be set out in an addition to this policy requiring: <i>“Ensure that views from within the conservation area are protected through the appropriate design and layout of the development and the use of muted tones for building materials.”</i></p> <p>We feel this would be an appropriate requirement given the role of the land in the green setting of the conservation area and as green space within it. However, a more specific and directive wording to guide design would provide greater clarity. Whilst we would recommend engagement with the National Park Authority’s conservation advisor in formulating a requirement we would suggest requiring the provision of views from the conservation area through green open space to the wider rural setting as part of the layout of development, to protect the contribution of the wider countryside setting to the character or appearance of the conservation area and the restriction of development fronting Hazeley Road to two storeys with a set back from the road including front gardens to reflect the character of development facing it on the south side.</p> <p>The allocated site is adjacent to areas identified in the Plan as having particular archaeological interest; however, it is not clear whether the potential for impacts on non-designated heritage assets recorded on the Hampshire Historic Environment Record has</p>	<p>provide further explanation.</p> <p>These views are severely limited by high fencing around the pre prep and by distance and slopes e.g. from the grounds of Twyford School and from other parts of the CA from which views are all restricted and framed by other buildings.</p> <p>This is a very small development of 20 dwellings within an existing strong landscape framework bordering varied built form including tall Victorian houses of effectively three story height. The indicative form of development is shown in the Spindrifft designs which are to provide the starting point for the developer’s proposals.</p> <p>The LPA pushes the boundaries of archaeological (and Historic Landscape) further than the guidance provided by HCC or SDNPA or HE or indeed other neighbourhood plans. TNP’s extensive evidence base on this has been</p>
--	--	---

	<p>been assessed.</p> <p>Without further analysis of the potential impact on heritage assets, including non designated heritage assets, we would consider Policies HN2 and DB1 to be insufficiently detailed to adequately support the Plan’s objectives for the historic environment and achieve sustainable development.</p> <p>Policy DB2</p> <p>The policy’s supporting text should explain why Stacey’s garage is out of keeping with the conservation area and should provide a locally specific direction for the design of new buildings to ensure the policy is clear and implementable. Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that plans <i>“contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”</i>.</p> <p>Policy DE1</p> <p>We are pleased that Policy DE1 on the design of development has been revised and now references specific documents to be used in identifying local distinctiveness and other design characteristics.</p> <p>Policy LHE2</p> <p>We support the intention of the policy to protect locally significant views that contribute to the character and distinctive feel of Twyford Parish and we welcome the inclusion of a Landscape</p>	<p>supplied to Winchester City’s Archaeologist for peer review as well as to SDNPA’s Heritage Officer. There is of course always the possibility for further discovery but the potential in this area appears to be less than the identified areas in LHE 5.</p> <p>We hope the Examiner will see that that the concerns of HE have been fully addressed.</p> <p>If the site has not been visited, Stacey’s garage can be clearly seen on Google Earth, an industrial building of poor quality with a yard occupied by semi derelict old minis and other vehicles in the midst of a cluster of listed buildings and historic villagescape of the highest quality and historic value. The design of new build to replace this is an exceptionally tricky exercise requiring a number of constraints to be resolved. TNP is able to recognize the need for redevelopment and to provide a facilitating policy but does not see the further advice as helping secure a suitable outcome, nor has TPC the necessary expertise.</p> <p>Following HE’s and SDNPA’s suggestions at Pre Sub mission TPC carried out a photographic survey of the viewpoints. Additional evidence has been added to the TNP website.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Character Assessment in the evidence base of the plan. We are disappointed that the opportunity has not been taken to provide a little more information on these views and how they contribute to the significance of heritage assets in order to make the policy more directive and adequately inform its implementation.</p> <p>Policy LHE3</p> <p>We are pleased that the policy’s supporting text has been redrafted to include a section that addresses non-designated heritage assets. We also note the reference to the evidence base of the plan which explains how areas of “archaeological potential” and “significant heritage assets” were identified. However, the wording of clauses 1. and 2. of Policy LHE3 suggests that only these areas are covered by the policy rather than all heritage assets within Twyford Parish and this requires clarification. The policy’s supporting text unnecessarily repeats the provisions of the NPPF on archaeological investigations and does not set out specific provisions for the conservation of archaeological remains of interest during the planning process. We consider that to support delivery of sustainable development Policy LHE3 should require that, where a development has the potential to affect heritage assets of archaeological interest, a programme of archaeological investigation to be completed prior to submission of a planning application to inform design and allow for preservation of remains in-situ where merited, and by record where their loss is justified by the public benefits that would not otherwise be delivered.</p> <p>Clause 3. of Policy LHE3 states that “historic buildings” should be preserved for their “collective contribution to the natural beauty of the SDNP”. In our view, the existing wording would not represent an enforceable development control policy and, as such, we would</p>	<p>The supplementary text of LHE3 clearly states the dependence of LHE 3 on SDLP SD 12-15</p> <p>We note with some disappointment that HE criticize LHE3 for repeating NPPF text and also criticizes it for not repeating the South Downs local plan text. The wording suggested by HE is, no doubt, compliant with, but the wording relied on, is that of the SDLP which is the adopted Development Plan.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>like to suggest the following amended wording:</p> <p>“Twyford’s designated heritage assets and their settings will be expected to be protected, conserved and, where practicable, enhanced where they would be affected by development proposals.</p> <p>Proposals for development that will result in the loss of, or harm to a non-designated heritage asset will not be supported, unless it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the development outweigh the loss of significance of the asset and cannot otherwise be provided in a less harmful manner.”</p> <p>Policy LHE4</p> <p>We welcome the intention to provide a specific policy for the protection and enhancement of Twyford Conservation Area and we are pleased with the intention to review the current designation and provide detailed guidance to inform new development. However, at present this statement does not amount to a planning policy in itself, but merely refers to the policies to be found elsewhere. As such it appears that the plan has not provided a clear vision for the future management of the conservation area that would achieve the plan vision or objectives.</p> <p>Policy MA6</p> <p>We support Policy MA6 which is a commendable recognition of local character detail and we welcome the description of the special characteristics of historic rural roads and the inclusion of a map showing their location within the Parish.</p>	
--	---	--

Pro Vision (on behalf of Humphrey's Group) Responses to the SDNPA Consultation to the TNP.

Doc Ref.	Response/Comment	Change Recommended	TPC Response
1.2	Humphrey's Group identify themselves as key stakeholder in the TNP		Agreed
1.3	States support of TNP		Pleased to note
1.4	States the Group have significant objections	Asking for Public Hearing due to objections	
2.1	Still have Pre-Submission concerns on TNP several of the proposed policies are duplicating policy of the Development Plan, but without providing a "additional level of detail and/or a distinctive local level approach" ¹ . In which case, the policies in question are not in accordance with the General Conformity test.		Noted: for TPC response see Examiner's questions and TPC response. See also EN/A and TPC comments on SDNPA both at Pre Sub and Submission.
2.3	Acknowledges some of the policies we raised concerns about previously have been amended so that they now have a local detail to justify their inclusion in the TNP (provided they do not otherwise undermine the higher-level policy). For example, policy WE1 (Flood Risk Management of the water environment).		TPC have made extensive modifications to address this, as also noted by SDNPA
2.4	Policy SS1 (Renewable energy) has been amended significantly since pre-submission consultation. While the 'Final' version now has a local detail – assertion that the local landscape is less suitable for wind turbines and solar arrays – it is not clear where the evidence is to support this significant amendment and blanket ban on these types of	The amended policy remains problematic.	The purpose of the policy remains as intended in the Pre Submission. Policy SS1 restricts SD policy for the Twyford Parish area. Note: that this is a Development Management Policy in SDLP not a Strategic one For response, see Examiner's Question on SS1 and TPC response.

	renewable energy schemes across the NP Area. Restricting the higher-level policy position for the National Park (Policy SDLP 51) does not appear to have been justified		
2.5	In regard to Policy SS2 (Sustainable and Adaptable Buildings), there appears to be a presentational issue in that the actual policy wording (usually presented in a green inset box) is missing.	Assuming the policy wording is the final paragraph of page 62, we would note that this appears to be a duplicate policy without a justified local application.	The final paragraph of the Pre-Submission TNP taken out to meet SD requirements of not duplicating but resulting in a presentational problem. See Examiner's question and TPC response
2.6	Nevertheless, the submitted TNP still includes several 'duplicate policies', including (but not necessarily to) the following policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy LHE6 (Local biodiversity, trees and woodlands) (formerly Policy LHE5). • Policy LHE7 Dark Night Skies (formerly Policy LHE6). 		Noted. See Examiner's questions and TPC responses.
3	Housing Policies		
3.1		3.1 In regard to the approach to housing, we wish to rely on the representations made at Pre submission stage ² , which in summary are that there are two sites that have been identified as potentially suitable	Noted. TPC made a major effort to reply to all of Pro Vision's points in detail at Pre Submission. TPC now rely on these responses and the extensive evidence in the Evidence base on the site selection process. These show careful process validated then by the democratic process and by wide consultation. There is no community support for the 40 dwelling option or the use of both sites. TPC is disappointed that Pro Vision has not addressed TPC's Pre -Submission responses.

		for allocation to meet the housing targets provided by the Local Plan, but it is not clear that the evidence supports the selection of S26 over Site 1, nor does it indicate that two sites would be unsustainable or otherwise inappropriate.	
3.2	Indeed, the evidence base shows that S26 is only of similar sustainability performance to S1 only once mitigation is factored in, i.e., S1 is the better performing option, including in terms of landscape impact and does not rely on mitigation to make it acceptable ³ .		The option selected by the Parish Council was tested and then supported by the SEA.
3.3	Dismissal of the alternative option of allocating both sites to meet the identified Local Housing Need (a higher figure than the allocation from the Local Plan) appears to have been dismissed prematurely noting that S26 is preferred subject to mitigation but S1 is less constrained including in terms of the significant issues of landscape and heritage impacts.	Stating local housing needs figures in the TNP are incorrect.	As above.
3.4	The key factor in selecting 26 over S1 appears to be the level of community benefits that can be delivered directly by the former and not the latter ⁴ . On the basis that S1 is better performing overall, but there is hope for specific community benefits to be delivered from S26 and noting the Local Housing Need is greater than 20 homes allocated from the		As above

	Local Plan, there is clear justification for allocation of both sites.		
3.5		Allocation of both sites to meet the Local Housing Need in full, would accord with the key objective of national policy to boost significantly the supply of homes (NPPF paragraph 59). It would also spread the benefits of development, including affordable housing, more widely noting that the two sites are in different parts of the village.	Noted. TPC have followed the Strategic guidance of SDLP on housing needs and is endorsed by SDLP. The Twyford Community has accepted 20 homes as the basis for its housing allocation, not 40.
3.6	Further, as we have previously noted, it would de-risk the Plan by avoiding over-relying on one site to deliver the local need when these are acknowledged to be significant constraints and there is understood to be uncertainty over who has control of the land. Whereas Site 1 is less constrained and is under the full control of the Humphrey Group, increasing its prospects of timely delivery.		Regular meetings have taken place with the landowner and all ownership details are known. Without any evidence, this is unhelpful speculation.
4	Employment Policies referring to TNP BE1		
4.1	We continue to have concerns over the supporting text, which continues to state “In Twyford there is		TPC has addressed these issues in its responses to the Examiner’s queries and in EN/F on Business. It

	no need for further employment and its encouragement would simply draw more people in from the outside” ⁵ . As we have stated in previous representations, this stance that the TNP is taking on employment appears to be at odds with the NPPF (paragraphs 83 and 84) and SDNPA policy SD34.		has also addressed the issues in its response to Pro Vision and SDNPA at Pre-Submission. Pro Vision do not address these substantial responses of TPC. The landowner here is in possession of two major consents for further commercial development, one granted 10 years ago, one in 2017 which he has failed so far to implement. In addition, SDLP SD 34, BE1 and BE2 both allow for unquantified further development. Both SD 34 and NPPF para 84 qualify their permissive stance by a number of caveats which BE1 and BE2 seek to apply to the circumstances of this site.
4.2	Likewise, we continue to have concerns that the supporting text states: “.... the expansion or intensification of other commercial premises, whether of sites or building, is resisted” ⁶ . This is again contrary to higher level policy.		Both SD 34 and NPPF para. 84 qualify their permissive stance by a number of caveats which BE1 and BE2 seek to apply to the circumstances of this site.
4.3	Equally, in regard to the wording of the policy itself, noting the lack of amendment in the Submission Version, we continue to have concerns that it is not in general conformity with national and Local Plan policy and is instead seeking to reinterpret those policies in a more restrictive way for the TNP area, rather than adding local level detail.	4.4 Overall therefore, while some positive amendments have been made to the supporting text of this policy, which is welcomed, there are still some significant conformity issues.	SDLP SD 34 is limited to those development proposals which “benefit the economic and social well being of local communities within the National Park”. BE1 and BE2 seek to apply these limitations within the TNP area.
4.5	Referencing TNP BE2 We have made comprehensive representation on		Noted. Also, that Pro Vision has not addressed the reasons given by TPC for accepting / rejecting Pro

	drafts of this policy previously and note that, while some amendments have been made, many of the concerns have not been addressed in the Submission Version and therefore we maintain objection to this policy.		Vision’s submissions at Pre Submission.
4.7	In respect of the supporting text, it is noted that a new paragraph is included since the Pre submission version?. This raises significant general conformity issues by explicitly constraining Local Plan policy SD34. The new assertion that this is justified so that individual businesses cannot “expand on an individual basis” runs contrary to national policy as well, which seeks to promote a prosperous rural economy (paragraphs 83 and 84). It is in direct conflict with NPPF paragraph 84, which promotes use of previously developed land “where suitable opportunities exist”. This should be tested through the planning system rather than a blanket restriction on business expansion introduced through the TNP.		BE1 and 2 both allow for further development in accordance with SD 34 (as modified by BE1). These policies define the “exceptional circumstances” as they apply in Twyford, in the case of BE2 subject to the preparation of a master plan. There is no “blanket restriction.”
4.8	We reiterate concerns expressed at Pre-submission stage that it is inappropriate and not consistent with Local Plan policy to seek to introduce a master plan for the site. A master plan would only be appropriate for a comprehensive redevelopment of the estate, not a retrospective master plan to seek to “regularize” issues that have, in any case, been addressed through various planning applications and legal agreements.		This is addressed at some length in TPC’s responses to the Examiner’s queries and in TPC’s response to SDNPA as well as our responses to Pro Vision at Pre-Submission. Master plans are flexible planning tools, not limited to comprehensive redevelopment. TPC have always accepted that the TNP is not able to revisit consents. It addresses itself to new development which the landowner has himself been exploring for this site with LPA, rather than with TPC and outside the TNP process. These proposals involved the redevelopment of the majority of the BE2 site.

4.9	It is understood that a master plan for the site has been an ambition of the Parish Council for some time. While policy MTRA5 of the Local Plan encourages master plans for “major commercial and educational establishments” in “sensitive rural locations”, the requirement is expressly stated as “prior to development”.		TPC and the landowner jointly objected to an earlier Local Plan in 2004 and appeared together at the Local Plan Inquiry advocating a master plan approach to the BE2 site. It was resisted by WCC and not taken on board by the Inspector to the regret of both parties. However, the Development Plan is now SDLP which supersedes earlier ones.
4.10	At Hazeley Enterprise Park, now identified as a Special Policy Area on Map 6, there are already three major and extant planning permissions that cover the development of the site (Appendix B). These have all been through the statutory planning process, and are subject to planning controls, through conditions and legal agreement.		Agreed. The plan in App B of the Pro Vision objection is helpful. Of the three applications, one (03/00302/FUL) has been completed and occupied for nearly 15 years; the two others for the Western 2/3 of the site remain unimplemented although capable of implementation. TPC have no dispute or issue with this.
4.11	Notwithstanding the lack of justification for a master plan in this case, it is noted that the TNP is seeking to rely on the site owner rather than the SDNPA to deliver a master plan. However, the site owner cannot adopt a master plan unilaterally, and it would of course have to be subject to public consultation and scrutiny by Officers, Members and other stakeholders. Only where there was the prospect of significant development over the Plan period – that has not already been subject to planning control – is such effort and expense warranted.		Agreed that the site owner should prepare the master plan and deal with publicity, just as he has prepared multiple applications for this site and obtained multiple consents including the three referred to above, all with extensive supporting information which is precisely what will be required for the Master Plan exercise; the material prepared for these applications is a substantial body of work which can help inform the further work required. The site owner is required by SD 25 to show “exceptional circumstances” to show why further development is justified on this countryside site outside the Settlement Boundary. On this site, the master plan will provide the “exceptional circumstances” required. Note that SDLP does not define what “exceptional circumstances” might fulfill their requirements. TNP provides certainty in this respect.

4.12	Therefore, our concern remains that as well as being an unreasonable policy requirement, given this is an established development area and has three extant permissions, it is placing unnecessary burden on the local authorities.		The master plan is only required when further development is proposed. See also TPC responses to the Examiner.
4.13	It is also relevant to distinguish the site (and policy BE2) from the Twyford Preparatory School (policy BE3). The School is understood to already be in discussions with the Parish Council about a master plan to guide its future development ambitions. No such discussions have taken place regarding with Northfields Farm/ Hazeley Enterprise Park, and as already explained, the site has been and is subject to planning controls associated with the three major extant permissions.		See however Twyford School’s response to the Submission plan and TPC comments on it and TPC’s response to the Examiner. For BE2, the site owners have been well aware of TPC’s aspirations for a master plan through TPC’s comments on its planning applications and Pre-Apps and its comments on three local plans; also via the TNP process and via meetings. If the subject has not been discussed at these meetings, it is because of the known difference of opinion.
4.14		We reiterate our concerns that this requirement for a master plan is not in conformity with the Local Plan, namely policy SD5 and there is no certainty about how any master plan would be scrutinized, who would approve or refuse it, and what status, if any, it would have in the planning system.	The term master plan is not defined by any SDLP policy or in its glossary. It is a flexible planning tool by which parties can agree the parameters of future development in accordance with agreed objectives/policies. Contrary to the Pro Vision objection, the proposal for a master plan is wholly in conformity with SDLP SD 5 (Design) in that it will set the landscape parameters which will for the first time enable the future development of the site to be “landscape led”: see SD 5.1 and 5.22-5.24.
4.15		Noting that the site is already subject to	The purposes/concepts of the SDNLP’s Whole Estate plan and of the master plan appear to be aligned;

		<p>three major planning permissions, and also that the area is now under the policy of the National Park Authority, a 'Whole Estate Plan' (WEP) (policy SDNP25), would perhaps be a more appropriate route for what the TNP appears to be seeking to achieve, i.e., coordination of a diverse range of commercial activities in a dynamic commercial environment, hence its passing reference to Local Plan Policy SD 25(3). However, these are generally aimed at large countryside estates of more than 400 acres, whereas the Enterprise Park is approximately 14 acres (or 5.5 hectares) albeit</p>	<p>both are planning tools to be adapted to particular circumstances; neither has a prescribed form/procedure.</p> <p>TPC has set out the particular challenges for this master plan in its responses to the Examiner; the key objectives are clearly set out in BE2.</p>
--	--	---	---

		within a wider landholding ⁸ .	
4.16	Nevertheless, scale is not the only factor, and a WEP would be a more appropriate vehicle for addressing general objectives (although not issues such as “hours of working” which are controlled at planning application, contrary to the assertion of the proposed criteria of Policy BE2.1 (b) that these are master plan matters).		Noted and partially agreed. Hours of working are of several elements which affect the relationship of the commercial area to the surrounding residential development, which will be a key consideration of the master plan and is a proper policy concern.
4.17	We reiterate objection to the policy seeking to constrain any new development at this ‘local employment site’ to removal of the existing mill business. This is a matter controlled in respect of a specific extant planning permission and associated legal agreement. It is inappropriate for the TNP to seek to widen these existing controls to bind any other development. The implications of the policy as put forward in Submission Version, despite our previous submissions, is that any of the existing businesses in this employment area could not change use until such time as the mill is removed. That is a very unreasonable constraint and liable to put businesses or new business opportunities at risk, not least in the prevailing difficult economic circumstances following the global health pandemic. In amending the Use Classes Order in September, the government is clearly seeking to introduce greater flexibility to support the economy. As submitted, the TNP is pushing the other way.		TPC agree that the removal of the mill is secured by Sec 106 agreement signed as a precondition for the issue of consent in 2010 or thereabouts. However: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mill is still in operation. • It has until 2026 to be demolished. • Sec 106 can be modified by the LPA with an appeal process. • The consent was granted 10 years ago in the context which is beyond the normal duration of a plan unimplemented planning consent. • It was not then, and has not been since, a planning policy. • The community supports the demolition. So, the policy is fully justified and requires a trigger which TPC have put as “any development”. However, TPC agree that the change of use of existing buildings does not appear to jeopardize the demolition of the mill. If this modification is included, it should be limited to existing buildings and not include land or any new building.
4.18	Finally, we have concerns regarding the third criterion listed as justification for encouraging		The multiple drawbacks describe those identified in the two pre-Apps for the Retirement complex

	alternative commercial uses in the event that the permitted care home is not implemented is inappropriate as it is too vague and is unsubstantiated: what are the “multiple drawbacks” of “noncommercial uses”?		submitted by the site owners on BE2. Also, those of the care home, for instance, the additional impact on the GPs’ practice and the very large numbers of employees, and the lack of contact with the village.
4.19	Overall, while it is supported that the Enterprise Park is identified as a key existing land use and the TNP is justified in having a site-specific policy (hence our support expressed in previous representations for policy SB2: Development outside the settlement boundary), the policy as put forward continues to be problematic, not least in respect of the vague and unjustified requirements for a master plan which appears to be seeking to rewrite established planning controls.		See our comments above and in response to the Examiner. In summary the site specific policy including the master plan provides the Exceptional Circumstances justifying further development outside the Settlement Boundary and is very much in the site owner’s favour.
4.20		The strength of our objections to the detail of Policies BE1 and BE2, which have been consistent through the plan making process, warrants a public hearing session with the Examiner.	This is a matter for the Examiner. TPC, hope they have provided more than adequate explanation and justification in support of BE1 and BE2.
5	Policy MA4		
5.1	We have made representations expressing concerns about the accuracy of the supporting text of this policy and indeed questioned whether it should be included in the TNP at all.		See Examiner’s queries and TPC’s reply.
5.2	Notwithstanding these concerns, we do not necessarily object to the actual policy which clarifies support for the principle of an alternative access to		Noted. TPC see that it would enhance the commercial profile of Northfields/HEP to have this new road as it

	the Enterprise Park, which could assist with reducing heavy vehicle traffic through the village		would give the site owners an access within 1 km of a junction with the M3 rather than the 6 km diversion along rural roads
5.3	While the supporting text claims that such a route would provide environmental benefits for the village, inclusion of a new road in the National Park will of course require careful assessment, not least in terms of landscape and biodiversity impact. We note, however, that SDNPA is silent on the policy in its comments on the Pre-submission TNP.		As 5.1
5.4	New infrastructure of this nature would normally only be feasible as part of facilitating new development.		Noted
5	Policy PO1		
5.6	Our previous representations on this policy do not appear to have entirely been understood judging by the amendments to the supporting text. It is still not clear how the assertion that odour from the mill is a main source of pollution is evidenced rather than anecdotal.		TPC have always considered the smell emanating from the Mill to constitute pollution. Many complaints have been lodged by parishioners over many years with the Environmental Health Department. The odours have reduced but continue; they are weather affected. The experience of the odours is first hand by residents, not second hand.
5.7	New reference to nitrates pollution in the Submission Version is noted. However, this should be in accordance with evolving guidance from Natural England, which seeks nitrate neutrality for all residential and overnight accommodation in the Solent catchment ⁹ . As submitted, this policy is widening this constraint to all developments.		This is a new area of planning concern and control. TPC follow the lead of SDNPA.
6	Conclusion		
6.1	The Humphrey Group is keen to support the Parish Council in its objective of producing a positive local policy framework for the village. It has engaged at each stage of the preparation of the TNP.		While the Humphrey Group has engaged with the plan in respect of the Mill and the selection of Housing site, it has promoted the retirement village on two occasions and further development within

			the BE2 site outside it separately through the development control process.
6.2	While it is welcomed that many of the comments made at the previous stages have led to positive amendments and clarifications to the content of the Plan, we continue to have significant objections to some key aspects, including the detail of the site-specific policy for Hazeley Enterprise Park (Policies BE1 and BE2) and for how the preferred housing site has been selected against the alternative options (Site 1 or both S26 and S1).		
6.3	In general, we continue to have concerns that many of the policies are not in general conformity with the higher-level policy.		TPC have looked at issues of conformity with particular care. The TNP is firmly based on the very recently approved SDLP; variations are based on evidence of local circumstances, are not substantial and deliver purpose and intention of the Local Plan and NPPF.

TPC Responses to the SDNPA comments of the Submission TNP.

Reference	Comment	SDNPA Recommendation	TPC Response
General comments	As previously stated in the SDNPA response to the Regulation 14 consultation there are a number of TNP policies which simply refer to a policy within the South Downs Local Plan (SDLP) and stipulate that the SDLP policy must be considered. As the SDLP will form part of the Development Plan, alongside the TNP, these references are not necessary. The SDNPA appreciate TPC have moved a large number of these policy references to the supporting text, but there are still policies which include signposting to a particular SDLP which isn't necessary, such as policy HN1.	1. Remove references to SDLP policy from TNP policies. If necessary and appropriate SDLP policy reference could be included within the supporting text of each TNP policy.	This has been pointed out by SDNPA on previous occasions. TPC have made multiple amendments to address these issues. TPC now see this as primarily an issue of presentation. See TPC's Explanatory note EN/A. TPC is happy to make any further amendments if the Examiner judges them to be necessary; for instance as we have no wish to repeat SDLP policies but we do wish to continue to refer to them where it is appropriate to do so, e.g. suggest rewording of HN1 to "In addition to being required to meet the housing mix requirements of SDLP SD27, new houses for one, two, three or four bedroom houses will be restricted to maximum floor area of....." (as HNI).
General Comments	As currently drafted the TNP policies include reference to policy numbers of previous version of the TNP. This could cause confusion for the reader and it is suggested that reference to previous policy	2.Remove older policy references in policy title, for example at HN2 the older policy references should be removed Policy HN2	Agreed

	numbers is removed.	(HN2 & 3 amalgamated)	
Section 1.3	The second sentence refers to the remaining 14 years of the plan period, however, the plan period remaining is currently 12 years.	3.It is a plan for the next 142 years to 2033	TPC to amend
Section 1, Para 1	Reference to a minimum of 20 dwellings should amended to read approximately as per SDLP policy SD26.	4.Another key decision for Twyford is the allocation of one or more sites for a minimum of <u>approximately 20 dwellings</u> between 2019 and 2033	Disagree: SDLP requires a minimum of 20 dwellings in SDLP7.26 says “at least” Suggest we remove the word “minimum” but don’t use “approximately” either.
Policy SB1	The supporting text to policy SB1 refers to a minimum of 20 dwellings, this should be amended to read approximately 20 dwellings as per Policy SD26.	5. The TNP is required to allocate land for a minimum of approximately 20 dwellings	SDNPA wording here is not clear; it’s either a minimum or approximate but not both.
Policy SB2	The supporting text to this policy lists several SDLP policies to which this policy relates. However, many of these policies are not specific to development outside the settlement boundary, they are also concerned with development inside the settlement boundary, therefore this list should be revised or deleted. As currently drafted this policy does not make it clear that development outside the settlement boundary (in open countryside) will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. This will ensure the reader understands that development outside the identified Settlement Boundary will only be permitted in exception circumstances, which include a range of policies set out in the TNP and SDLP.	6a Review the list of SDLP policies in the supporting text	6 a. This point is a consequence of the different approach of SDLP and TNP to the Settlement Boundary. The comment highlights that SDLP’s policies cover development both inside and outside the settlement boundary. TNP has the advantage of a defined settlement boundary and deals with the differences between the different situations more clearly and explicitly. The Examiner has also identified this matter and we have suggested a modification to clarify the status

		<p>6b 1. Development outside the settlement boundary will <u>only</u> be permitted in <u>exceptional circumstances as per</u> subject to the following policies of the TNP as set out in detail as follows:</p>	<p>of SB2 when considering development of the countryside</p> <p>6 b. Disagree: the TNP defines the circumstances in which planning permission will be granted. We have suggested additional wording to say in the supporting text that these constitute "exceptional circumstances"; it has the great advantage of avoiding the additional justification which SDLP requires for all development outside SBs.</p>
Policy HN1	<p>Part 3 of the policy requires maximum floor areas for new housing. It would be helpful if the supporting evidence provided more explanation of the rationale for this, other than New Forest Local Plan. There would also need to be evidence to support such a requirement in Twyford. The additional text does not provide sufficient justification for this approach</p>	<p>7. Provide additional evidence to justify the policy requirement for maximum floor areas for new housing</p>	<p>Explanatory note EN/B addresses this and additional evidence has been prepared for the Examiner.</p>
Policy HN4	<p>Part 2 of the policy seeks to control the eligibility for occupation of the new affordable housing. However, as currently drafted it is not clear what these eligibility criteria are. The policy states that the eligibility for occupation is as set out in HN4-1, however, HN4 – is only a reference to SDLP policy SD29. Clarification is required as to whether TPC are setting occupation eligibility as per the requirements in the SDLP. If HN4 is only signposting to SD29 and also referring to the occupation conditions set out in</p>	<p>8. Policy HN4 – Rural exception sites 1. Proposals for rural exception sites will be permitted with SDLP SD29. 2. The eligibility for occupation will be as set out in HN4 – 1. [HN4 – 2]</p>	<p>TPC addressed this issue in EN/C; we have explained the issues further in our responses to the Examiner. SDLP makes clear that eligibility criteria are to be discussed with local communities.</p>

	SD29, this policy is not required as it offers no more detail than policy SD29 of the SDLP.		
Policy HN5	<p>Part 2 of the policy places extra policy restrictions in relation to the previous policy clauses set out at HN5 -1. Many of these additional requirements would be required by policy in the TNP or policies in the SDLP, therefore many of the additional criteria are not necessary and should be deleted. Point a is already covered by policy SD31. Point b is already covered by policy HN1, therefore these policy requirements can be deleted.</p> <p>Part 2c) should be presented as a separate policy relating to development in conservation areas. This will need to be addressed in order for the plan to meet the basic condition of conformity with the local plan and national planning policy, where plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. An assessment of how the loss of garden and walls within the Conservation Area will impact on the heritage assets is required.</p>	<p>9 1. Development is subject to the following restrictions:</p> <p>a) for categories 1 a, 1 b and 1 d, the increase in floor space is limited to 30% and accords with SD 31.</p> <p>b) for category e, new detached houses should not exceed 150 m²</p> <p>c) within the Conservation Area there is to be no loss of garden land or walls</p>	<p>Disagree: there is a clear difference between SDLP policy and TNP. SDLP applies the 30% only to small and medium sized houses and those with landscape impact; TNP policy applies to all houses. See our response to the Examiner on this.</p> <p>A separate policy for the conservation area is to be found at LHE4. This was inserted in response to SDNPA's, and HE's comments at Pre Sub. We agree that the policy on gardens and walls should be retained but moved to form part of amended LHE4. See the Examiner's query on LHE4 and TPC's response to the Examiner.</p>
Policy HN6	<p>Part 1a of the policy as currently drafted requires a limitation of 30% on extensions and replacement dwellings as per Policy SD30 and SD31 of the South Downs Local Plan. Policies SD30 and SD31 require a limitation of approximately 30% on this form of development and the TNP policy should be modified accordingly</p> <p>Part 1c of the policy appears to prioritize two</p>	<p>10) For extensions and replacement dwellings, policies SD 30 and SD 31 will apply with <u>limitations of approximately the 30% being applied</u> in each and every case</p> <p>c) At racing stables, hostel</p>	<p>Racing Stables are a flourishing feature of Twyford; they have special needs for their type of business. "hostel" accommodation for stable lads is a requirement of racing stables. TPC responded to the same SDNPA comment on the Pre Sub plan as part of the</p>

	particular types of institution. It is not clear why these particular institutions are referred to in the policy, it is recommended that this aspect of the policy is removed.	accommodation tied to the operation.	comprehensive reply.
Policy HN7	<p>The intention of is to be welcomed given the support for increased provision of elderly care as set out in the SDLP. However, there are a number of policy criteria which seem restrictive given the nature of the facility.</p> <p>Policy Criteria 1b states that the expansion of the facility must be justified by local need. It is likely that people from outside the parish may want to live in any expanded facility, and the wider need for elderly care provision needs to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Part 2 of this policy, specifically Policy criteria 2a requires a landscape led design brief to be prepared. The SDNPA would require a landscape led approach to any expansion of the facility, but not necessarily a separate design brief.</p> <p>Policy clause 2c requires no increase in traffic generation as a result of redevelopment, given the potential range of redevelopment opportunities this may significantly restrict possible redevelopment</p> <p>Part 2 policy clause g only serves to repeat policy requirements covered by other policies in the TNP and SDLP and can therefore be deleted</p>	<p>11 a Consider deletion or amendment to policy HN7 1b.</p> <p>11 b 2. The change of use or redevelopment of Orchard Close to residential will be permitted provided</p> <p>a) A landscape led design brief is first prepared Any <u>redevelopment should seek to</u> retaining the existing landscape garden with its trees.</p> <p>b) Any new buildings to be within or close to the footprint of the existing buildings-</p> <p>c) There is no increase in traffic generation.</p> <p>d) No new vehicular access point is formed.</p> <p>e) The Edwardian house may be retained or replaced as a private house.</p> <p>f) New dwellings to be for the elderly</p> <p>g) Affordable housing to accord with HN4/ SD 28.</p>	<p>Policy to be revised now that Orchard Close has been acquired by Twyford School for staff and pupil accommodation. See the comment by Twyford School with TPC responses; the Examiner’s query on BE3 and TPC’s responses to the Examiner. TPC have proposed a modified policy.</p> <p>On traffic generation, SDNPA should be reassured that TNP have taken advice on the relative numbers of movements of the Care home and residential and do not see it as a constraint, let alone an unreasonable one.</p>
Policy BE1	As currently drafted Policy BE 1 part 1 offers no further policy requirement than SDLP policy SD35. Therefore, this part of the policy is unnecessary as it	12a 1. Within the settlement boundary, development, including change of use and	12a This is an example of where TNP gives extra clarity.

	<p>only duplicates SDLP policy. Part 2 of the policy, applies SDLP policy to the specific local requirements, which is welcomed. However, the policy only allows for redevelopment on a like for like basis outside of the uses specified, this is considered too restrictive and should be deleted.</p>	<p>redevelopment for economic purposes will be permitted, in accordance with SD 35. 12b 2. Outside the settlement boundary including BE2, new development, redevelopment and expansion, whether of site area or buildings will be permitted in accordance with SD 34, and the uses specified in SD34 (a—d and g only). In other cases re-development will be permitted on a 'like for like' basis. Changes of use for commercial purposes will be permitted provided that no additional heavy traffic is generated</p>	<p>12b Disagree for reasons set out in EN/F or business and employment. Ask SDNPA if this gives the explanation required</p> <p>TNP policy needs to deal with situation both inside and outside Settlement Boundary therefore reference to SD35 is sensible otherwise policy is lopsided, but perhaps it could be reduced to one policy, worded as follows: "Policy SD35 sets out requirements for development inside the Settlement Boundary however outside the Settlement Boundary including BE2....."</p>
<p>Policy BE2</p>	<p>The SDNPA welcome the designation of the site as a local employment site as per paragraph 7.140 of the SDLP. Northfields Farm is identified as site W1 in the Employment Land Review Update (2017) as both an existing and potential employment site with the following commentary:</p> <p>'Fully occupied mostly high quality business park for local businesses; adjacent to potential housing site in draft Twyford NDP; protected by draft general safeguarding policy in NDP; part of site permitted for new B uses.'</p> <p>Criterion 2 of Policy BE1 is unduly restrictive as it only allows like for like replacement of buildings on the</p>	<p>13a Consideration should be given to redrafting the policy so that it does not seek to control an extant planning permission.</p> <p>13b the provision of a Master plan is only relevant where proposals for the development of the entire site are submitted.</p> <p>13c Delete Criterion 2 of the</p>	<p>13a TNP does not seek to control an existing planning consent for the care home which it recognises as valid. This repeats SDNPA's Pre Sub comment which TPC addressed fully and directly both in its response to SDNPA and in EN/F.</p> <p>13b. TPC disagrees. See the Examiner's queries on BE2 and TPC's responses. TPC is disappointed that its positive attempts to propose a means of delivering a landscape</p>

<p>Policy LHE2</p>	<p>Supporting text for policy LHE2 refers to the adoption of SDLP policy SD4 and SD6 for Twyford, these policies will apply to Twyford as part of the development plan for the park so this reference is not necessary.</p> <p>The policy refers to SDLP policy SD4 and specific policy criteria. However, it omits policy clause 4 from part 2 of SDLP policy SD4. Policy clause 4 of SD4 is particularly important as it seeks to safeguard blue and green corridors.</p> <p>A number of the views set out in Table 3 relate to the Conservation Area and heritage assets within the parish. Reference within the policy is made to Policy SD4 of the SDLP. However, to be in general conformity with the policies within the SDLP, it should set out how SD4 2) is applicable to Twyford and how the Parish Council has demonstrated their understanding of the design principles of the landscape or illustrated how the protected views set out in Table 3, where heritage assets are listed, have been identified.</p> <p>More information on how these views contribute to the significance of the heritage assets as well as allowing an appreciation of the wider historic environment should be provided within the supporting text or a signpost to a document submitted as an evidence paper.</p>	<p>14a Delete reference to adoption of SDLP policies for Twyford</p> <p>14b If references to SDLP policies are to be included in the TNP policy (although this is not necessary) reference to the relevant aspects of the policy is important</p> <p>14c Further clarification of how policy SD4 is to be applied in Twyford, it should set out how SD4 2) is applicable to Twyford and how the Parish Council has demonstrated their understanding of the design principles of the landscape or</p> <p>14d illustrated how the protected views set out in Table 3, where heritage assets are listed, have been identified.</p>	<p>on MA4.</p> <p>14a This is supporting text which we thought is far more within TPC’s discretion. The advice is contrary to that of SDNPA in other comments on what is appropriate in supporting text.</p> <p>14b. As far as TPC is aware SDNPA has made no progress in defining green corridors in Twyford or sought to help TPC in their definition. TPC has however taken the initiative in defining Green Infrastructure. See LHE5.</p> <p>14c. TPC is at a loss on how to respond to this. TPC could simply have relied on SDLP 4 to meet its obligations, without doing any further work. In fact, it has done so much more by assembling additional evidence on landscape, historic landscape, views, photos, site analyses etc (links to this evidence are shown on the TNP website). All of which add to the understanding of what is special about the Twyford landscape. Landscape will also, of course, need to be considered by bespoke reports on individual planning applications.</p>
--------------------	---	---	---

			<p>14d TPC has now provided additional evidence on TNP website “Twyford Today” page in the form of photos and links to the Twyford Landscape Assessment and Twyford Conservation Area Plan which both independently describe the importance of the views listed on Table 3 and the need to protect them.</p>
<p>Policy LHE3</p>	<p>This policy lacks focus of the various heritage assets located within the parish and refers solely to SDLP policies. The policy remains generic with little detail and it is not clear the purpose of the policy itself. There is no particular reference to what the areas are within the supporting text and the policy refers to a map which does not clearly define the areas listed in the key. It is also not clear where the supporting evidence can be found and the key conclusions/recommendations of this evidence. Policy LHE3 suggests that only the areas on the map are covered by the policy rather than all the heritage assets and the historic environment within the parish. In order to be in compliance with national planning policy, it is recommended Policy LHE3 should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. National Planning Practice Guidance states ‘neighborhood plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide decisions and put broader strategic heritage policies from the</p>	<p>15 Consider revision of policy wording to include enough information about local heritage to guide decisions and put broader strategic heritage policies from the local plan into action at a neighborhood scale</p>	<p>15 As LHE3 is a map based policy supported by a formidable and bespoke evidence base dealing with historic fabric including both archaeological potential and historic landscape. This comment is hard to understand. The LHE policy is positively stated and of course is dependent on SDLP policies which meet all statutory requirements. It is possible that the author has not recognised the inter-dependence of the two plans (TNP and SDLP).</p>

	local plan into action at a neighborhood scale’.		We note that the key on map 10 needs to more clearly define the boundaries of areas with archaeological potential.
Policy LHE4	In line with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 185), plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. In developing their strategy, plan-making bodies should identify specific opportunities within their area for the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets, including their setting.	16 In order to be in conformity with national planning policy, it is recommended that this policy is focused on facilitating the conservation, enhancement and regeneration of the Conservation Area.	See the Examiner’s questions and TPC response on LHE4. TPC had expected to rely on SDNPA advice on how to handle the Conservation Area policy. The SDNPA’s revision to the WCC 1980 Twyford CA is in draft but appears not to have progressed for the last 18 months.
Policy LHE5	Supporting text to policy LHE5 refers to the relationship with a number of SDLP policies, the reference to policy SD2 Ecosystem services is incorrect Part 2 of policy LHE5 refers to ‘open land’, is this in reference to undeveloped land, rather than the character of the land being open? Clarification is required in the supporting text to define what the TNP considers to be open land.	17a SD 2 Ecosystem <u>Services</u> 17b Provide clarification of the term open land in the context of policy LHE5	17a Noted 17b Green infrastructure: this policy was amended in this way to take account of SDNPA comments at Pre Sub.
Policy LHE6	Part 2 of this policy proposes a cross border policy to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the river Itchen SAC. As drafted this policy cannot be applied in the determination of planning applications and proposes the development of new policy, this is not appropriate for the development plan and should be deleted. The SDNPA is preparing a technical advice	18a Delete policy criteria 2 of policy LHE6	18a In context of the River Itchen’s catchment, flood plain, ecology and river engineering have impacts both upstream and downstream and are to be taken account of in policy as in a development. TNP’s policy

	<p>note on Habitat Regulation Assessment matters, which will take into consideration international sites such as the River Itchen, as well as the provisions set out in policy SD9 of the SDLP</p> <p>Part 3 of this policy refers to the need to protect tree's hedges and woodland in Twyford, but specifically within the settlement boundary and conservation area. Is the reference to the settlement boundary and Conservation Area necessary, as currently worded the policy suggests that SDLP policy SD11 will only apply within the settlement boundary and Conservation Area</p>	<p>18 b Consider rewording the policy to ensure the policy intention is clear</p>	<p>recognizes the need for cross border working.</p> <p>18b Reconsider for clarity if not clear to Examiner.</p>
Policy WE1	<p>It appears that some wording has been omitted before the policy criteria start. A currently drafted the policy does not make sense</p>	<p>19 Consider whether policy wording has been omitted accidentally and reword policy</p>	<p>Agree. See extra wording in response to Examiner's queries.</p>
Policy MA1	<p>Part 1 and 2 of this policy only refer to SDLP policies which already form part of the development plan, therefore repeating the policy is not necessary. The 2nd part of the policy seeks to encourage the highways authority to deliver a local cycle path scheme, this would not be relevant in the determination of a planning application. Therefore it is recommended that this policy is deleted.</p>	<p>1. Rights of Way will be extended and enhanced to secure the objectives of SD 20, 4; 5; & 6.</p> <p>2. TPC working with HCC and WCC will improve cycling facilities along the B3335/B3354 through the village from Hockley traffic lights to Colden Common. Land adjacent to this route will be safeguarded for this purpose.</p>	<p>TPC cannot see the problem. Part 1 does not repeat the SDLP policies it just refers to them in relation to a specific TNP policy.</p> <p>Part 2 does relate to land and would be relevant to a planning application on the line of the potential route so should be retained. It is a policy supported by WCC and refers to a strategic cycling route. Its provision is relevant to any further development in Twyford.</p>
Policy MA2	<p>The SDNPA's Parking Supplementary Planning Document will provide additional detail to supplement SDLP policy on this matter, therefore</p>	<p>Parking will be provided in accordance with SD 22 and the following:</p>	<p>MA 2 .1 This supplementary planning document does not exist yet so, until it is, a policy is</p>

	<p>part 1 and 2 of the policy are not necessary and should be deleted.</p> <p>Part 3 of the policy is covered by requirements set out in Policy DB1 of the TNP therefore this aspect of the policy is also unnecessary and can be deleted.</p>	<p>1. Until SDNP parking standards are adopted, the standard WCC (for residential) and HCC (for all other land uses) will apply.</p> <p>2. Development proposals that result in a loss of existing car parking spaces will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that suitable alternative provision can be made in the vicinity.</p> <p>3. Land to accommodate up to 40 additional car parking spaces is reserved on land adjoining the existing Parish Hall car park.</p>	<p>appropriate.</p> <p>MA2.2 The TNP will be a statutory plan to give added status in DC decisions.</p> <p>MA2.3. See Examiner's query on this and TPC's response. Additional parking is a key proposal of the TNP independent of the housing allocation. The TNP proposal is site specific. TPC is again disappointed that this is not recognized by SDNPA.</p>
Policy MA3	As this policy is not related to land use matters it is recommended that the policy is stated as a community aspiration, and clearly distinguishable from planning policies	22 Delete policy and if appropriate state this as a community aim or aspiration	Already stated in introductory text as being aspirational. See TPC response to Examiner.
Policy MA5	Policy MA5 concerns itself primarily with encouraging sustainable forms of transport and traffic management proposals. These are not appropriate for Neighborhood Plan policy; they are matters for the highways authority to consider when reviewing the road network in the parish. It may be appropriate for these aspects to be stated as community aspirations or community aims, clearly identified as separate to land use policies of the TNP. This will allow the aspirations to be recorded within the TNP as a community aim, rather than deleted entirely as they are not appropriate as planning policy	23 Delete policy and if appropriate state this as a community aim or aspiration	Already stated as being aspirational. See TPC response to Examiner.
Policy SS1	As currently drafted policy SS1 does not allow for the provision of solar panels or wind turbines. This is	24 Consider review and amendment to policy SS1 to align	See TPC response to Examiner.

	considered too restrictive and would not allow for small scale solar array or small scale wind turbines as per SDLP policy SD51	with the approach in SDLP policy SD51	
Policy DB1	<p>The supporting text to Policy DB1 states that 8 of the new homes are to be affordable, this does not comply with policies of the SDLP or TNP, this should state that 10 homes will be affordable.</p> <p>Part of the boundary of the site is in close proximity to the Conservation Area. It is recommended that the policy includes a reference to the Conservation Area and its setting so that it sets out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment and enables development that will make a positive contribution to the heritage asset and reflect and enhance local character and distinctiveness.</p>	<p>25 a Site 26 is the principal site for allocation of new houses in the Neighborhood Plan and is to provide 20 houses (see HN3) of which 8 10 are to be affordable (see HN3) and additional car parking (see MA2).</p> <p>25 b Include a reference to the close proximity of the Conservation Area to ensure the development can make positive contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>25a Agreed and amend.</p> <p>25b. Noted and agreed. See also the comments of HE and TPC's response to HE and to the Examiner in this issue. The reason part of the site was included within the conservation area was probably to have the clump of trees included and protected. This is now achieved by TPO and by the provisions of the brief. See additional wording proposed for the supporting text of DB1. The SEA records the close involvement of SNPA's Conservation Officer and Landscape Officer in its assessment of Site 26 for development.</p>

Protocol for responses

I would be grateful for responses and the information requested by 26 May 2021. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

If certain responses are available before others, I am happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled please could it come to me directly from the National Park Authority. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan.

20 April 2021