

A report to the South Downs National Park Authority on the Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2033

**Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
BA (Hons) M.A. DMS M.R.T.P.I.**

Director – Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited

Executive Summary

- 1 I was appointed by South Downs National Park Authority in April 2021 to carry out the independent examination of the Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- 2 The examination was undertaken by written representations. I visited the neighbourhood area on 15 April 2021.
- 3 The Plan includes a range of policies and seeks to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. There is a very clear focus on safeguarding local character and providing a context within which new dwellings can be accommodated within the village. It includes a series of environmental policies including the identification of protected gaps.
- 4 The Plan has been underpinned by community support and engagement. It is clear that all sections of the community have been actively engaged in its preparation.
- 5 Subject to a series of recommended modifications set out in this report I have concluded that the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan meets all the necessary legal requirements and should proceed to referendum.
- 6 I recommend that the referendum should be held within the neighbourhood area.

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
9 August 2021

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report sets out the findings of the independent examination of the Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2033 (the 'Plan').
- 1.2 The Plan has been submitted to South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) by Twyford Parish Council (TPC) in its capacity as the qualifying body responsible for preparing the neighbourhood plan.
- 1.3 Neighbourhood plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to allow local communities to take responsibility for guiding development in their area. This approach was subsequently embedded in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 and its updates in 2018 and 2019. The NPPF continues to be the principal element of national planning policy.
- 1.4 The role of an independent examiner is clearly defined in the legislation. I have been appointed to examine whether or not the submitted Plan meets the basic conditions and Convention Rights and other statutory requirements. It is not within my remit to examine or to propose an alternative plan, or a potentially more sustainable plan except where this arises as a result of my recommended modifications to ensure that the plan meets the basic conditions and the other relevant requirements.
- 1.5 A neighbourhood plan can be narrow or broad in scope. Any plan can include whatever range of policies it sees as appropriate to its designated neighbourhood area. The submitted plan has been designed to be distinctive in general terms, and to be complementary to the development plan in particular. It has a clear focus on maintaining the integrity of the neighbourhood area, identifying a site to deliver strategic housing growth and ensuring good design standards.
- 1.6 Within the context set out above this report assesses whether the Plan is legally compliant and meets the basic conditions that apply to neighbourhood plans. It also considers the content of the Plan and, where necessary, recommends changes to its policies and supporting text.
- 1.7 This report also provides a recommendation as to whether the Plan should proceed to referendum. If this is the case and that referendum results in a positive outcome the Plan would then be used to determine planning applications within the Plan area and will sit as part of the wider development plan.

2 The Role of the Independent Examiner

- 2.1 The examiner's role is to ensure that any submitted neighbourhood plan meets the relevant legislative and procedural requirements.
- 2.2 I was appointed by SDNPA, with the consent of the Parish Council, to conduct the examination of the Plan and to prepare this report. I am independent of both SDNPA and the Parish Council. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan.
- 2.3 I possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to undertake this role. I am a Director of Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited. In previous roles, I have over 35 years' experience in various local authorities at either Head of Planning or Service Director level. I am a chartered town planner and have significant experience of undertaking other neighbourhood plan examinations and health checks. I am a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute and the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service.

Examination Outcomes

- 2.4 In my role as the independent examiner of the Plan I am required to recommend one of the following outcomes of the examination:
- (a) that the Plan as submitted should proceed to a referendum; or
 - (b) that the Plan should proceed to referendum as modified (based on my recommendations); or
 - (c) that the Plan does not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 2.5 The outcome of the examination is set out in Sections 7 and 8 of this report.

Other examination matters

- 2.6 In examining the Plan I am required to check whether:
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood plan area; and
 - the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one neighbourhood area); and
 - the Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.
- 2.7 I have addressed the matters identified in paragraph 2.6 of this report. I am satisfied that the submitted Plan complies with the three requirements.

3 Procedural Matters

3.1 In undertaking this examination I have considered the following documents:

- the submitted Plan;
- the Basic Conditions Statement;
- the Consultation Statement;
- the Sustainability Assessment;
- the Habitats Regulations Assessment;
- Landscape Character Assessment (2015 Terra Firma)
- Explanatory Notes A-H
- the Parish Council's responses to my Clarification Note;
- the representations made to the Plan;
- the adopted South Downs Local Plan;
- the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021);
- Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014 and subsequent updates); and
- relevant Ministerial Statements.

3.2 I visited the neighbourhood area on 15 April 2021. I looked at its overall character and appearance and at those areas affected by policies in the Plan in particular. The visit is covered in more detail in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.16 of this report.

3.3 It is a general rule that neighbourhood plan examinations should be held by written representations only. The representation from the Humphreys Group suggested that a hearing was necessary. Having considered carefully all the information available to me, including the representations made to the submitted plan, I was satisfied that the Plan could be examined without the need for a public hearing. In reaching this decision I took account of the significant level of detail included in the Humphreys Group representation and those of the other parties who engaged in the process.

4 Consultation

Consultation Process

- 4.1 Policies in made neighbourhood plans become the basis for local planning and development control decisions. As such the regulations require neighbourhood plans to be supported and underpinned by public consultation.
- 4.2 In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 the Parish Council has prepared a Consultation Statement. The Statement sets out the mechanisms used to engage all concerned in the plan-making process. It also provides specific details about the consultation process that took place on the pre-submission version of the Plan (January to February 2020). It captures the key issues in a proportionate way and is then underpinned by more detailed appendices. It is a good example of a Consultation Statement.
- 4.3 The Statement sets out details of the comprehensive range of consultation events that were carried out in relation to the initial stages of the Plan. They included:
- the use of the Parish Council website to publicise the work of the Plan and its key stages;
 - ongoing discussions with landowners;
 - the initial consultation in the village (February 2015);
 - the consultation on housing needs (February/March 2015);
 - the consultation at The Graze Festival (August 2015);
 - the engagement with village groups (August to November 2015);
 - the Character Study Work (September 2015);
 - assessment of potential housing sites (November 2015 to February 2016); and
 - the parking survey in the village centre (April 2016).
- 4.4 The Statement also provides details of the way in which the Parish Council engaged with statutory bodies whilst the Plan was being prepared.
- 4.5 Section 4 of the Statement provides specific details on the comments received during the consultation process associated with the pre-submission version of the Plan. The various links provide details of its responses to the general comments made together with its detailed response to the representations from SDNPA and The Humphreys Group. The broader package identifies the principal changes that worked their way through into the submission version. This process helps to describe the evolution of the Plan.
- 4.6 It is clear that consultation has been an important element of the Plan's production. Advice on the neighbourhood planning process has been made available to the community in a positive and direct way by those responsible for the Plan's preparation.
- 4.7 From all the evidence provided to me as part of the examination, I can see that the Plan has promoted an inclusive approach to seeking the opinions of all concerned

throughout the process. SDNPA has carried out its own assessment that the consultation process has complied with the requirements of the Regulations.

Representations Received

4.8 Consultation on the submitted plan was undertaken by SDNPA that ended on 25 March 2021. This exercise generated comments from a range of organisations as follows:

- Highways England
- Natural England
- Twyford Waterworks Trust
- South Downs National Park Authority
- Southern Water
- Morestead Racing Stables
- National Grid
- Twyford School
- Historic England
- The Humphrey Group
- Environment Agency

4.9 Representations were also received from three local residents.

4.10 I have taken account of the various representations in examining the Plan. Where it is appropriate to do so I make specific reference to the individual representations in Section 7 of this report.

5 The Neighbourhood Area and the Development Plan Context

The Neighbourhood Area

- 5.1 The neighbourhood area consists of the parish of Twyford. Its population in 2011 was 1589 persons living in 676 houses. It was designated as a neighbourhood area on 12 January 2015. It is an irregular area located between Winchester to the north and Eastleigh to the south. The neighbourhood area is predominantly a rural parish and much of its area is in agricultural use. It lies wholly within the South Downs National Park. The M3 runs through the northern part of neighbourhood area.
- 5.2 The principal settlement in the neighbourhood area is Twyford itself. It is based astride the B3335 and includes a series of attractive historic buildings. It has a comprehensive range of retail and community facilities which provide a degree of sustainability well beyond its limited population base. Twyford also has a large employment base. Twyford Preparatory School is the largest employer and there is a large commercial estate at Northfields Farm and Hazeley Enterprise Park. In addition, many people are self-employed or work from home.
- 5.3 The remainder of the neighbourhood area consists of a very attractive agricultural hinterland. Its western part is dominated by the River Itchen. It flows from its source 15 miles north-east, through Winchester and into Twyford in a broad corridor of ecological, cultural and landscape significance. It defines the location of the village and provides extensive informal recreation opportunities for local residents.

Development Plan Context

- 5.4 The South Downs Local Plan (SDLP) was adopted in July 2019. It sets out the basis for future development in the National Park up to 2033. The Plan is landscape-led and based around a series of defined landscape types. Twyford falls within the Dip Slope which extends along the entire length of the South Downs ending in the east at the Sussex Heritage Coast. This broad area includes a series of villages and parts of country estates such as Uppark and Goodwood. Along with the Scarp Slope, it includes the downland part of the Brighton and Lewes Downs Biosphere Reserve. The villages on the Dip Slope are largely situated in southern-oriented valleys and have their own relationships with towns beyond the southern boundary of the National Park. Twyford is an exception to this approach and looks across the chalk ridge towards Winchester.
- 5.5 In this context Strategic Policy SD25 sets out an approach which supports the principle of development in identified settlements which are of a scale and nature appropriate to the character and function of the settlement in its landscape context, make best use of suitable and available previously developed land in the settlement and make efficient and appropriate use of land. Twyford is one of a series of such settlements. Policy SD26 sets out a requirement for the delivery of 20 new homes in Twyford up to 2033.

5.6 In addition to this wider strategic approach the following policies are particularly relevant to the Twyford Plan:

- SD5 Design
- SD9 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- SD12 Historic Environment
- SD15 Conservation Areas
- SD22 Parking Provision
- SD23 Sustainable Tourism
- SD27 Mix of Homes
- SD28 Affordable Homes
- SD29 Rural Exception Sites
- SD34 Sustaining the Local Economy
- SD35 Employment Land

5.7 The Basic Conditions Statement usefully highlights the key policies in the Local Plan and how they relate to policies in the submitted Plan. It provides confidence to all concerned that the submitted Plan sits within its local planning policy context.

5.8 In process terms the timings involved have allowed the submitted neighbourhood plan directly to take account of this recently-adopted local planning context. In doing so it has relied on up-to-date information and research that has underpinned existing planning policy documents in the National Park. This is good practice and reflects key elements in Planning Practice Guidance on this matter.

Unaccompanied Visit

5.9 I visited the neighbourhood area on 15 April 2021. I drove into the neighbourhood area from the M3 to the north. This gave me an initial impression of its setting and the character in general, and within the wider setting of the western extent of the South Downs National Park in particular.

5.10 I parked by the Church. I saw the splendid relationship between the Church itself, the former Rectory, Midmay House and the adjacent Barn. I carry on down Berry Lane to the River Itchen and then beyond into Berry Meadows. I saw the scale and the significance of the proposed Twyford and Shawford Protected Gap. I retraced my steps to the Church and saw the notice about the Lowdown Twyford Litter Pick. It had clearly been hugely successful as I did not encounter any litter throughout the visit.

5.11 I then walked back to High Street and continued up Bourne Lane. I saw the interesting collection of large houses and elements of the Twyford School site. I saw Orchard View and its current condition. As the Lane met Hazeley Road I saw the immaculate condition of the school playing fields.

5.12 I then looked at the proposed housing site by the Parish Hall and the surgery off Hazeley Road. I saw the way in which it related to the topography of the wider landscape in general, and the mature trees in particular. I looked at the site both from

Hazeley Road to its immediate south and from a wider context from the junction of Hazeley Road and Bourne Lane. I looked at the adjacent GP surgery/pharmacy/parish hall and then the shop and post office at the junction of Hazeley Road and High Street. I saw that the combination of these uses was physically and functionally at the heart of the community.

- 5.13 I then walked along High Street to the south. I saw Stacey's Garage and the Bugle Inn. I continued down to the proposed Twyford and Colden Common Protected Gap. I saw the various equestrian and agricultural uses in and around the proposed Gap.
- 5.14 I then retraced my steps and walked up Park Lane. I saw the very impressively-maintained allotments and the equally well-maintained Hunter Park.
- 5.15 I then walked along the northern part of High Street. I saw Brunswick House on the eastern side and Beaulieu Cottages on the western side. I saw the Phoenix Inn. I walked up Queen Street and saw the Primary School. I continued past Twyford School and saw the impressive Twyford House and Wing House.
- 5.16 I walked along Northfields up to Northfield House. I saw the range of housing types and ages off Northfields. I finished my visit by driving along the Humphreys Farm Road to the range of commercial units located at the eastern end of Northfields Farm. I then drove to Morestead so that I could understand the context of the village within the wider National Park.

6 The Neighbourhood Plan and the Basic Conditions

6.1 This section of the report deals with the submitted neighbourhood plan as a whole and the extent to which it meets the basic conditions. The submitted Basic Conditions Statement has helped considerably in the preparation of this section of the report. It is a well-presented and informative document. It is also proportionate to the Plan itself.

6.2 As part of this process I must consider whether the submitted Plan meets the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. To comply with the basic conditions, the Plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in the area;
- be compatible with European Union (EU) obligations and the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR); and
- not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (7).

6.3 I assess the Plan against the basic conditions under the following headings.

National Planning Policies and Guidance

6.4 For the purposes of this examination the key elements of national policy relating to planning matters are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued in July 2021. This version of the NPPF was published whilst the examination was taking place. The submitted Basic Conditions Statement assessed the Plan against an earlier (February 2019) version of the NPPF. Section 7 of this report provides any necessary comments on a policy-by-policy basis where there are differences between the two versions of the NPPF.

6.5 The NPPF sets out a range of core land-use planning issues to underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. The following are of particular relevance to the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan:

- a plan led system– in this case the relationship between the neighbourhood plan and the adopted South Downs Local Plan;
- delivering a sufficient supply of homes;
- building a strong, competitive economy;
- recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving local communities;
- taking account of the different roles and characters of different areas;
- highlighting the importance high quality design and good standards of amenity for all future occupants of land and buildings; and
- conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

- 6.6 Neighbourhood plans sit within this wider context both generally, and within the more specific presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 13 of the NPPF indicates that neighbourhoods should both develop plans that support the strategic needs set out in local plans and plan positively to support local development that is outside the strategic elements of the development plan.
- 6.7 In addition to the NPPF I have also taken account of other elements of national planning policy including Planning Practice Guidance and ministerial statements.
- 6.8 Having considered all the evidence and representations available as part of the examination I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to national planning policies and guidance in general terms. It sets out a positive vision for the future of the neighbourhood area within the context of its role and status in the South Downs Local Plan. In particular it includes a series of policies on the scale and nature of new development. The Basic Conditions Statement maps the policies in the Plan against the appropriate sections of the NPPF.
- 6.9 At a more practical level the NPPF indicates that plans should provide a clear framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made and that they should give a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal (paragraph 16d). This was reinforced with the publication of Planning Practice Guidance in March 2014. Paragraph ID:41-041-20140306 indicates that policies in neighbourhood plans should be drafted with sufficient clarity so that a decision-maker can apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. Policies should also be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.
- 6.10 As submitted the Plan does not fully accord with this range of practical issues. The majority of my recommended modifications in Section 7 relate to matters of clarity and precision. They are designed to ensure that the Plan fully accords with national policy.

Contributing to sustainable development

- 6.11 There are clear overlaps between national policy and the contribution that the submitted Plan makes to achieving sustainable development. Sustainable development has three principal dimensions – economic, social and environmental. It is clear that the submitted Plan has set out to achieve sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. In the economic dimension the Plan includes policies for infill development and proposes a housing allocation (Policies SB1 and HN2). It also includes a package of policies on employment development (BE1-3). In the social role, it includes a policy on meeting local housing needs (Policy HN1) and on open spaces (Policy CP1). In the environmental dimension the Plan positively seeks to protect its natural, built and historic environment. It has a range of policies on landscape, heritage and ecology (LHE1-7). The Parish Council has undertaken its own assessment of this matter in the submitted Basic Conditions Statement.

General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan

- 6.12 I have already commented in detail on the development plan context in South Down National Park in paragraphs 5.4 to 5.8 of this report.
- 6.13 In general terms I am satisfied that the submitted Plan delivers a local dimension to this strategic context. There are some cases where there is a degree of overlap, duplication or potential conflict with strategic policies and I address these on a case-by-case basis. The Basic Conditions Statement helpfully relates the Plan's policies to policies in the development plan. Subject to the recommended modifications set out in this report I am satisfied that the submitted Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan.

European Legislation and Habitat Regulations

- 6.14 The Neighbourhood Plan General Regulations 2015 require a qualifying body either to submit an environmental report prepared in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 or a statement of reasons why an environmental report is not required.

Sustainability Appraisal including SEA

- 6.15 In order to comply with this requirement TPC commissioned the preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The work undertaken incorporates SEA. It is a well-constructed document which assesses the environment of the neighbourhood area in a proportionate fashion.
- 6.16 The SA incorporates two key elements. The first is an assessment of the strategic aspects of the Plan. The second is an assessment of the reasonable alternatives which were considered during its preparation. In particular it assessed four specific options for the delivery of new housing.
- 6.17 The wider SA process considered and assessed changes to the settlement boundary and the main alternative options for sites to be allocated for housing. The policies were appraised as well as the "do nothing" scenario for the effects on the SA objectives if the policies in the Plan were not in place. The process has been iterative and where appropriate recommendations have been incorporated into the emerging Plan. The SA also includes a monitoring regime for identified environmental effects.
- 6.18 The site selection process has been both thorough and comprehensive. Paragraph 3.4 of the non-technical summary comments that the final strategic level appraisal was in terms of which site (or sites) would be allocated to provide 20 dwellings in order to meet the strategic requirement as set out in Policy SD26 of the SDLP. Four options were appraised on two sites, as follows: -
- Option A – the delivery of all 20 dwellings on site 26;
 - Option B – the delivery of all 20 dwellings on site 1;
 - Option C - Split the provision of dwellings between site 1 and 26, with 11 houses on each site giving a total of 22 (sites with over 10 houses maximise the

provision of on-site affordable homes as per the policy in the South Downs Submission Local Plan); and

- Option D - Site 26 to accommodate 14 dwellings on an area of this site suggested in a Landscape Assessment, with 6 further houses on site 1.

6.19 Paragraph 3.5 of the non-technical summary comments about the outcomes of the site selection process. Paragraph 3.6 comments about the mitigation measures associated with the selected Option D (Site 26). In the round I am satisfied that the wider approach is evidence-based and meets the basic conditions. TPC has balanced a wide range of information and developed the outcomes of the SA/SEA process into a robust policy base. I comment in further detail on the development of site 26 in both policies HN2 and DB1 later in this report.

Habitats Regulations Assessment

6.20 SDNPA commissioned a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Plan as part of the preparation of the pre-submission Plan. This resulted in several changes being made to the Plan. In addition, Natural England also advised that the concept of nutrient neutrality in the Solent requires further appraisal in the HRA. The wider HRA assesses the post-consultation submission version of the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan and includes an Appropriate Assessment of water quality issues in relation to the Solent.

6.21 The report is both thorough and comprehensive. It takes appropriate account of the significance of European sites. In particular it assesses the extent to which the policies in the submitted Plan would have any direct or indirect impacts on the River Itchen SAC, the Solent & Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar and the Solent Maritime SAC. It provides details about the impact of the Plan's policies and proposals on the following matters:

- Recreational Pressure;
- Bird Disturbance;
- Non-breeding birds;
- Bat Disturbance;
- Trampling/mechanical damage;
- Water Quality;
- Water Quantity and Abstraction; and
- Atmospheric Pollution;

6.22 Due to potential impact of the proposals in the Plan on protected sites the assessment process proceeded to the Appropriate Assessment stage. Subject to the incorporation of additional text into the Plan the report concludes that the Plan is not likely to have significant environmental effects on a European nature conservation site or undermine their conservation objectives alone or in combination taking account of the precautionary principle. The Parish Council has carefully incorporated the additional text and policies into the submitted Plan as recommended by the report.

6.23 Having reviewed the information provided to me as part of the examination, I am satisfied that a proportionate process has been undertaken in accordance with the various regulations. The HRA report and the Appropriate Assessment provide

assurance to all concerned that the submitted Plan takes appropriate account of important ecological and biodiversity matters. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I am entirely satisfied that the submitted Plan is compatible with this aspect of European obligations.

European Convention and Human Rights

- 6.24 In a similar fashion I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and that it complies with the Human Rights Act. There is no evidence that has been submitted to me to suggest otherwise. In addition, there has been full and adequate opportunity for all interested parties to take part in the preparation of the Plan and to make their comments known. On the basis of all the evidence available to me, I conclude that the submitted Plan does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with the ECHR.

Summary

- 6.25 On the basis of my assessment of the Plan in this section of my report I am satisfied that it meets the basic conditions subject to the incorporation of the recommended modifications contained in this report.

7 The Neighbourhood Plan policies

- 7.1 This section of the report comments on the policies in the Plan. In particular, it makes a series of recommended modifications to ensure that they have the necessary precision to meet the basic conditions.
- 7.2 My recommendations focus on the policies themselves given that the basic conditions relate primarily to this aspect of neighbourhood plans. In some cases, I have also recommended changes to the associated supporting text.
- 7.3 I am satisfied that the content and the form of the Plan is fit for purpose. It is distinctive and proportionate to the Plan area. The wider community and the Parish Council have spent time and energy in identifying the issues and objectives that they wish to be included in their Plan. This sits at the heart of the localism agenda.
- 7.4 The Plan has been designed to reflect Planning Practice Guidance (Section 41-004-20190509) which indicates that neighbourhood plans must address the development and use of land.
- 7.5 I have addressed the policies in the order that they appear in the submitted plan. Where necessary I have identified the inter-relationships between the policies.
- 7.6 For clarity this section of the report comments on all policies whether or not I have recommended modifications in order to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions.
- 7.7 Where modifications are recommended to policies they are highlighted in bold print. Any associated or free-standing changes to the text of the Plan are set out in italic print.

The initial section of the Plan (Sections 1-2)

- 7.8 These initial parts of the Plan set the scene for the range of policies. They do so in a proportionate way. The Plan is presented in a professional way. It makes a very effective use of well-selected maps. A very clear distinction is made between its policies and the supporting text. It also highlights the links between the Plan's objectives and its resultant policies.
- 7.9 The Introduction addresses the background to neighbourhood planning. It comments about how the Plan has been prepared and the need for it to comply with the basic conditions. It defines the Plan period and includes a map of the designated neighbourhood area. It provides a very succinct summary of the role of a neighbourhood plan and how the Plan itself has been prepared within its wider strategic context. Section 1.4 draws attention to the details in Map 1. Whilst the Plan period is shown on the front cover of the Plan, I recommend that it is included at the end of Section 1.4 for clarity purposes.

At the end of section 1.4 add: The Plan period is 2019 to 2033

- 7.10 The Introduction also provides a context to the detailed information on consultation and engagement (in the Consultation Statement) and on biodiversity matters (in the HRA).

- 7.11 Section 2 sets out a comprehensive vision and related objectives for the Plan. In all cases they are distinctive to the neighbourhood area. It is clear that the policies flow from the evidence base and the supporting text.
- 7.12 Section 2 also draws specific attention to the landscape qualities of the South Downs National Park and the outcomes which the Plan seeks to achieve. They have a healthy overlap with National Park Partnership Management Plan (2019).
- 7.13 The remainder of this section of the report addresses each policy in turn in the context set out in paragraphs 7.5 to 7.7 of this report.

General commentary

- 7.14 The Plan is both detailed and comprehensive. It is very clear that TPC and those who have worked on the Plan have put a very significant time and effort into its preparation. In doing so the Plan is in a fortunate place that the SDLP was adopted during its preparation – this has provided a sound basis against which the emerging neighbourhood plan can seek to add distinctive local value to the existing policies in the development plan. In several instances the Plan has sought either to reinforce SDLP policies or to add local value to their content or application.
- 7.15 This approach is reflected in the structure and the organisation of the Plan. On a policy-by-policy basis the supporting text comments about the purpose of the policy concerned and its relationship to the SDLP. In turn this provides a strong connection to the Plan's Vision (Section 2.1), its objectives (Section 2.2), its relationship to the SDNP (Section 2.3) and to the Plan's intended outcomes (Section 2.5). This approach is best practice.
- 7.16 In general terms the policies in the Plan fall into four distinctive groups as follows:
- Policies which are very specific to the neighbourhood area and complement the strategic approach taken national and local planning policies (for example LHE1 Protected Gaps). These are the types of policies which national legislation anticipates should come forward in neighbourhood plans and I will examine them in this context. In particular I will come to a case-by-case assessment of the extent to which the policies concerned are in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan. Various court cases have established that this will be a matter of judgement and that neighbourhood plan policies do not have to follow development plan policies in a slavish fashion.
 - Policies which identify particular facilities/land uses/parcels of land to which the more general policies in the SDLP would be applied (for example Policies CP1 and CP2). These policies are an interesting way in which a local community can provide a degree of clarity about the extent to which its facilities are affected by more strategic policies. I will examine them in this context.

- Policies which refer to specific matters in the neighbourhood area and which add little if any value to national and local policies which address the matter (for example Policy LHE4). I can appreciate that TPC has wanted to reinforce the importance of existing policies. However, there is no need for a neighbourhood plan to reinforce or repeat national or local policies and I will examine these policies in this context unless there is compelling evidence to the contrary.
- Policies which are effectively community actions as they set out the details of projects which TPC will pursue in the Plan period (either itself or with other partners and organisations). Matters of this nature traditionally arise during the Plan making process. In several circumstances TPC recognises in the Plan that some of the policies are aspirational. However, where they are community actions rather than land use-based policies which will be used to determine planning applications I recommend that they are relocated into a separate part of the Plan dealing with such matters. This will make an appropriate separation between land use and non-land use matters whilst safeguarding matters of importance to the local community within the wider Plan.

7.17 This overall approach will bring clarity to all concerned in the development management process. In particular it will bring a very clear distinction between the land use policies and the non-land use policies (in the proposed Community Action section). It will help to resolve the ongoing debate between TPC and SDNPA which has taken place during the Plan making process about the way the neighbourhood plan should relate to the adopted SDLP. Moreover, the arrangements in the Plan will accord with national advice which is to present Community Actions in a separate part of neighbourhood plans.

7.18 For the sake of brevity I will not repeat this explanation on a policy-by-policy basis.

7.19 The policy headings in the Plan identify the policy number in the pre-submission Plan. Whilst I understand that this provides an audit trail and reflects the development of the Plan the inclusion of such detail is unnecessary. I recommend their deletion.

Remove the references to the policy numbers in the pre-submission Plan on a policy-by-policy basis

SB1 The Settlement boundary

7.20 This policy sets the scene for other key elements of the Plan. In summary development is supported within the settlement boundary but not elsewhere in the neighbourhood area.

7.21 The Plan comments that Twyford has had a settlement boundary for several years but that it has never been reviewed. Some changes are necessary to take account of developments in that period and because Twyford is now within the National Park. An independent review of the existing boundary was carried out by Terra Firma in late

2015, using the methodology for the review of settlement boundaries adopted by the SDNPA. The findings of this work are incorporated in this policy.

- 7.22 The policy proposes that the Twyford Preparatory School is no longer included within the settlement boundary and instead a specific policy in the Plan (Policy BE3).
- 7.23 The policy takes a sustainable approach towards the location of development within the parish. This is particularly important given the range of commercial and community facilities which are concentrated within the village. It is in general conformity with Policy SD25 of the SDLP. I recommend that the policy is modified so that it has the clarity required by the NPPF. The resulting policy also has a simpler format. Its approach remains unchanged. I also recommend a detailed modification to the supporting text to take account of the SDNPA representation on the linkage between the policy and the SDLP.
- 7.24 I looked at the relationship between the settlement boundary and Twyford School very carefully during the visit. On the one hand its main buildings are an important part of the fabric of the village. On the other hand, it has a distinctive function which is associated with extensive recreational facilities and playing fields to the south and the east. In this context TPC's decision to craft a separate policy for the School is understandable. I comment on that policy in more detail later in this report.

Replace the policy with:

'Within the settlement boundary (as defined in Map 2), proposals for development and redevelopment will be supported where they meet the requirements of other policies in the development plan

Outside the settlement boundary, development proposals will only be supported where they comply with other policies in the development plan'

In the fifth paragraph of supporting text replace 'a minimum of' with 'approximately'

SB2 Development outside the settlement boundary

- 7.25 This policy complements the approach in Policy SB1. In this case it sets out a policy approach towards development proposals outside the settlement boundary. It does so by identifying specific circumstances related to other policies in the Plan.
- 7.26 SDNPA comment that the policy does not make it clear that development outside the settlement boundary (and therefore in open countryside) will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. The equivalent approach in the SDLP (Strategic Policy SD25) is more general in offering support in exceptional circumstances where it complies with other policies in that plan, responds to the context of the relevant broad area or river corridor and meets one of four criteria.
- 7.27 In its response to the clarification note TPC contends that in listing the classes of development which may be permitted outside the settlement boundary, the Plan clarifies the 'exceptional circumstances' as referenced in the SDLP.

- 7.28 I have considered this matter very carefully. It is an important matter given the sensitivity of the wider countryside in the parish. In practical terms there would be little difference between the outcomes of policies in the SDLP and in the submitted neighbourhood plan. Indeed, as TPC comments it has attempted to refine the approach in Strategic Policy SD25 of the SDLP to reflect local circumstances. Nevertheless, they take differing approaches which have the ability to detract from the overall clarity of the development plan. In particular the SDLP takes a restrictive and exceptional circumstances approach whereas the neighbourhood plan directly offers support for development which meets the requirements of identified policies.
- 7.29 I recommend modifications to remedy this issue. Their effect is to ensure that the policy follows the approach in the SDLP and supplements its details with reference to specific policies in the neighbourhood plan which affect parcels of land outside the defined settlement boundary.
- 7.30 I also recommend the deletion of the very detailed schedule of SDLP policies from the supporting text. Whilst this has been done in good faith to provide a degree of context to the policy some of the policies listed apply in a general sense rather than solely outside settlement boundaries.

Replace the policy with:

‘Development outside the defined settlement boundary will be strictly controlled

In exceptional circumstances development proposals will be supported outside the settlement boundaries where they comply with the relevant policies in the development plan, respond to the context of the Dip Slope as defined in the SDLP, and, as appropriate:

- **the land concerned is allocated for development or safeguarded for the use proposed as part of the development plan in general and Policies HN2: Housing provision and allocation of land, HN4: Rural Exception Sites, HN6: Housing outside the Settlement Boundary, HN7: Orchard Close, BE1: Employment and Business provision BE2: Northfields Farm & Hazeley Enterprise Park BE3: Twyford Preparatory School, and ST1: Visitor and Tourism Facilities of this Plan in particular; or**
- **there is an essential need for a countryside location; or**
- **in the case of community infrastructure, there is a proven need for the development that demonstrably cannot be met elsewhere; or**
- **it is an appropriate reuse of a previously developed site, excepting residential gardens, and conserves and enhances the special qualities of the National Park’**

In the supporting text under the Relationship to the SDLP delete ‘The principal ones are’ and the list of policies thereafter.

HN1 Local housing needs and housing mix

- 7.31 This policy seeks to address the related issues of house sizes and affordability and to provide a more bespoke local approach to that included in the SDLP. The supporting text provides the context to the policy.
- 7.32 The policy has two related parts. The first requires that the mix of new housing developments follows the approach in Policy SD 27 of the SDLP. The second sets out specific maximum sizes for different sizes of new houses as follows:
- 1 bed 80 square metres;
 - 2 bed 100 square metres;
 - 3 bed 120 square metres; and
 - 4 bed 150 square metres.
- 7.33 I sought advice from TPC on the evidence which it had used to take such approach. I was advised about a similar approach which has been taken in the formulation of the New Forest Local Plan. More importantly I was advised about local evidence (as already captured in Rural Community Profile) as follows:
- ‘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 £386k 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 Parish Council, 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’*
- 7.34 On the balance of the information I am satisfied that the approach taken is both distinctive to the parish and evidence-based. In addition, the proposed housing sizes are not unduly restrictive and, with good design and layout will provide appropriate houses throughout the Plan period.
- 7.35 I recommend detailed modifications to the wording of the policy to bring the clarity required by the NPPF. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions. It will assist significantly in the delivery of both the economic and the social dimensions of sustainable development in the parish.

Replace the first part of the policy with: ‘Development proposals for new housing should comply with the provisions of Policy SD 27 of the South Downs Local Plan’

Replace the second part of the policy with: ‘Development proposals for one-, two-, three- or four-bedroom houses should not exceed a maximum floor area of 80 sq. metres; 100 sq. metres, 120 sq. metres and 150 sq. metres respectively except where larger replacement dwellings otherwise comply with the provisions of Policy HN6 a)’

At the end of the supporting text under Purpose of the Policy add: ‘Policy HN1 addresses this important matter. The maximum areas are to be measured gross internally (that is excluding the external walls)’

HN2 Housing provision and allocation of land

- 7.36 This policy proposes a housing allocation to meet the strategic requirement included in Policy SD26 of the SDLP.
- 7.37 The proposed allocation is a key element of the Plan. It brings forward an imaginative proposal to ensure strategic housing delivery in a very sustainable part of the village. Indeed, its very purpose is to concentrate development in immediately close proximity to local services and facilities. The wider process has also paid great attention to the way in which the development would be able to be incorporated into the National Park in general, and within the specific and local topography of the site in particular.
- 7.38 The site selection process is detailed in the SA and in the earlier Housing Site Selection process. The process has been both robust and thorough. Historic England raises commentary on the allocation of the site in the Plan. I address its comments in Policy DB1.
- 7.39 The resulting policy is matter of fact in the way it which allocates the site for housing development. It meets the basic conditions. It makes specific reference to Policy DB1 which provides further details to control its development.

HN3 Affordable provision on allocated and windfall sites

- 7.40 This policy comments about the need for allocated and windfall sites to deliver affordable housing. It makes reference to Policy SD28 of the SDLP. It also comments about the way in which the delivered affordable housing is allocated. It specifies that it should follow the approach taken in 2010 to the Hewlett Close development. TPC sets out its case on this issue in Explanatory Note C.
- 7.41 As submitted the policy conflates two issues. The first is the delivery of affordable housing and in this context the policy offers no added value to the contents of Policy SD28 of the SDLP other than to comment that providing affordable housing is a principal objective of the Plan, with a strong preference for social rented housing provided to eligible households at a reduced cost or rent. The second is the allocation of the delivered affordable housing and which is managed by Winchester City Council in its capacity as the housing authority. Whilst I can understand TPC’s support for the

outcome of the allocation of affordable houses on the Hewlett Close development, the allocation of any future such sites will need to be considered based on their specific circumstances. In any event the approach in the SDLP provides a context for this to take place. The fourth part of Policy SD28 comments that occupancy conditions and local connection criteria will be applied to affordable housing to ensure local needs are met. This approach is underpinned by paragraph 7.62 of the SDLP which comments that 'local connections will be determined by the Authority, parish council and relevant housing authority, having primary regard to the relevant housing register allocations policy'.

- 7.42 In all the circumstances I recommend that the policy is deleted. However, I recommend that the supporting text is retained with a degree of modification so that TPC's views on the allocation of affordable housing can be considered by the SDNPA throughout the Plan period. In reaching this conclusion I have taken account of TPC's response to the clarification note.

Delete the policy

Replace the fourth paragraph of supporting text with: 'The Parish Council considers that the occupation of affordable housing in the parish should be limited to people with strong local connections to Twyford Parish. This approach was taken for the most recent scheme at Hewlett Close where priority was given to those born and educated in the Parish and those who have been resident in the Parish for a long time and have close relatives in the Parish. This would take account of the approach set out in Policy SD28 of the South Downs Local Plan'

Delete the fifth paragraph of the supporting text.

Delete the final sentence of the sixth paragraph of supporting text.

HN4 Rural exception sites

- 7.43 This policy comments about the approach towards rural exception housing. Its first part comments that any such proposals will be assessed against the contents of Policy SD29 of the SDLP. The second part of the policy proposes the same occupancy restrictions as those in Policy HN3.
- 7.44 Plainly this is an important local matter. However, the policy raises the same issues as those which apply to Policy HN3. I recommend that it is deleted for the same reasons. In particular it offers no added local value to Policy SD29 of the SDLP. In reaching this conclusion I have taken account of TPC's response to the clarification note.
- 7.45 In this case I also recommend the deletion of the associated supporting text. It explains a general matter without any specific commentary about the neighbourhood area.

Delete the policy

Delete the supporting text

HN5 Housing within the Settlement Boundary

- 7.46 This policy comments about the type of housing development which will be supported within the settlement boundary. It has three related parts. The first identifies the type of housing development which would be supported. The second comments about particular restrictions which would apply to new development. The third comments in detail about developments of more than one dwelling or over 0.1 hectare in size.
- 7.47 The policy has been developed within the policy context already provided by the SDLP. In particular Policies SD25 and 31 comment about the focus of new development within settlement boundaries and extensions to existing dwellings respectively.
- 7.48 I sought TPC's comments on the added value of the second and third parts of the policy beyond the content of the SDLP. It commented that:

'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'

- 7.49 SDNPA suggests that elements of the policy unnecessary in the way in which they repeat or restate Local Plan policies or other policies in the submitted neighbourhood plan. I have considered these comments very carefully along with TPC's response to the clarification note. On the balance of the information available to me I am satisfied that there is a purpose to the policy which adds value to the existing development plan policies and which provides a broader context to day-to-day development proposals in the parish. Nevertheless, I recommend the following series of modifications to the policy and the supporting text to bring the clarity required by the NPPF.

- the deletion of the second part of the policy (which largely repeats or signposts other policies);
- its replacement with a specific policy element of the conservation area and walls and boundary features in particular. Otherwise, this important element of the character of the parish is not addressed. This is particularly important given the recommended modifications to Policy LHE4 later in the report;
- the refinement of the third part of the policy so that it uses more specific language (rather than expressing a preference for certain types of development);
- the deletion of the element of supporting text which comments about neighbour disputes and the expectation that applicants would discuss proposed extensions with their neighbours. Whilst this is good practice a neighbourhood plan cannot create an expectation for this approach;
- the refinement of the approach in the Plan towards applying the approach towards affordable housing provision to schemes for the elderly to ensure that it is in general conformity with the provisions of Policy SD28 of the SDLP; and
- the relocation of policy elements into the supporting text.

As an indirect outcome of the recommended modifications the policy will have a much simpler format.

In the first part of the policy replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’

Replace the second part of the policy with: ‘Development proposals within the Twyford Conservation Area should be designed to preserve or enhance its character or appearance. In particular proposals should safeguard the relationship between buildings, their garden spaces and walls’

Replace the third part of the policy with: ‘On sites in excess of 0.1 ha, or where more than one new dwelling is proposed, housing development should comply with Policy SD 27 of the South Downs Local Plan, and deliver the numbers of dwellings and housing mix in accordance with Policy HN1 of this Plan. Development proposals which make provision for those with special needs and the elderly will be particularly supported’

At the end of the second paragraph of supporting text under the Purpose heading add: ‘Policy HN5 has been designed to be complementary to Local Plan policies. Development proposals should also take account of other policies in the neighbourhood plan, and policy HN1 on housing mix in particular.

Delete the third paragraph of supporting text under the Purpose of the Policy heading.

At the end of the sixth paragraph of supporting text add: ‘The third part of Policy HN5 addresses this important matter. Where a scheme falls within Use Class C2 (Residential institutions) and is wholly for special needs or the elderly, the provisions of Policy SD 28 of the Local Plan will not apply’

In seventh paragraph of supporting text (under the purpose of the policy heading) replace the final sentence with: ‘This matter is addressed in the second part of Policy HN5’

HN6 Housing outside the Settlement Boundary

7.50 This policy identifies a series of circumstances where housing schemes would be supported outside the settlement boundary. It identifies four types of development which would be supported as follows:

- extensions and replacement dwellings;
- annexes;
- hostel accommodation at racing stables; and
- the subdivision of larger houses

7.51 The policy takes an appropriate and distinctive approach to this matter. In particular I am satisfied that it is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan and brings distinctive local value.

7.52 SDNPA make detailed comments about the first type of development highlighted in the policy. I recommend modifications to the policy to reflect its comments and to ensure that the policy approach is in general conformity with Policies SD30 and 31 of the

SDLP. I also recommend a detailed modification to the wording used in the opening part of the policy.

- 7.53 SDNPA also suggests that the specific reference to hostel accommodation for racing stables should be deleted. I have considered this matter carefully and have taken account of the detailed response which TPC made to the earlier comments from SDNPA at the pre-submission stage. I have also taken account of the representation from Morestead Racing Stables on this matter. In all the circumstances I am satisfied that the inclusion of such a use in the policy is locally-distinctive to the parish. There is a facility of this type within its boundary and racing stables are uses which are traditionally associated with a countryside location in general, and a downs environment in particular. Racing stables can contribute to the overall sustainability and well-being of local communities and stimulate the local economy. The supporting text associated with the policy addresses this matter in a balanced way. However, to bring the clarity required by the NPPF I recommend additional supporting text.

In the opening part of the policy replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’

Replace a) with: ‘Extensions and replacement dwellings. For such proposals Policies SD 30 and SD 31 of the South Downs Local Plan will apply with limitations of approximately a net increase of approximately 30% compared with the gross internal area of the existing dwelling being applied in each and every case’

Replace c) with ‘hostel accommodation tied to the operation of racing stables’

In d) delete ‘will be permitted’ and at the end of d) ii add ‘and’

At the end of the third paragraph of supporting text (under the Purpose of the Policy) add: ‘Any such applications will be considered by the National Park Authority based on their individual details and accommodation requirements. As appropriate to their circumstances, planning conditions or legal agreements may be required to take account of the special circumstances presented by such proposals’

HN7 Orchard Close

- 7.54 This policy comments about Orchard Close. Until recently it was used as a residential home and provided assisted living accommodation for older people. It is located to the east of the village on Bourne Lane and sits in substantial grounds. Following the closure of the residential home it has been purchased by Twyford School. In its representation to the Plan the School sought to update TPC on the current ownership position and to provide a degree of flexibility for the School to use the accommodation for boarding school or other schooling facilities
- 7.55 In its response to the clarification TPC responded positively to the representation and proposed a series of changes and updates both to the policy and to the supporting text. I recommend modifications which take account of TPC’s responses to the School’s comments. The modifications incorporate wording which will bring the clarity required by the NPPF. In particular the first criterion in the modified policy requires that changes of use or redevelopment proposals are landscape-led in terms of their

outcome rather than requiring a more process-driven approach for the preparation of a design brief as included in the submitted policy.

Replace the policy with:

‘The change of use or redevelopment of Orchard Close to residential or other uses will be supported subject to the following criteria:

- **the design is landscape-led and retains the existing landscape garden with its trees;**
- **any new buildings are within or adjacent to the footprint of the existing buildings;**
- **the proposal does not result in an unacceptable increase in traffic generation; and**
- **the proposal uses the existing vehicular access point’**

Replace the supporting text with:

‘Purpose of the Policy

Orchard Close was formerly a residential home providing assisted living accommodation for older people. The home has recently closed and the site has now been acquired by Twyford School for educational purposes. No detailed proposals for the future use of the home have yet been submitted.

Orchard Close is located outside the settlement boundary. As such any further development requires exceptional circumstances to be shown, in accordance with Policy SD25.2 of the Local Plan. The site is relatively large and merits a special policy to guide changes which are imminent following its change of ownership. In particular Orchard Close however has a number of individual characteristics which should inform 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; and*
- *Bourne Lane is heavily-used.*

The policy has been designed to address several important matters. The first is that the existing vehicular access to Bourne Lane should be retained and used to service any new development. There should be no unacceptable 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. There are several dwellings close to Orchard Close, so the impact on change to residential use is acceptable amenity is also to be considered.

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 should be addressed in all proposals.

Where necessary any new development should comply with the requirements for affordable housing as set out in Policy HN4 of this Plan and Strategic Policy SD 28 of the South Downs Local Plan.

Improvements to pedestrian access to and from the site would be welcomed but is likely to require third party land'

BE1 Employment and business provision

- 7.56 This policy comments about proposals for employment and business development. Its approach falls within the wider context set by the proposed settlement boundary.
- 7.57 As submitted the policy comments about both proposals for employment and business uses within and outside the defined settlement boundary. However, I recommend that the element relating to proposals within the settlement boundary is deleted. It adds no local value beyond the contents of policies in the SDLP. I also recommend consequential modifications to both the policy title and to the supporting text.
- 7.58 I am satisfied that the second part of the policy with regard to proposals for employment and business uses outside the defined settlement boundary adds value to Policies SD34 and 35 of the SDLP. I recommend modifications to the wording about heavy traffic movements so that it relates to the capacity of the highways network rather than to 'additional' traffic being generated. Any such approach would be difficult to monitor, would vary over time and would take no account of the acceptability or otherwise of such traffic levels.
- 7.59 I also recommend modifications to the supporting text so that the overlapping relationship between Policies BE1 and BE2 on the Northfields Farm and Hazeley Enterprise Park are clear. Otherwise, the policy will make a significant contribution to achieving the economic dimension of sustainable development in the plan period.

Replace the policy with:

'Proposals for new business development, (including the expansion of existing premises or the redevelopment of sites or premises) outside the defined settlement boundary will be supported where they are in accordance with the contents of Policy SD 34 of the South Downs Local Plan, and the uses specified in Policy SD 34 (a—d and g only) in particular.

Changes of use for commercial purposes will be supported where any additional heavy traffic generated can be accommodated within the capacity of the local highways network'

Replace the policy title with: 'Employment and business provision outside the Settlement Boundary'.

At the beginning of the supporting text add: ‘This policy relates to proposals for business and employment proposals outside the defined settlement boundary. Proposals inside the boundary are already addressed in Policy SD35 of the South Downs Local Plan’

Replace the second sentence of the second paragraph of supporting text with: ‘The evidence base for Twyford Parish shows that the community has extensive opportunities for employment, few of the businesses in the Parish provide direct services for the community and that existing planning permissions provide the opportunity for expansion and modernisation of existing commercial premises’

At the end of the first sentence of the third paragraph of the supporting text add ‘Policies BE1 and BE2 apply to the Northfields Farm and Hazeley Enterprise Park which is the largest employment site in the parish’

BE2 Northfields Farm and Hazeley Enterprise Park

- 7.60 This policy comments about this specific site to the immediate north of the village. It has a separate access from Hazeley Road. Due to the various uses the site has a complex history.
- 7.61 The policy has the following related elements:
- the identification of the enterprise park as a local employment site;
 - proposals for the expansion of individual commercial buildings or redevelopments will be supported where they remove the feed mill and relate to the principles of a master plan for the wider site; and
 - a reference to support for a new access road to the Park (and which is then dealt with in greater detail in Policy MA3).
- 7.62 The policy has attracted overlapping representations from the owners of the site (The Humphreys Group) and SDNPA. In their different ways they address the following matters:
- their support for the designation of the park as a local employment site
 - their concerns over the appropriateness of the need for a detailed master plan to inform new development (based on existing consents, the proportionality of the approach and which organisation would prepare any master plan required)
 - the requirement to remove the feed mill; and
 - the comments in the supporting text about how any subsequent planning applications should be considered if the application for the care home is not implemented.
- 7.63 I have considered these matters very carefully. I have also considered TPC’s very detailed commentary on the representations in its response to the clarification note. I can understand the circumstances which have caused TPC to develop the policy as submitted. Plainly the site has a complicated history and the development of a neighbourhood plan provides an opportunity to develop a locally-distinctive policy. Nevertheless, as submitted I have concluded that the policy is overly-restrictive and onerous. In particular the requirement for a master plan approach is likely to be

disproportionate to the needs of most planning applications. In addition, the removal of the feed mill is already a requirement of an extant planning permission and where there is a direct relationship between the development proposed and the feed mill. These circumstances will not necessarily apply to other planning applications. In any event it is not the role of a neighbourhood plan to seek to affect an extant planning permission.

- 7.64 I recommend modifications to the policy to address these matters. The resulting policy continues to address many of the matters included in the submitted policy which featured as components of its proposed master plan-led approach. This will ensure that the policy is both criteria-based and able to provide a locally-distinctive policy approach to this important site. I also recommend that the potential need for a master plan approach is captured in the supporting text. This would apply only to large scale proposals which differed from the substantive approach of the three planning permissions on the site.

Replace the policy with:

‘The Northfields Farm and Hazeley Enterprise Park as shown on Map 6 is designated as a local employment site.

Proposals for the extension/adaptation of existing business premises or for the development of new employment uses within the site will be supported subject to the following criteria:

- **they are positively-designed to take account of their location in the wider landscape;**
- **they can be satisfactorily accommodated in the local highways network;**
- **they minimise impacts on the wider landscape and, where practicable, includes areas of planting identified on Map 6; and**
- **as appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals provide pedestrian and cycle access to the existing network’**

Delete the fourth paragraph of supporting text (beginning ‘Consents have been granted’)

In the sixth paragraph of supporting text replace ‘Principle’ with ‘The principal’

Under the Relationship to the SDLP heading replace the text with the following:

‘The site is outside the Settlement Boundary. Policy SD 35 of the Local Plan requires that premises in commercial use should be retained for that purpose. A variety of planning permissions exist on the site and provide a context for development in the Plan period. Policy BE2 of this Plan provide a local context within future proposals for employment development can be determined. It takes account of the location in the wider landscape and the potential impact of any further proposals on the capacity of the highways network.

The provision of a new route to the north west providing a direct connection to B3335 while avoiding the centre of the village is addressed in Policy MA4

The Care Home development is associated with the eventual demolition of the feed mill (by way of a planning obligation)’

BE3 Twyford Preparatory School

- 7.65 This policy comments about the Twyford School Site. The School is an integral part of the village and a major employer in the parish. The policy is important both in its own right and as the Plan proposed the exclusion of the School from the settlement boundary in particular.
- 7.66 The policy sets a positive tone for proposals which may come forward to sustain the School in the Plan period. At its heart is a requirement that development comes forward within the context of a Master Plan for the overall site. The policy comments that the Plan should address access and vehicle movements, landscape and design, heritage and an overall approach to the location of any new buildings.
- 7.67 It is common ground between TPC and the School that the preparation of a master plan has been overtaken by events. As the School comments in its representation '(it) 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 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'.
- 7.68 The proposed contents of a master plan in the policy are comprehensive. They address a series of matters which would naturally arise in the consideration of development proposals in an extensive site on the edge of the village and with a range of heritage, landscape and access requirements. In its response to the clarification note TPC reasserts its views about the significance of such issues. In its representation the School confirms its commitment to the sensitive management of its estate and highlights its track record in doing so.
- 7.69 I have considered this matter very carefully. Plainly the preparation of a master plan would be helpful for longer-term certainty and clarity. However, the School is not at a point at which it has been able to produce such a plan. Similarly, the submitted policy provides no clarity on how the master plan would be approved. Indeed, the policy simply requires that the School prepares a master plan and then developments which conform with the master plan will be supported. In any event the policy would be ineffective without a master plan. In this context the School has a reasonable expectation that any future planning applications would be determined on the basis of the development plan and any material planning considerations which apply to that proposal.
- 7.70 In all the circumstances I recommend that the policy is recast so that provides the clarity required by the NPPF. The modified policy retains the matters identified for inclusion in a master plan as key parts of a criteria- based approach. I also recommend that the School's suggestion that an indicative master plan should be submitted with any future planning applications to show how the school intends to develop the site over the next 10 years. Plainly this will need to be pursued on a proportionate basis – whilst such an approach would be appropriate for substantial new development it would

be unnecessary for minor works to the existing buildings. I also recommend modifications to the third part of the policy to take account of TPC's helpful response to the clarification note.

Replace the policy with:

'Development proposals related to the educational needs of the School within the area shown on Map 7 will be supported subject to the following criteria:

- **they incorporate measures for access and movement which manage both the use of the car and the impact of pupil related traffic on the village and local roads;**
- **they take a sensitive approach to the landscape setting of the School;**
- **they are sensitively designed to respect the landscape setting of the School and the integrity and character of the buildings in the wider School site;**
- **they respect the historic fabric and archaeology of the building concerned and the wider School complex; and**
- **any additional buildings are sensitively-located both within the wider landscape and in relation to other buildings both within the School site and/or on adjacent parcels of land.**

Any new buildings should be located on the upper part of the site in close proximity to existing buildings'

Delete the final sentence of the fifth paragraph of supporting text.

Add additional paragraphs of text thereafter to read:

'The School has undertaken some earlier work on the preparation of a master plan to provide clarity for the medium and longer term. This work has not progressed as circumstances have changed in general, and with the purchase of Orchard House in particular. In this context Policy BE3 sets out a criteria-based approach for the determination of any planning applications which may come forward. Where it is proportionate to do so an indicative parameter master plan should be submitted with planning applications to show how the School intends to develop the site in the medium and longer term and the way in which the current proposal fits within that framework.

The second part of the policy sets out general approach to the location of any new buildings. It takes account of the openness of the lower land (now playing fields)'

ST1 Visitor and tourism facilities

- 7.71 This policy offers general support to the enhancement of existing tourism facilities or the development of new facilities within the settlement boundary. It makes a close association with Policy Strategic Policy SD23 of the SDLP.
- 7.72 The third part of the policy comments that visitor accommodation will only be supported within the settlement boundary. Given the nature of the parish this approach would be appropriate. Nevertheless, a strict interpretation of the policy would not be in general

conformity with Policy SD23 of the SDLP. In this context I recommend that it is expanded to take account of the circumstances supported in Part 1 g of Policy SD23. I also recommend consequential modifications to the supporting text. Otherwise, with detailed modifications to its wording the wider policy meets the basic conditions.

In the first and second parts of the policy replaced ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’

Replace the third part of the policy with: ‘Visitor accommodation will only be supported within the settlement boundary unless the circumstances as set out in Strategic Policy SD23 Part 1 g) apply to the site or the building concerned’

Replace the final paragraph of supporting text with: ‘Provision is made for visitor accommodation only within the Settlement Boundary (unless the provisions of Policy SD23 of the Local Plan apply or by conversion of farm buildings on the basis of Policy SD 41 of the Local Plan)’

ST2 Visiting and enjoying Twyford

- 7.73 The South Downs National Park Partnership Management Plan 2020—2025 includes a series of objectives which include “Outstanding Experiences” for those visiting the National Park. It will be for Twyford Parish Council and all local landowners and organisations to work with the SDNPA on a range of matters. Two areas in particular are identified. The first is appropriate and sensitively-sited signage, orientation and visitor information (at visitor information points and online) is to be provided for key sites of interest in the Parish, linked to key transport and access routes and compliant with other policies. The second is the promotion of sustainable visitor behaviour to users of paths and trails using appropriate resources, signage and interpretation at key sites.
- 7.74 This policy sets out a general approach to achieve these matters. It is distinctive from the other policies in the Plan as there is no specific policy in a policy box. In its response to the clarification note TPC advised that a policy was included in the pre-submission Plan dealing with countryside management issues. This was pointed out by SDNPA and as such the policy was removed but the text retained.
- 7.75 I recommend that the intentions of the policy are captured in the Community Actions Section of the Plan. This will provide clarity to all concerned that there is no land use policy of this type in the Plan whilst highlighting the collaborative work which TPC intends to pursue to encourage sustainable recreation, leisure and tourism in the parish.
- 7.76 With detailed modifications I am satisfied that the supporting text can remain in the Plan. Indeed, it provides a broader context to the importance of the conservation area to the parish.

Capture the intention of this part of the Plan to a new section in the Plan on Community Actions (as addressed in paragraphs 7.153 of this report).

In the supporting text delete ‘Policy ST2’ from the initial title

At the end of the fourth paragraph of the text add: 'The Community Actions section of this Plan sets out the Parish Council's intention to work with the relevant public and private organisations to deliver key elements of the South Downs National Park Partnership Management Plan with regard to recreation and sustainable tourism'

CP1 Open Spaces

- 7.77 This policy identifies a series of sporting, leisure and open spaces in the parish in Table 1 and on Map 8. In its response to the clarification note TPC clarified that its intention was to apply the provisions of Policy SD46 of the SDLP to the identified facilities.
- 7.78 I looked at the various open spaces as part of the visit. I saw their importance to the community and their extensive use. In this context I am satisfied that the policy brings a distinctive approach to that in Policy SD46 of the SDLP by defining the facilities in the parish to be safeguarded by that approach.
- 7.79 I recommend modifications to the format of the policy so that its effects are clear. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions. Its implementation will do much to deliver the social dimension of sustainable development.

Replace the policy with:

'The Plan identifies Twyford's community, sports facilities and open spaces in Table 1 and Map 8. Development proposals affecting the identified facilities will be assessed against the provisions of Strategic Policy SD 46 of the South Downs Local Plan'

CP2 New and Existing Community Facilities

- 7.80 This policy has a similar format to that of Policy CP1. In this case it identifies a series of community facilities in the parish in Table 2 and on Map 8. In its response to the clarification note TPC clarified that its intention was to apply the provisions of Policy SD43 of the SDLP to the identified facilities.
- 7.81 I looked at the various community facilities as part of the visit. I saw their importance to the community. In this context I am satisfied that the policy brings a distinctive approach to that in Policy SD43 of the SDLP by defining the facilities in the parish to be safeguarded by that approach.
- 7.82 The policy's focus is on safeguarding existing community facilities. This is in contrast with its title which also refers to new facilities. For clarity I recommend that the 'new' element of the policy title is deleted.
- 7.83 I recommend modifications to the format of the policy so that its effects are clear. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions. Its implementation will do much to deliver the social dimension of sustainable development in the parish.

Replace the policy with:

‘The Plan identifies Twyford’s community facilities in Table 2 and Map 8. Development proposals affecting the identified facilities will be assessed against the provisions of Strategic Policy SD 43 of the South Downs Local Plan’

In the policy title delete ‘New and’

CP3 St Mary’s Primary School

- 7.84 The policy offers support to improvements to the school, including updated access arrangements. I saw its importance to the wider community during the visit.
- 7.85 I recommend that the two parts are combined into a single policy. I also recommend that the policy acknowledges that not all improvement works to the School will need planning permission. Otherwise, the policy meets the basic conditions. As with the other policies in this part of the Plan its implementation will do much to deliver the social dimension of sustainable development in the parish.

Replace the policy with:

‘Insofar as planning permission is required development proposals for the maintenance and improvement of the St Mary’s Primary School’s facilities, including its access arrangements, will be supported’

LHE1 Protected gaps

- 7.86 The policy identifies two protected gaps around Twyford village. One is to the west (between it and Shawford). The other is to the south (between it and Colden Common). I looked at the two proposed Gaps during the visit. In particular I took time to look at the Twyford-Shawford Gap and its relationship to the River Itchen and the network of footpaths to the west running through the Meadow.
- 7.87 The policy sets out to deliver a key objective of the Plan to maintain the rural character of the village. As the Plan comments retaining the open and undeveloped countryside between Twyford and adjoining settlements is an important way of keeping the sense of place and character of the village, and in preventing erosion of the countryside and landscape of the National Park and its relationship to the village.
- 7.88 The policy is underpinned by detailed research and evidence. As part of the Plan’s development, the Parish Council commissioned a full study of the parish landscape from Terra Firma Consultants. The resulting Parish Landscape Assessment Part 1: Landscape Character Assessment December 2015 builds on earlier studies by Winchester City Council, Hampshire County Council and the National Park Authority.
- 7.89 The policy defines the two gaps and then sets out an approach to safeguard them from development unless it does not reduce the physical separation of the settlements or compromise the integrity of the gap, individually or cumulatively with other existing or proposed developments. In this context its approach is clear without being prescriptive.

- 7.90 The policy is an excellent local response to this important matter to the longer-term integrity of the parish. Plainly it will play a major part in the delivery of the environmental dimension of sustainable development in the parish. Subject to a detailed modification it meets the basic condition.

In the second part of the policy replace ‘allowed’ with ‘supported’

LHE2 Landscape and views

- 7.91 This policy addresses landscape features and identified views. It is underpinned by the findings of the Character Assessment. In this regard I am satisfied that the features identified are both appropriate and that their identification is evidence-based
- 7.92 The policy has a complicated format in that it both identifies important elements of the local landscape and then seeks to relate them to SDLP policies. This issue is highlighted given the different emphasis and approaches of the policies concerned.
- 7.93 In order to bring the clarity required by the NPPF I recommend that the policy is reconfigured so that it requires that development proposals take account of the features in Table 3. I also recommend that this is achieved in a proportionate way. Finally, I recommend that the supporting text is reconfigured so that it describes the way in which the policy will add value to the purpose of SDLP policies.

Replace the policy with:

‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals should take account of Twyford’s landscape and the important parish views, landmark features, and designated landscapes identified in Table 3’

At the end of the final paragraph of the supporting text add: ‘Policy LHE2 adds value to the two South Downs Local Plan policies by identifying a specific series of landscape features in the parish. Development proposals should take account of these features as appropriate to their scale, nature and location’

LHE3 The historic environment, buildings and archaeology

- 7.94 This policy addresses the rich historic environment in the parish. In particular it identifies locations with significance for archaeology and built heritage. In this context this policy has a similar format to that of Policies CP1 and CP2.
- 7.95 In its response to the clarification note TPC clarified that the purpose of the policy is to identify particular elements of the historic environment in the neighbourhood area. I recommend that the policy is recast in a similar way to that of Policy LHE2 so that, in this case, it requires that development proposals take account of the features shown on Map 10.
- 7.96 Finally I recommend that the supporting text is reconfigured so that it describes the way in which the policy will add value to the purpose of SDLP policies.

Replace the policy with:

‘Development proposals should take account of the following heritage assets in the neighbourhood area and respond positively to their importance:

- **Areas 1—5 as shown on Map 10 identified as having particular archaeological potential; and**
- **Areas 3—6 as shown on Map 10 containing significant heritage assets’**

At the end of the final paragraph of supporting text add: ‘Policy LHE3 adds value to the South Downs Local Plan Policies SD13/14/16 by identifying a specific series of heritage features of which development proposals should take account’

LHE4 Twyford Conservation Area

- 7.97 This policy concentrates on the Twyford Conservation Area. It is extensive in nature and incorporates the older parts of the village and the three village fords. It was designated by Winchester City Council with an appraisal of its historical architectural and landscape assets and their significance. It includes a large number of listed buildings. Since then, the significance of the conservation area has been underpinned by a range of studies on the history of Twyford, its archaeology and individual buildings.
- 7.98 The first part of the policy reinforces the protection afforded by the development plan (Strategic Policy SD15 of the SDLP). The second part of the policy comments that TPC will work with SDNPA to produce more detailed advice and guide new development and to work out a programme of enhancement.
- 7.99 Plainly the conservation area is an important part of the character and appearance of the parish. However, the first part adds no distinctive value to the policy approach already captured in the SDLP. In addition, there is no evidence that the character and appearance of the conservation area is not being protected by existing policies. The second part is a clear expression of TPC’s ambition to work with SDNPA to produce more detailed advice for the conservation area rather than a policy in its own right. In these circumstances I recommend that the policy is deleted. I also recommend that this aspect of the policy is repositioned to a community action part of the Plan to recognise its importance (and likely benefits) to the wider community.
- 7.100 With detailed modifications I am satisfied that the supporting text can remain in the Plan. Indeed, it provides a broader context to the importance of the conservation area to the parish.

Delete the policy

Reposition the second part of the policy to a new section in the Plan on Community Actions (as addressed in paragraph 7.153 of this report).

In the supporting text delete ‘Policy LHE4’ from the initial title

At the end of the third paragraph of the text add: ‘Strategic Policy SD15 of the South Downs Local Plan provides a robust policy context against which proposals in the conservation area will be assessed. The Community Actions section of this Plan sets

out the Parish Council's intention to work with the SDNPA to produce more detail guidance for new development in the Conservation Area and to inform any required enhancements'

LHE5 Green Infrastructure

- 7.101 This policy comments about green infrastructure. Its approach reflects that the character of Twyford owes much to its close relationship to the surrounding countryside and to green areas within the village. There are numerous green wildlife corridors and green areas, mostly on private land with no permissive access, such as other fields within the water meadows and fields located between the north and south parts of the village that are also important to the village landscape character. Of particular importance is the flood plain of the Itchen Valley.
- 7.102 The policy has two parts. The first identifies the Itchen Valley Twyford Down and Hockley Golf Course as Green Infrastructure. I am satisfied that the approach taken is both evidence-based and appropriate to the parish. With detailed modifications it meets the basic conditions.
- 7.103 The second sets out a more general approach towards 'other open land'. The Plan comments that this part of the policy has been developed as no formal study has been carried out to identify other key areas of green infrastructure. Until this has been done the Plan contends that all open land will need to be considered for their green infrastructure impact and potential in development proposals. I can understand the approach which TPC has taken on this matter. However, it is not directly underpinned with evidence and adds little if any value to existing policies in the development plan. As such I recommend its deletion. I also recommend consequential modifications to the supporting text.

Replace the first part of the policy with:

'The Itchen Valley, Twyford Down and Hockley Golf Course (as shown on Map 11) are designated as Green Infrastructure. Any development proposals within these areas will be determined on the basis of the provisions of Policy SD45 of the South Downs Local Plan'

Delete the second part of the policy.

Delete the fifth paragraph of supporting text under the Purpose of the Policy heading.

At the end of the Purpose of the Policy heading add: 'Policy LHE5 adds value to South Downs Local Plan Policy SD46 by identifying a specific series of green infrastructure of which development proposals should take account'

LHE6 Local biodiversity, trees and woodlands

- 7.104 This policy comments more broadly about biodiversity, trees and woodlands. It includes extensive supporting text and translates into three separate elements of the policy.

- 7.105 The first part of the policy identifies parcels of land with specific protections to which Policy SD9 of the SDLP will apply. Subject to detailed modifications to bring the clarity required by the NPPF it meets the basic conditions.
- 7.106 The second part of the policy comments about TPC's intentions to prepare a cross border policy for the River Itchen SAC with Winchester City Council and the SDNPA. This has the making of an excellent project. However, it is just that rather than a land use policy. I recommend that this aspect of the policy is repositioned to a community action part of the Plan to recognise its importance (and likely benefits) to the wider community.
- 7.107 The third part of the policy seeks to safeguard trees and woodlands. As drafted, it could be considered as either a policy or as a community action. On balance I am satisfied that with modifications it is a community action. As a proposed policy it adds no distinctive local value. I recommend accordingly

Replace the first part of the policy with:

'Development proposals should conserve and enhance the biodiversity and ecological importance of the sites shown on Map 12 and otherwise comply with the requirements of Strategic Policy SD 9 Biodiversity and Geodiversity of the South Downs Local Plan'

Delete the second and third parts of the policy.

Reposition the second and third part of the policy to a new section in the Plan on community actions (as addressed in paragraph 7.153 of this report).

At the end of the final paragraph of supporting text under the biodiversity heading add: 'This matter is set out in the Community Actions section of the Plan'

LHE7 Dark Night Skies

- 7.108 This part of the Plan draws attention to the Dark Skies approach taken by the SDNPA in general, and in policies in the SDLP in particular.
- 7.109 Whilst it is appropriate for the Plan to address this matter it does not include a policy despite the heading of the section. I recommend that the title of the section is modified accordingly. As the text comments this important matter is already satisfactorily addressed in Policy SD8 in the SDLP. I recommend modifications to correct errors in the text.

In the supporting text delete LHE7 from the initial title

In the second paragraph of the supporting text replace SD9 with SD8.

WE1 Flood risk management

- 7.110 As the Plan comments Twyford Parish's water environment is a key component of its natural beauty and role in the South Downs landscape. However, this results in periodic flooding.

- 7.111 The policy and the associated supporting text have a hybrid format. They partly comment about general flood risk management and flooding issues in the village and partly about an emerging flood mitigation scheme to the east of the B3355 involving TPC, Hampshire County Council (HCC) in its capacity as the Land Drainage Authority and the Environment Agency. A separate element of the policy comments that the scheme should be delivered in parallel with the development of the housing allocation identified in the Plan.
- 7.112 Plainly the interrelationship between these matters is an important issue for the neighbourhood area. In its response to the clarification note TPC commented about the progress that has been achieved on the flood mitigation scheme. HCC have agreed that TPC can take the lead in preparing the scheme and securing the finance. TPC have now largely done so in cooperation with the relevant land owners. This policy overlaps with the provisions of Policies HN2 and DB1. Given that Policy DB1 already comments about the relationship between the housing development and the implementation of the flood management works there is no need for Policy WE1 to address this particular matter.
- 7.113 As submitted the policy has a complicated format. I recommend modifications so that it takes on a simpler format. In doing so it provides a more general context to ensure that development does not cause flooding issue, safeguards the land identified for the emerging flood mitigation works and directly relates those works to the proposed housing allocation off Hazeley Road.

Replace the policy with:

‘Proposed developments should demonstrate how they can be accommodated within the water environment of the neighbourhood area and that they will not contribute directly or indirectly to surface water runoff or flooding.

Development proposals for the implementation of flood defence works to the east of the B3355 off Hazeley Road will be supported where they respect the nature of their immediate environment and the amenity of residential properties in the immediate locality.

Development proposals which would directly or indirectly conflict with the land safeguarded for flood mitigation works on Map 3 will not be supported’

Include an additional paragraph of supporting text at the end of the Purpose of the Policy section to read:

‘Policy WE1 addresses these various matters in the round. It provides a more general context to ensure that development does not cause flooding issues, safeguards the land identified for the emerging flood mitigation works and directly relate those works to the proposed housing allocation off Hazeley Road. Policy DB1 of the Plan comments about the relationship between the housing development and the implementation of the flood management works’

WE2 Foul Sewerage including surcharging

- 7.114 This policy comments about foul sewerage. It reflects recent incidents of flooding. As submitted the policy is more about process requirements. The history to the policy was explained in the TPC's responses to the clarification. I recommend that the policy is replaced with an alternative version which sets out TPC's ambitions on this matter. The recommended modification is a variation of TPC's suggested policy. I also recommend that a modified version of the submitted policy is repositioned into the supporting text to provide a context for the replacement policy.

Replace the policy with:

'Development proposals should be designed to ensure that additional foul sewage does not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity or the natural environment The designs of such proposals should take into account their cumulative impact with other developments and any potential mitigation measures including the surcharging of the existing system'

At the end of the Purpose of the Policy supporting text add: 'Policy WE2 addresses this important matter. Planning applications should be accompanied a drainage plan to show that the drainage associated with the site will either utilise an existing foul sewer for mains drain only at the nearest point of capacity or will be dealt with by a small package treatment plant (or similar). Details of the proposed means of surface run off disposal to be in accordance with Part H3 of the Building Renovations Hierarchy as well as acceptable discharge points, rates and volumes to be agreed by the lead Local Flood Authority, in consultation with Southern Water'

MA1 Walking and cycling

- 7.115 This policy addresses TPC's view that there is a need to maintain and improve the walking and cycling network to enhance connections across the village and particularly to the village centre and the school and also to enhance opportunities for recreation and enjoyment of the countryside. It has two related parts. The first comments about the extension and improvement of rights of way. The second comments about TPC's anticipation of collaborative work to improve cycle access along the B3335/B3354 axis.
- 7.116 As TPC comments in its response to the clarification note the various measures are important to the local community. Nevertheless, they are proposals rather than land use policies. I recommend that the policy is repositioned to a community action part of the Plan to recognise its importance (and likely benefits) to the wider community.
- 7.117 With detailed modifications I am satisfied that the supporting text can remain in the Plan. Indeed, it provides a broader context to the importance of these matters to the parish

Delete the policy

Reposition the first and second parts of the policy to a new section in the Plan on community actions (as addressed in paragraph 7.153 of this report).

In the supporting text delete 'Policy MA1' from the initial title

Before the first paragraph of supporting text insert: ‘The development of the Plan has identified a series of access improvements in relation to rights of way and cycle routes which would be on benefit to local people. In this context a series of access improvements are included in the community actions sections of the Plan’

Replace the text in the Relationship with SDLP section with: ‘The community actions relating to this matter seek to deliver several of the key objectives of the South Downs Local Plan’

MA2 Parking

- 7.118 This policy reaffirms the importance of Policy SD22 of the SDLP. Thereafter it proposes three bespoke strands of parking related policies in the parish.
- 7.119 SDNPA suggests that the policy adds no value either to existing development plan policies or to the allocation of the housing site in the plan (Policies HN2 and DB1). In its response to the clarification note TPC sets out its approach to the matter in general terms. I have considered all the information very carefully. On the balance of the evidence, I recommend that the policy is deleted. Since the Plan was submitted SDNPA has adopted its own Supplementary Planning Guidance on this matter. Similarly, I am satisfied that the parking arrangements for the proposed housing allocation in the Plan are satisfactorily addressed elsewhere in the Plan.

Delete the policy

Delete the supporting text

MA3 Minor traffic management improvements

- 7.120 This policy seeks to safeguard the safety of the local highway network. As part of this ambition, it proposes that minor roads should be safeguarded from excessive speeds and that it will apply pressure on HCC to introduce management measures for minor roads to prevent HGV use.
- 7.121 I saw the impact of some of these issues first hand during my visit. Nevertheless, the matters raised in the first and second parts of the policy are highways issues rather than land use matters. I recommend that this aspect of the policy is deleted and repositioned to a community action part of the Plan to recognise its importance (and likely benefits) to the wider community.
- 7.122 The third part of the policy comments about the need for new developments to mitigate their effects on the road network. I recommend that the policy acknowledges that some development may be able to be comfortably incorporated into the network. I also recommend that the policy is applied in a proportionate way. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions.
- 7.123 I recommend consequential modifications to the supporting text.

Delete the first and second parts of the policy.

Replace the third part of the policy with:

‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals should incorporate any required measures to mitigate the impact of additional traffic and movement created by the development concerned’

Reposition the first and second parts of the policy to a new section in the Plan on community actions (as addressed in paragraph 7.153 of this report).

At the end of the sixth paragraph of the supporting text add: ‘This matter is set out in the Community Actions section of the Plan’

Replace the second paragraph of supporting text with: ‘Excessive speed and on-street parking reduce the amenity and safety within the village and are controlled by the Highway Authority. Moreover Twyford, in its role as ‘gateway’ to the National Park, needs to protect its minor roads from unwanted parking by visitors. In this context a series of traffic management measures are included in the community actions section of the Plan’

Replace the text in the Relationship to the SDLP and other policies with: ‘Policy MA3 seeks to supplement the approach in national policy and within the wider development plan’

MA4 Northfields/Hazeley Enterprise Park

- 7.124 This policy supports the principle of a new access road from the B3335 into the Northfields/Hazeley Enterprise Park. As the supporting text comments ‘Traffic to and from Northfields Farm /Hazeley Enterprise Park has to use Hazeley Road for access. There is an existing Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting large goods vehicles over 7.5 tonnes from using the western section of Hazeley Road between the Northfields access and the crossroads in the middle of the village. This is not always complied with and large vehicles continue to make the tight turn across the front of the General Stores/ Post Office and use the narrow section of Hazeley Road that has numerous parked cars between the Post Office and Parish Hall car park. The owner of Northfields/Hazeley Enterprise Park has also erected signs advising all large goods vehicles to turn left out of the access and has installed a monitoring system. The formation of a new direct link from the bottom of Whites Hill into Northfields Farm/Hazeley Enterprise Park would provide environmental benefits to the village and reinforce the existing weight restriction along the village end of Hazeley Road’
- 7.125 In its response to the clarification note TPC clarified its intentions that the policy was intended to be a land use policy rather than a community action. In this context I recommend that its wording is modified accordingly. I also recommend that the policy acknowledges that the delivery of the road needs to be sensitively addressed. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions and has the potential to make a significant contribution to the delivery of the environmental dimension of sustainable development in the parish

Replace the policy with:

‘Proposals for a new highway access from B3335 Whites Hill into Northfields Farm/Hazeley Enterprise Park (as shown diagrammatically on Map 6) will be supported where they respond positively to the landscape setting of the neighbourhood area’

At the end of the Purpose of the Policy supporting text add a further paragraph to read: ‘Policy MA4 sets the context for the delivery of this important element of infrastructure. Any such proposal should be carefully designed and aligned to address any potential impacts on the quality of the local landscape’

MA5 Transport in the Parish

- 7.126 This policy proposes a package of transport improvements in Twyford village. In summary they include pedestrian movements, cycle routes, general traffic management and public transport matters.
- 7.127 As TPC comments in its response to the clarification note the various measures are important to the local community. Nevertheless, they are proposals rather than policies. I recommend that the policy is repositioned to a community actions part of the Plan to recognise its importance (and likely benefits) to the wider community.
- 7.128 With detailed modifications I am satisfied that the supporting text can remain in the Plan. Indeed, it provides a broader context to the importance of these matters to the parish.

Delete the policy

Reposition the first and second parts of the policy to a new section in the Plan on community actions (as addressed in paragraph 7.153 of this report).

In the supporting text delete ‘Policy MA5’ from the initial title.

Replace the first paragraph of supporting text with: ‘The development of the Plan has identified a series of transport improvements which would be of benefit to local people. They address pedestrian and cycle movements, general traffic management issues and public transport initiatives. In this context a series of traffic management measures are included in the community actions section of the Plan’

Replace the text in the Relationship with SDLP section with: ‘The community actions relating to this matter seek to deliver several of the key objectives of the South Downs Local Plan’

MA6 Historic Rural Roads

- 7.129 As clarified in TPC’s response to the clarification note this policy identifies a series of historic rural roads which will be protected under the terms included in Policy SD21 of the SDLP.

- 7.130 I recommend that the policy is inserted within a policy box and modified so that its purpose is clear. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions.

Replace the first part of the policy with:

‘The Plan identifies the following historic rural roads which will be safeguarded in accordance with policy SD 21.2’

[thereafter include the list from the submitted policy].

Insert the policy into a policy box.

SS1 Micro generation and renewable energy

- 7.131 This policy offers support for renewable energy schemes (other than free standing wind turbines and solar arrays). It seeks to refine the approach in Policy SD51 of the SDLP. The policy is more restrictive than the approach in Policy SD51 in respect of free-standing solar arrays and wind turbines. TPC considers that they are obtrusive by their nature. The limitation on the free-standing proposals derives from the Plan’s analysis of the extra sensitivity of the Twyford landscape for a series of reasons as set out in the response to the clarification note. I have considered them carefully. However, I am not satisfied that they are either so important or evidence-based as to warrant an approach which is not in general conformity with the SDLP. In these circumstances I recommend the deletion of both the policy and the supporting text.

Delete the policy

Delete the supporting text

SS2 Sustainable and adaptable buildings

- 7.132 This part of the Plan draws attention to the importance of all new buildings incorporating sustainable design features. It signposts the reader to Policy SD48 of the SDLP.

- 7.133 Whilst it is appropriate for the Plan to address this matter it does not include a policy despite the heading of the section. I recommend that the title of the section is modified accordingly. As the text comments this important matter is already satisfactorily addressed in Policy SD48 in the SDLP.

In the supporting text delete ‘Policy SS2’ from the initial title

PO1 Pollution and Contaminated land

- 7.134 The policy identifies a series of pollution sources in the parish. It then comments that developments which would be affected by such sources of pollution should assess and mitigate their effects. The policy makes reference to the approach taken in Policy SD54 of the SDLP.

- 7.135 The submitted Plan has approached the matter in a different way to that Policy SD54 of the SDLP. The former looks to ensure that new development proposals are not affected by existing sources of pollution. The latter looks to ensure that new

development proposals do not cause unacceptable harm to the local environment and, where necessary to introduce mitigation measures.

- 7.136 In order to remedy this matter I recommend that the policy is recast so that it more closely relates to the character and appearance of the neighbourhood area.

Replace the policy with:

‘Development proposals should demonstrate that their levels of air, noise, vibration, light, water, odour or other pollutants do not have an unacceptable impact on people and the natural environment now or in the foreseeable future, taking into account cumulative impacts and any mitigation. In particular development proposals should demonstrate that they do not contribute to existing pollution levels in the neighbourhood area.

Where necessary development proposals should quantify any additional nitrate emissions and mitigate their potential effects on the Solent SPA.’

DE1 Design

- 7.137 The policy comments that development proposals should take account of the distinctive village character and be informed by the Twyford Village Character Assessment, the Twyford Parish Landscape Assessment and the Conservation Area Appraisal, and to accord with Policies SD4 and SD5 of the SDLP.
- 7.138 The policy is underpinned by extensive supporting text which sets out the various existing assessments and the Terra Firma study produced as part of the preparation of the Plan. Whilst the Plan was prepared and submitted before the 2021 version of the NPPF was published it is underpinned by a range of assessments and detailed studies as highlighted in paragraph 129 of that version of the NPPF.
- 7.139 I recommend that the policy is modified so that it brings the clarity required by the NPPF. In doing so I recommend that it takes account of the scale and the nature of the development proposal. Finally, I recommend that the policy sets out the implications of development proposals not taking the approach as specified in the policy. The approach taken in the second part of the recommended modification to the policy takes account of the contents of paragraph 134 of the NPPF.
- 7.140 I also recommend consequential modifications to the supporting text.

Replace the policy with:

‘Development proposals should respond positively to the distinctive character of Twyford and, as appropriate to their scale, nature and location, be informed by the Twyford Village Character Assessment, the Twyford Parish Landscape Assessment and the Conservation Area Appraisal.

Development proposals which do not respect the character and appearance of the neighbourhood area will not be supported’

At the end of the final paragraph of supporting text (under the Relationship with SDLP policies heading) add: 'Policy DE1 brings a local dimension to this important strategic approach'

IDC1 Infrastructure

- 7.141 This policy comments about the Parish Council's views about the levels of infrastructure in the parish and the way in which they meet its existing and growing population. It identifies seven areas where there is a deficiency in the current provision.
- 7.142 The resulting policy has been designed to complement the approach taken in Strategic Policy SD42 of the SDLP. It has two parts. The first requires that new development proposals assess their impact on the identified infrastructure deficiencies. The second offers support for works which are designed to resolve the identified infrastructure deficiencies. I saw some of the traffic and highways issues first-hand during the visit.
- 7.143 In general terms the policy is well-considered. In particular it identifies local infrastructure deficiencies which are not challenged in the representations. I recommend detailed modifications to the policy so that it has the clarity required by the NPPF. In particular the modifications relate the policy approach more fully to the development management process, comment about the acceptability or otherwise of any harm and clarify the extent and nature of the first part the policy.
- 7.144 Part of the first element of the policy and its second part comment about circumstances where broader infrastructure improvements come forward. It is anticipated that this may arise from public bodies and/or statutory agencies. In this context I recommend that the policy is restructured so that the potential need for developers to take account of improvements to infrastructure undertaken by the public sector agencies follows on after the general expression of policy support for such works. The implementation of the policy will do much to promote the social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

Replace the first part of the policy with:

'As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals should assess their impact on the current infrastructure deficiencies listed as 1—7 above, and ensure that no unacceptable harm is caused to the matters which are relevant to the proposal or that any harm can be mitigated in an appropriate fashion.

Proposals for the provision of new and improved utilities and other infrastructure to address the matters set out in 1 -7 above will be supported.

Where a scheme of mitigation of any infrastructure deficiency is being taken forward by a public body and/or a statutory agency, development proposals should be designed to take account of and be complementary to the implementation of those works'

Replace the paragraph of supporting text beginning with 'The deficiencies...' with 'Policy IDC1 provides a context within which these issues can be managed. It

addresses the need for development proposals to take account of the identified deficiencies in infrastructure, offers support to the delivery of infrastructure improvement works and sets out a requirement for other development proposals to be complementary to such works'

DB1 Land allocation by the Village Hall

- 7.145 The policy provides detailed guidance for the development of the allocated site in the Plan (as already identified in Policy HN2). In particular it comments about the following five matters:
- landscape impact;
 - access and the village centre;
 - flooding;
 - foul sewerage; and
 - dwelling sizes and mix.
- 7.146 This policy incorporates an excellent approach towards the need for a development brief. In many cases the policy provides the detailed outcome of the assessment of the effect of the allocation of the site as included in the SA. In overall terms it provides assurance to all concerned that the various mitigation measures have been captured into a policy context. It makes specific reference to the flood mitigation scheme off Hazeley Road and as described in further detail in Policy WE1.
- 7.147 In particular the policy positively addresses the way in which the development of the site needs to deliver the community's wider ambitions to incorporate a well-designed housing scheme adjacent to the social and community facilities in the village. This will result in a high level of sustainability. It is a very good example of how a community has identified and promoted a housing site both to satisfy the strategic housing needs of the parish and reinforcing its social and community well-being at the same time.
- 7.148 I recommend modifications to both the policy and to the supporting text to address the helpful comments from Historic England on the policy. I have based the recommended modifications on the very helpful responses from TPC to the clarification note.
- 7.149 Criterion i) addresses design matters. It sets out to ensure that the eventual development of the site takes account of the various elements of consultancy work which have informed the promotion of the site within the Plan. As the supporting text comments 'The Parish Council recognizes that this is a sensitive site; it has taken extensive advice on the landscape impact of development on the site, both from Terra Firma Landscape Architects and from Urban Design Planners, Spindrift on layout and design, and from photomontages of the Spindrift layout. As a result, the development area has been limited in its extent and also excludes the tree clump in the centre of the site; this is to be kept as a major feature of the village centre. Further planting will also be required along the line of Hazeley Road.'

7.150 Whilst the Plan was prepared and submitted before the NPPF 2021 was published, the approach taken in this policy is underpinned by a range of assessments and detailed studies as highlighted in paragraph 129 of that version of the NPPF. Nevertheless, as submitted, this part of the policy is overly-complicated. I recommend modifications to remedy this matter and to bring the clarity required by the NPPF. I also recommend detailed modifications to other criteria so that they naturally flow from the opening part of the policy.

In criterion e) replace ‘preparation’ with ‘delivery’

Replace criterion i) with: ‘A design which responds positively to the surgery and the parish hall, which follows the principles of the layout (shown on Map 15) unless there are clear advantages of an alternative layout and otherwise accords with the provisions of Policy DE1 of the Plan’

In j) replace ‘Management’ with ‘The management’

In l) delete ‘must be provided’

Replace the opening element of supporting text with: ‘Site 26 is the principal site for allocation of new houses in the Plan. It will provide 20 houses (see Policy HN2) of which 10 are to be affordable (see Policy HN3). The scheme will also deliver additional car parking (see Policy MA2)’

In the supporting text insert an additional overarching matter (between numbers 1 and 2 in the submitted Plan to read:

‘Conservation Area:

The north western corner of the site is within the Twyford Conservation Area The principal feature of conservation importance is the clump of eleven mature beech and Scot’s pine which is on high land and widely visible, three of which are within the conservation area. The trees 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 incorporation as public open space within the wider proposal (and eventually to be dedicated to the Parish Council). A Heritage Statement will be required for the development of the site in accordance with South Downs Local Plan policies SD12 and SD15’

DB2 Housing allocation at Stacey’s Garage

7.151 This policy provides details for the development of Stacey’s Garage. It is not specifically an allocated site as it lies within the settlement boundary. The condition of the site is at odds with the otherwise well-maintained conservation area. Its appearance detracts from character and appearance.

7.152 I recommend that the policy is reconfigured so that it properly captures the two criteria included in the second part of the policy. I also recommend that the criteria are expanded so that they address the need to secure high-quality design in the

Conservation Area. This will address the representation made by Historic England on the policy.

Replace the policy with:

‘Proposals for the redevelopment of Stacey’s Garage (as shown on Map 5) for other purposes including housing will be supported subject to the following criteria:

- **their design responds positively to the character and the appearance of the village in general and its immediate locality in particular;**
- **their design conserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Twyford Conservation Area;**
- **any contamination issues are identified and positively addressed;**
- **appropriate vehicular access is provided; and**
- **safe and convenient facilities for pedestrian movement along the High Street frontage are provided’**

At the end of the first paragraph of supporting text add: ‘Policy DB2 provides a positive context for the potential redevelopment of the site. It identifies an important set of criteria which include a requirement to conserve or enhance the character of the conservation area’

Community Actions

7.153 Elsewhere in this report I have recommended that policies are deleted from the main part of the Plan and are repositioned into a Community Actions Section. I set out below the wording of the initial part of such a section. Thereafter it should list the community actions.

Add a new section to the Plan to read as follows:

‘5 Community Actions

The bulk of the Plan has included land use Policies. They will form part of the development plan in the event that the Plan is ‘made’ after a public referendum.

This Section comments about a series of community actions. They are issues where the residents of the parish have expressed a strong view about the issue concerned during the plan making process but which are not land use-based matters. In some cases, they overlap with or complement land use policies in the Plan.

Community actions will not form part of the development plan in the event that the Plan is made. However, they may form the basis of actions which the Parish Council will pursue within the Plan period either in its own right or with other agencies.

Thereafter incorporate the following submitted policies as Community Actions (with their own numbering sequence which is distinctive from the policies)’

ST2, LHE4, LHE6.2, LHE6.3, MA1, MA3.1, MA3.2, MA5,

Implementation and Monitoring of the Plan

- 7.154 Section 4 of the Plan addresses the important matters of the implementation and the monitoring of the Plan. They do so to good effect.
- 7.155 I recommend the inclusion of two additional paragraphs to this part of the Plan. The first comments about the way in which the Parish Council would monitor the effectiveness of the series of community actions which have arisen as part of the examination process. The second comments about the importance of monitoring the delivery of the allocated site and, if necessary, to review the Plan in the event that it does not come forward. In these circumstances the Plan would not deliver the strategic housing required for the parish as set out in the SDLP.

At the end of Section 4 add two new paragraphs to read as follows:

'The Parish Council will monitor the effectiveness of its delivery of the Community Actions set out in Section 5 of this report.

In addition, the Parish Council will monitor the delivery of the allocated site (as set out in Policies HN2 and DB1 of this Plan). Where necessary it will liaise with the South Downs National Park Authority, the landowner and statutory agencies to understand any delays in the determination of planning applications and subsequent construction. In the event that progress is not made the Parish Council will assess the need or otherwise for the Plan to be reviewed to ensure the strategic housing required for the parish as set out in the Local Plan is delivered in a timely fashion within the Plan period'

Other matters – General

- 7.156 This report has recommended a series of modifications both to the policies and to the text in the submitted Plan. Where consequential changes to the text are required directly as a result of my recommended modification to the policy concerned, I have highlighted them in this report. However other changes to the general text may be required elsewhere in the Plan as a result of the recommended modifications to the policies. It will be appropriate for SDNPA and the Parish Council to have the flexibility to make any necessary consequential changes and factual updates to the general text. I recommend accordingly.
- 7.157 This report has recommended that some policies are deleted and that others become community actions. This will have an inevitable effect on the policy numbering sequence in the Plan. In these circumstances it would be appropriate for TPC to renumber the policies which remain in the Plan as it sees fit.

Modification of general text (where necessary) and policy numbering to achieve consistency with the modified policies.

8 Summary and Conclusions

Summary

- 8.1 The Plan sets out a range of policies to guide and direct development proposals in the period up to 2033. It is distinctive in addressing a specific set of issues that have been identified and refined by the wider community.
- 8.2 Following my independent examination of the Plan I have concluded that the Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the basic conditions for the preparation of a neighbourhood plan subject to a series of recommended modifications.

Conclusion

- 8.3 On the basis of the findings in this report I recommend to the South Down National Park Authority that subject to the incorporation of the modifications set out in this report that the Twyford Neighbourhood Development Plan should proceed to referendum.

Referendum Area

- 8.4 I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Plan area. In my view, the neighbourhood area is entirely appropriate for this purpose and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that this is not the case. I therefore recommend that the Plan should proceed to referendum based on the neighbourhood area as originally approved by the South Downs National Park Authority on 12 January 2015.
- 8.5 I am grateful to everyone who has helped in any way to ensure that this examination has run in a smooth and efficient manner. TPC's responses to the clarification note were both thorough and helpful.

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
9 August 2021